An Integronic Frame About the Interface(s) “BIODIVERSITY <=> GENOME <=> SOCIETY <=> HUMAN KNOWLEDGE”

Nicolae Bulz1,2,3*

1National Defence College, Romania
2World Economy Institute / NERI, Cybernetics Commission / SSEJS / Romanian Academy
3New York Academy of Sciences, NY, USA

*Corresponding author: Nicole Bulz, National Defence College, Romania; World Economy Institute / NERI, Cybernetics Commission / SSEJS / Romanian Academy, New York Academy of Sciences, NY, USA. Tel: +40269-241466; Email: nbulz@yahoo.com

Citation: Bulz N (2018) An Integronic Frame About the Interface(s) “BIODIVERSITY <=> GENOME <=> SOCIETY <=> HUMAN KNOWLEDGE.” Anthropol Open Acc: AOAP-124. DOI: 10.29011/AOAP-124/100024

Received Date: 03 July, 2018; Accepted Date: 23 July, 2018; Published Date: 30 July, 2018

Abstract

How could the assumption onto our Cosmos by Transdisciplinarity, Integrative Science, and Theology fit in the worldview made by the globalization/regionalization realities and postmodern aspirations?

There is, here, a “possible turning point” proposal to take account on the state of art, at least, in the related arena to Cognitive Science, regarding the comprehension on consciousness [1]. So, there is a significant term, here taken as a creative metaphor within an epiphoric tension [2], ‘qualia’ (at plural; singular ‘quale’, in Latin) to refer to the introspectively phenomenal aspects of our mental lives. The actual usage of the term bears the disagreement on how qualia relate to the physical world both inside and outside the human, beyond which mental states have qualia, and, also, the disagreement on mind-body problem. This “nominated” disagreement, through qualia term, support and elicit the comprehension on consciousness and beyond. The subjective sensory qualities like “the redness of red” (those accompany our perception) are per se qualia. The explanatory gap (that exists between the subjective qualities of our perception and the physical system that we call the brain) is symbolized per se by qualia. So, it may be a proper turning point to approach subjective-objective gap of ourselves. As above presented, as related to our gap, qualia term is used starting from ourselves. Now, on another part, a new insight “subject-object reversal” is elicited by aiming out of: conventional understanding (“what else is true?”) and constraining explanation (“what is science?”). These “out of” are equivalent to prolong qualia beyond “our gap” and so, to face toward the construction of a “HUMAN GENOMIC COMPLEX”. Is this construct a new term within a possible “Science/Culture/Religion” triad? Is this triad a possible pavement in order to LEARN TO LIVE AND TO PROGRESS TOGETHER? Could a NETWORK OF (the contemporary) NETWORKS implement these new constructs?
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The 1st FRAME

“Original” rationale addressing a conjecture upon the MULTILEVEL_CIRCULAR relation: KNOWLEDGE_1 \(\Rightarrow\) BRAIN \(\Rightarrow\) MIND \(\Rightarrow\) GENOME \(\Rightarrow\) SOCIETY \(\Rightarrow\) KNOWLEDGE_2

(Quasi) Definition_1: An Integronic Mode of Thinking (Imt) means a ‘subtle near-ness’ to the Holistic Mode of Thinking (Hmt). I.e. a HUMAN, as much as possible, attains Imt if HE/SHE USES one (at least) from the operators from the open set: {COMPARISON OPERATOR; BELONGING OPERATOR; INCLUSION OPERATOR; ...} – within a ‘problem solving’ saturated environment.

This USAGE is revealed by “engaging” related subtle expressions of gnosis and/or episteme, as well, alongside his/her explanations and/or understanding attempts and/or embedded sentiments and/or intuitions – as attempts within our World. [3-10].

**Proposition 1:** A subtle near-ness to the Hmt, so, an expression of Imt has a necessary and sufficient communication condition within the evolutionary creative Human’s appearance of communication.

This condition is implemented by/from/with an issue of communication which contains at least a related subtle expression of gnosis and/or episteme responsible on his/her explanations and/or understanding attempts and/or embedded sentiments and/or intuitions attempts [11-17].

**Proposition 2:** If a Human, as much as possible, attains Imt, then he/she is, has and uses one element (at least) from the set of bio-support for the acting within the probabilistic/statistic, fuzzy, and subtle approaching on our World within a MULTILEVEL_CIRCULAR relation:

KNOWLEDGE_1 \(\Rightarrow\) BRAIN \(\Rightarrow\) MIND \(\Rightarrow\) GENOME \(\Rightarrow\) SOCIETY \(\Rightarrow\) KNOWLEDGE_2

This above stated relation is embedded within a General Humankind System // Living Support Entities (and their Existence-Reflection) [as an Anticipatory / Incursion (computing) system] [18-33] (K1-K2).

**Proposition 3:** A subtle near-ness to the Hmt, so, an expression of Imt, has a necessary and sufficient communication condition within the innate cultural Human’s appearance of communication: “HUMAN COMPLEX”. This condition is implemented by/from/with an issue of communication which contains at least a related subtle expression of gnosis and/or episteme responsible on his/her FLOW through the MULTILEVEL_CIRCULAR relation K1-K2 / [34-39].

**Proposition 4:** If a Human, as much as possible, attains Imt, then he/she is, has and uses one element (at least) from the set of bio-support as Individual - but - meantime, he/she does all these as an element of a set of Individuals (i.e. PAIR/e-DIALOGUE COUPLE, TRIAD, FAMILY, COMMUNITY/e-COMMUNITY, SMALL/MIDDLE/LARGE SCALE COMMUNITARIAN ENTITY, HUMANKIND) and, so, is acting within the probabilistic/statistic, fuzzy and subtle (re-)approaching on our World.

Then this USAGE [of any element from the set of bio-support as Individual] means that that set of Individuals (as above) attains Imt – pointing HUMAN GENOMIC and HUMAN (e-)COMPLEX.

**Remark 1:** This attainment (as Proposition 4 states it) does not directly means that both that Individual or that set of Individuals recognize(s)/communicate(s) that attainment of Imt, generally addressing, toward another element of a set of Individuals (again: as above into Proposition 4).

**Proposition 5:** The reciprocal stance of the Proposition 4 does not stand meantime there is/are severe constrain(s) [as Microcosm, neural, biological, environmental, societal, Macrocosm constrain(s)] related to the obvious emittance of a gnosis and/or episteme subtle expression by/from/with an Individual toward a set of Individuals (e.g. cases from: SATURATED PROBLEMS FROM SCHOOLS, JAILS / ANY FORM OF CONSTRAINED LIBERTY, HARD LABOUR CAMP, STRESS-ZONE FROM RESEARCH LABORATORIES, MILITARY UNITS, SECRET INFORMATION UNITS, EXECUTIVE GOVERNMENTAL UNITS - much more addressing, here, a General Humankind System // Living Support Entities (and their Existence Reflection) [as an Anticipatory / Incursion (computing) system]. [40-52]

A recovery of the Remark 1 / (but) as an [explicit] Inquiry: Which is the COMPARATIVE RELATION - as pointing from the associations of more than one mode of thinking to the Imt? (It could be as a step by step “jumping” from a neuronal image to another neuronal image by/from/with an Individual and/or a set of Individuals)

**Proposition 6:** The SUPPOSED probabilistic/statistic, fuzzy, subtle type of the Enl K1_K2 MULTILEVEL_CIRCULAR relation would remain a per se unproven type/unknown type meantime there are/will be yet NOT significant discoveries related to the meta-relations between the elements of the relation KNOWLEDGE_1 \(\Rightarrow\) “HUMAN GENOMIC COMPLEX” \(\Rightarrow\) BRAIN \(\Rightarrow\) MIND \(\Rightarrow\) GENOME \(\Rightarrow\) (e-)SOCIETY.
"HUMAN (e-)COMPLEX" <=> KNOWLEDGE_2. Also, equivalent significant discoveries and inventions are foreseen/foreshift/prospected within the ontic multi-open string {..., MICROSCOSM, HUMAN BEING, NEURAL ENTITIES, BIOLOGICAL ENTITIES, ENVIRONMENTAL ENTITIES, SOCIETAL ENTITIES [INDIVIDUAL, (E-)PAIR/(E-)DIALOGUE COUPLE, “Science/Culture/Religion” TRIAD, (E-)FAMILY, COMMUNITY/E-COMMUNITY, SMALL/MIDDLE/LARGE SCALE (E-)COMMUNITARIAN ENTITY; (E-)LEARN TO (E-)LIVE TOGETHER STANCE], HUMANKIND, BIOCOSM; ECOCOSM; MACROCOSM, ...}. 

Remark 2: As, here, an Inquiry, is there an increasing stance of the Enl K1_K2 MULTILEVEL_CIRCULAR relation if an Individual has an increasing (even unproven/unknown) stance of the attaining Imt? [Which are the “individual” sources toward “fixing/prompting/sustaining/attaining” an increasing stance of the Imt STANCE?] [3,10,53-66].

NOTE-1: These “original” rationale are to be presented, also, as a result of (at least...) some scientific meetings with three Professors and a Director who the author of this current study had met, thus stimulating (in)directly this edition of this I frame:

Richard L. Amoroso, Director of Noetic Advanced Studies Institute, CA, US. [67].

Mariano L. Bianca Ph.D., Professor, Siena University, Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Dip. di Scienze storico-sociali, filosofiche e della formazione, Italy[38].

Radu J. Bogdan Ph.D., Professor, Tulane University, US; Regular Guest Professor, University of Bucharest, Romania [64].

Niels Henrik Gregersen PhD, Professor of Systematic Theology, Department of Systematic Theology, Faculty of Theology, University of Copenhagen, Denmark [68].

There was an attempt to realize a kind of methodological-dialogue between the above ‘four scientifically types’ of meetings. There is the affirmation that the current study inquires upon the diversity of these ‘four scientifically fragmented types’; one result is revealed by the consonant diversity within the TABLE-contents entitled “HUMAN GENOMIC COMPLEX” stance of approaches / see these TABLE-consonant-contents into the downward Section I of the III frame.

The next quotation, here, tries to lexicographical represent the above text [only and only within a metaphor]:

“As giving, it starts as giving from what you have to HAVE, then - from a moment, it follows as giving from what you are to BE.” (The Father ARSENIE BOCA, Christian Theologian b.1910 - d.1989) / “Cand dai, la început dai din ceea ce ai, apoi, de la un moment dat, dai din ceea ce esti.” / In Romanian language.

NOTE-2: The HOLISTIC mode of thinking (Hmt) [‘highly and possible firstly’ focalised by Plato] is defined ‘together’ and within the diversity/fragmentation of our human thinking. This diversity/fragmentation comprises also the following three other modes of thinking: ANALYTIC [‘highly’ focalised by Descartes], EXPERIMENTAL [‘highly’ focalised by Fr. Bacon], and EXPERIENTIAL [‘highly’ focalised by Bergson] [8,55,60,69-85].

NOTE-3: An INTEGRONIC mode of thinking (Imt) BEYOND its subtle near-ness to the HOLISTIC mode of thinking (Hmt) would have to inquiry on (at least a ‘fragment’ of) the open string {... <=> BRAIN / HEART <=> MIND <=> CONSCIENCE <=> CONSCIOUSNESS <=> ...}. The next graphic is intended to represent the above integer text as an image, for the initial (by the contexts before the Proposition 4) frame, and then the enlarged (by the context of proposition 4) frame – i.e. Figure 1.

\[ 
\text{Figure 1: Multilevel Circular Relation: KNOWLEDGE_1 <=> "HUMAN GENOMIC COMPLEX" <=> BRAIN <=> MIND <=> GENOME <=> (E-)SOCIETY <=> "HUMAN (E-)COMPLEX" <=> KNOWLEDGE_2.} 
\]
The II\textsuperscript{nd} FRAME

Toward a Possible Turning Point between Transdisciplinary Research, Integrative Science Prospect, and Theology: A Possible Turning Point as Facing "HUMAN GENOMIC COMPLEX" within a possible "Science/Culture/Religion" triad. Possible pavement in order to LEARN TO LIVE AND TO PROGRESS TOGETHER. A NETWORK OF (the contemporary) NETWORKS implementing these new constructs.

How could the ‘first stage’ assumption onto our Cosmos by Transdisciplinarity, Integrative Science, and Theology fit in the worldview made by the globalization / regionalization realities and postmodern aspirations?

There is here a “possible turning point" proposal to take account on the state of art at least in the related arena to Cognitive Science, regarding the comprehension on consciousness. So, there is a significant term, here taken as a creative metaphor within an epiphoric tension ‘qualia’ (at plural; singular ‘quale’), in Latin) to refer to the introspectively phenomenal aspects of our mental lives. The actual usage of the term bears the disagreement on how qualia relate to the physical world both inside and outside the human, beyond which mental states have qualia, and, also, the disagreement on mind-body problem. This “nominated” disagreement, through qualia term, support and elicit the comprehension on consciousness and beyond. The subjective sensory qualities like “the redness of red” (those accompany our perception) are per se qualia. The explanatory gap (that exists between the subjective qualities of our perception and the physical system that we call the brain) is symbolized per se by qualia. So, it may be a proper turning point to approach subjective-objective gap of ourselves. As above presented, as related to our gap, qualia term is used starting from Now, on another part, a new insight “subject-object reversal” is elicited by aiming out of: conventional understanding (“what else is true?”) and constraining explanation (“what is science?”). These “out of” are equivalent to prolong qualia beyond “our gap” / and so, to face toward the construction of a “HUMAN GENOMIC COMPLEX”.

Here it is proposed an extended usage of qualia term to comprehend the multiple approaches onto our Cosmos by contemporary thinkers beyond strictly Philosophy, Biology and Physics, and beyond actual state of our economic and political shaped [post-crisis] Planet. This multiple approach refers the deepest and profound reality, research for the convergent points of existence and reflection; it is beyond the complexity of “a” categorized academic science and the long-term tribulation of the “hard” XX century. From the contemporary thinkers beyond all these, here, the proposed focalization is on Transdisciplinarity Integrative Science prospect [45,47,87,88] these types of research being the one part into the Science-Theology dialogue. And into the “Centrum” of this dialogue it is proposed a Qualia role for the subjective-objective gap of ourselves inward the Cosmos, as “nominated” disagreement, just to support and elicit the comprehension on fragmentised deep knowledge, on the act of contemporary individual and collective consciousness [and Universal Consciousness], onto the complex relation consciousness-data-information-knowledge - a visible section into the Science-Theology dialogue. All these support a generalized subjective-objective gap. So, a “HUMAN GENOMIC COMPLEX” would support the analysis and to elicit the usage of Qualia term that would grant “any” overwhelmed gap, by “any” part, seen in any section regarding Science-Theology dialogue [89-92].

A new/innovative ‘second stage’ assumption stance is expected within the research and implementing labor toward a ‘subtle possible’ and/or an ‘acting probabilistic/fuzzy/subtle’ “Science/Culture/Religion” triad. This triad is foreseen to take up a ‘subtle possible’ dialogue-and-negotiation toward a new stance of education, administration, (re-)construction of our freedom, (re-) construction of our (meta-)juridical ‘probabilistic/fuzzy/subtle’ societal pavement of prosecution and reward. All these would be in order to LEARN TO LIVE AND TO PROGRESS TOGETHER. Could a NETWORK OF (the contemporary) NETWORKS implement these new constructs? I.e. a “Prospective subtle” YES within a responsible respond alongside this complex text on.

The III\textsuperscript{rd} FRAME

Is it possible to really be a way toward the Innovative Social Relations and Creative Partnership issue vs. the Interactive Modelling / “HUMAN GENOMIC COMPLEX” stance (IM/HGC)?

Section I: The STRUCTURAL section of the III\textsuperscript{rd} FRAME:

There are the following proposed principles (PP) focusing the proposal within the IM/HGC stance - also, to form the background for the structural construction of this study:

PP1: The affirmation upon a per se COMPLEXITY - within the two FRAMES, above, as key interdisciplinary research themes - toward the Innovative Social Relations and Creative Partnership (ISR and CP) objectives and a primal-dual conceptual stage vs. the IM/HGC stance [93].

PP2: On INNOVATION AND EDUCATION regarding the two FRAMES, above, as key interdisciplinary research themes - toward the ISR and CP demands vs. the IM/HGC stance.

PP3: The PERCEPTION of the two FRAMES, above, as key interdisciplinary research themes -toward the ISR and CP issue vs. the IM/HGC stance.

PP4: A STRATEGY to enable world-wide professional and scientific societies related and consequent - within the two FRAMES, above, as key interdisciplinary research themes -toward the ISR and CP research, education and innovation.
PP5: A core of LOCAL-GLOBAL CRITERIA.

PP6: The IM/HGC stance approach on the KNOWLEDGE versus the societal FRAME.

If the previous tasks of survey (PP1-6) would be successful, then a possible conceptual orientation may be assured according to the following TABLE, as an initial contribution from the “HUMAN GENOMIC COMPLEX” stance of approaches – i.e. Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE vs societal FRAME</th>
<th>Symbolic societal FRAME</th>
<th>Numeric societal FRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structured KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>Expert Systems</td>
<td>Probabilistic/Statistical and/or Fuzzy Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'No' structured KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>Subtle (‘No’) Systems e.g. NETWORK OF (the contemporary) NETWORKS</td>
<td>{Neural Systems (networks)}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The relation between different modelling approaches within an extended System Theory, Praxis and Logic on the background of the KNOWLEDGE vs. the societal FRAME.

So, if there is an agreement upon the fact that the enquired <<Role and impact of professional and scientific societies -within all the two societal FRAMES, above, as key interdisciplinary research themes - toward Innovative Social Relations and Creative Partnership research, education and subsidiary innovation>> quasi exists, then there is a possibility to be reflected within a Subtle (Non) System-as nearly delimited by the above table. Then, this possible conceptual orientation would be a necessary support with the tracks of the: task-1: providing an analytical list of professional and scientific societies - on related world-wide backgrounds; task-2: developing a questionnaire on the present and next future issues on the matter; task-3: organizing a large scale Workshop to consult on future options-as the generative core of a Humankind approach on - all the PP1-4 key interdisciplinary research themes according to the related recognized scientific entities - for a Periodical Study-Report on “HUMAN GENOMIC COMPLEX”.

Section II: The FUNCTIONAL section of the of the IV th FRAME: There are the following dually proposed principles (DPP), correlated and concordant to the above Proposed Principles (PP) - just to form the background for the structural-functional construction of this study:

DPP1: The re-affirmation upon the COMPLEXITY of the two FRAMES, above, as key interdisciplinary research themes - toward the ISR and CP issue vs. the IM/HGC stance objectives and the expansion of a DUAL CONCEPTUAL STAGE.

DPP2. Proposing the ANALYSIS of the professional and scientific TRENDS on the two FRAMES, above, as key interdisciplinary research themes - toward the ISR and CP issue vs. the IM/HGC stance.

DPP3. A brief survey on Interactive Modelling stance; SOCIETAL KNOWLEDGE.

DPP4. A brief survey on the CONSEQUENCES of the societal knowledge: Qualia[Planetron, Sociotron] - as constructs toward the two FRAMES, above, as key interdisciplinary research themes - toward the ISR and CP issue vs. the IM/HGC stance, and possible domain.

DPP5. Notes upon an INFORMATION-KNOWLEDGE JOURNEY.

DPP6. SOURCES OF SUBTLENESS - proposed through the two FRAMES, above, as key interdisciplinary research themes - toward the ISR and CP issue vs. the IM/HGC stance, and possible domain.

DPP7. Describing author’s current and POSSIBLE RESEARCH INTERESTS.

DPP8. An ordered LIST OF INQUIRIES and their details related to the two FRAMES, above, as key interdisciplinary research themes toward the ISR and CP issue vs. the IM/HGC stance, and possible domain - according to the content of the DPP1, 2, 4, 6.

The inter/trans/co/cross-disciplinary approaches upon the 3rd millennium are challenges to reduce the societal gap between humankind aspiration and limitation. Focusing on the globalization / regionalization turning point, the contemporary societal gap is a complex reality; nature, society, and thinking are the reverted parts of this non-systemic entity: societal gap. All these emulate the thinking upon the brain/heart, mind, conscience, consciousness, Existence Reflection profoundness, and Universal Consciousness re-approaches. Let be the following “new” description of a perceived problem within our humankind – i.e. Figure 2.

Figure 2: The connections between, “intro/extro” Input and Output (I and O) within the representation of the Living Support Entities, Eco-consciousness, Holistic capacity, HUMAN GENOMIC COMPLEX” (HGC) [94].
**Problem:** After 2.5 millennia (proved within the structural science) of life learning across the unknown environment, eliciting innate profoundness, and transmitting information among the parts of the group and to the next group of living support systems, at the beginning of the IIIrd millennium, with the discovery of own humankind genome, the society is facing with its own increasing complexity. There is a profound societal gap between aspiration and limitation within an indirect scientific responsibility.

If there is a constituted problem, then Humankind includes its solution, or there is a collapse. The current humankind tends to resolve the constituted problems (also the above represented Problem too) [95]. Also, there is a dilution of the tension between material and spiritual keen approaches over our worlds; but, thus, the entire responsibility is relatively not increased.

Now and here, a possibility consists in an aggregation of the concepts related to:

1. The connected problems of the Planet (poverty/welfare, culture, religion, ideology, science, environment, individual/societal becoming/evolution, survival within the becoming/evolution).

2. The worth or/and worthless Knowledge Transfer as a basis for the future decisions and actions; the turning point of the individual and societal tensions.

3. The today necessary transition-net: Universal $$\Rightarrow$$ Particular $$\Rightarrow$$ Planetary.

As a becoming of a solution for the above represented Problem, the Rational Subject minds upon the individual and collective flows of the cycle: *1-*2-*3-*1, according to the synergy of the increasing knowledge. It would stand between / across / around / besides an understanding and an explanation inside / during self-“lost / hidden / unseen” humankind vs. the above presented challenges and metaphors.

* Holistic capacity (an instant insight and correct representation of an entire context); here it is metaphorical associated with the FIRE symbol – regarding the existence vs. HGC.

* Eco-consciousness (at least, a harmonic decision versus the contrary tendencies of all the parts); here it is metaphorically associated with the WATER symbol -and reflection vs. HGC / [33,35,65,86,96-115].

Onto our current space-time period, it may be a proper turning point, within our contemporary tension(s), to re-approach on the subjective-objective gap of ourselves. As above presented, as related to our gap, *qualia* term is used starting from ourselves (… BRAIN/HEART $$\Rightarrow$$ MIND $$\Rightarrow$$ GENOME $$\Rightarrow$$ (e-)SOCIETY $$\Rightarrow$$ “HUMAN (e-)COMPLEX” …). Now, on another part, a new insight “subject-object reversal” is elicited by aiming out of: conventional understanding (“what else is true?”) and constraining explanation (“what is science?”). These “out of” are equivalent to prolong *qualia* beyond “our gap” and so, to face toward the construction and/or re-construction of a “HUMAN GENOMIC COMPLEX”. Is this construct a new term within a possible “Science/Culture/Religion” triad? Is this triad a possible pavement in order to LEARN TO LIVE AND TO PROGRESS TOGETHER? Could a NETWORK OF (the contemporary) NETWORKS implement these new constructs? Are these inquiries, at this text-stage, elicited within a virtual or within a (hypothetical) real ontic multi-open string {…, MICROCOSM, HUMAN BEING, NEURAL ENTITIES, BIOLOGICAL ENTITIES, ENVIRONMENTAL ENTITIES, SOCIETAL ENTITIES [INDIVIDUAL, (E-)PAIR/(E-)DIALOGUE COUPLE, “Science/Culture/Religion” TRIAD, (E-)FAMILY, COMMUNITY/E-COMMUNITY, SMALL/MIDDLE/LARGE SCALE (E-)COMMUNITARIAN ENTITY; (E-)LEARN TO (E-)LIVE TOGETHER STANCE], HUMANKIND, BIOCOSM; ECOCOSM; MACROCOSM, …}? This text tries to reserve both the subtle outcomes:

I.e. a “Prospective subtle” YES within any human intentionality (e-)basement and responsible respond alongside the humankind (e-)complex – prospected within this complex text on.

A “prospective subtle” NO would exist only and only if ‘any’ human intentionality (e-)based act would collapse, and any kind of re-iterated responsible respond would be cracked within the {increased exponential technological advance (mostly on the realms of the ‘biocomputing’ and ‘quantum computing’) –probabilistic/fuzzy/subtle aggregated with- non-exponential human (e-)complex advance (mostly on the realms of the ‘bio-Real_Virtuality’ and ‘neuro-augmented-Virtual_Realities’} and expended Artificial Intelligence and Artificial Life innovative intrusions within the near stages of the human being) [but ‘these constructs and concepts’ are fuzzy-outside and subtle-alongside the complexity of this text].
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