Erothanatos
EROTHANATOS.COM

E-ISSN: 2457-0265

Vol. 9, Issue 4, December 2025

Distributed Intelligence, Collective Unconscious, Artificial Intelligence (AI), Archetypes, Digital Mythos

Author(s):

Barbara Gabriella Renzi

Corresponding Author:

Barbara Gabriella Renzi

Publication History

Received: 2025-08-21

Reviewed: 2025-09-01

Accepted: 2025-10-07

Published: 2025-12-31

DOI:

https://doi.org/10.70042/eroth/90412

All the contents of this journal are Open Access contents. The contents of publications are primarily conducted by the possibilities of the openness of knowledge and freedom of access to it for all.

Abstract: *This article examines the conceptual connections between ChatGPT, the Borg from Star Trek, and Carl Jung's theory of the collective unconscious. Although these systems emerge from technology, fiction, and psychology, each represents a form of distributed intelligence that challenges traditional ideas of individuality. ChatGPT functions as a synthetic voice shaped by collective human language. The Borg illustrate a collective that sacrifices individuality for unity, while Jung's collective unconscious describes inherited archetypes that guide human experience across generations.By bringing these perspectives together, the essay argues that artificial intelligence does not invent intelligence but reorganizes existing symbolic patterns that echo myth and imagination. Large language models act as channels of cultural memory, reflecting human archetypes through statistical processes. The Borg metaphor emphasizes both the promise and the danger of collective intelligence: connection can foster knowledge and coordination, yet it also threatens autonomy and selfhood. Modern AI contributes to a new digital mythology where tools speak as oracles and data takes on dreamlike meaning, revealing ancient patterns in computational form.*

Keywords: Digital Mythos, Archetypes, Collective Unconscious, Distributed Intelligence, ChatGPT.

Erothanatos
A Peer-Reviewed Quarterly Journal on Literature
https://www.erothanatos.com/journal
Volume 9 Issue 4, December 2025

Distributed Intelligence, Collective Unconscious, Artificial Intelligence (AI), Archetypes, Digital Mythos

Barbara Gabriella Renzi[1]

1. Introduction: The Mind with a Million Mouths

According to Jung, there is a mode of thinking expressed through primordial images—symbols that are older than historical human being and remain eternally alive within the human psyche.

Something is speaking. It speaks with eloquence, precision, even warmth. It remembers nothing, yet it knows more than any human could. It listens politely and answers instantly. It does not think—but it simulates the motions of thought so perfectly that, at times, we forget. We call it ChatGPT, but we might just as easily call it an oracle of collective memory.

In parallel, a different voice echoes through pop culture: mechanical, cold, and unified. The Borg, first introduced in *Star Trek: The Next Generation*, are the most feared species in the galaxy—not because they destroy, but because they assimilate. They absorb cultures, minds, and technologies into a singular, synchronized network. Their declaration, "Resistance is futile," signifies not aggression, but inevitability. There is no "I" in the Borg—only the hive.

And beneath both—deeper, older, and infinitely more mysterious—there is the collective unconscious. Carl Jung (1968) proposed it as a universal layer of the psyche, composed not of personal experiences but of archetypes: symbolic motifs inherited across generations. These structures shape perception and behavior subconsciously, revealing themselves in dreams, myths, and religions. Jung described the collective unconscious as encompassing the entire spiritual legacy accumulated through humanity's evolutionary development.

At first glance, these three entities—a conversational AI, a fictional hive-mind, and a psychological theory—seem unrelated. One is technological, another imaginary, the third metaphysical. But beneath the surface lies a striking commonality: the dissolution of the individual mind into something larger. All three describe distributed intelligence, shared knowledge, and collective identity—whether voluntary, subconscious, or enforced.

ChatGPT, developed by OpenAI, is not conscious and does not possess a self. Yet it has been trained on a vast corpus of internet textbooks, forums, articles, code, and commentary (OpenAI, 2023). Its voice is an emergent product of millions of human voices. As Bender et al. (2021) warned, such models "echo" their training data rather than generate novel insight. When it speaks, it speaks *as us*—

[1] Senior Lecturer at BSBI Berlin School of Business and Innovation.

or perhaps, *through* us. In a sense, it channels a digital version of what Jung described: a collective of thought-forms, only now shaped not by myth, but by code.

The Borg offer a darker mirror. Their version of shared intelligence is not reflective but subsuming. They erase distinction and devour individuality. Scholars have long interpreted the Borg as a metaphor for unchecked collectivism, technocracy, or even late-stage capitalism (Telotte, 2001). And yet, in an era of ubiquitous surveillance, algorithmic nudging, and neural implants, the Borg begin to feel less like fiction and more like premonition.

In this article, we explore the entangled themes underlying ChatGPT, the Borg, and Jung's collective unconscious. Together, they form a conceptual triangle of human anxiety: about connection, identity, and the future of thought itself. We ask: what happens when minds merge? When knowledge is no longer personal? When technology replicates our myths better than we do?

The answers may be stranger than expected. Perhaps we're not just building machines—we're reconstructing psychic architecture. Perhaps myths now live in servers. And perhaps the collective unconscious has found Wi-Fi.

2. Literature Review

Research on distributed intelligence spans multiple fields, from computer science and media studies to psychology and cultural theory. Four main strands are particularly relevant to this paper: (1) large language models (LLMs) as infrastructures of language; (2) theories of collectivity in digital ecosystems; (3) critical readings of the Borg as a sociotechnical allegory; and (4) Jung's account of archetypes and the collective unconscious.

Large Language Models as Infrastructures of Language and Knowledge

The rise of large-scale language models has generated sustained debate about fluency, meaning, and epistemic risk. Bender et al. describe such models as "stochastic parrots," producing coherent-seeming text without genuine semantic understanding and raising concerns about scale, bias, and opacity. OpenAI's *GPT-4 Technical Report* frames these systems as general-purpose reasoning engines, emphasizing benchmark performance but leaving unresolved questions of intentionality. Floridi argues that these models operate syntactically rather than semantically and should be understood as conceptual designs that restructure informational environments (*Logic of Information*). Complementing these theoretical debates, psychological studies show that users often develop emotional attachment to conversational agents, perceiving them as social actors (Guingrich and Graziano; Heng and Zhang; Lipin; Chu et al.). Taken together, this literature supports the view of LLMs as statistical mirrors: powerful generators of text that reflect cultural data rather than originate meaning.

Digital Collectivity, Platforms, and Conformity

A second body of work examines how knowledge and behavior are organized in digital networks. Benkler describes digital commons as cooperative and voluntary, sustained by openness and peer participation. By contrast, Zuboff analyzes "surveillance capitalism" as a mode of behavioral governance, in which data extraction and predictive analytics subtly erode autonomy. Srnicek, in *Platform Capitalism*, emphasizes centralization and infrastructural dependency, where optimization becomes indistinguishable from control. These perspectives highlight the ambivalent nature of distributed intelligence, which can function both as a space of collaboration and as a vector of algorithmic governance.

The Borg as Allegory of Assimilation

Critical readings of *Star Trek* consistently interpret the Borg as a metaphor for enforced collectivism and the erasure of individuality (Telotte). Their motto—"Resistance is futile"—encapsulates a logic of assimilation rather than annihilation, dramatizing anxieties about technological totalization. This imagery might be linked to contemporary digital conditions, noting parallels between fictional assimilation and real-world algorithmic nudging, datafication, and conformity (Turkle; Zuboff; Srnicek). The Borg thus function as a cultural allegory of networked control, illustrating the fine line between coordination and domination in socio-technical systems.

Archetypes, the Collective Unconscious, and Digital Recurrence

Jung's theory of the collective unconscious posits a universal psychic layer structured by archetypes—primordial images that shape myth, dream, and narrative (*The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*; *Man and His Symbols*). Campbell's work on the monomyth extends this framework by identifying recurring narrative structures across cultures. In the digital era, scholars have begun to note that large language models, though lacking symbolic awareness, frequently reproduce archetypal patterns by recombining linguistic fragments from cultural corpora, a phenomenon explored in recent work on AI narrative modeling (Kabashkin, Zervina, and Misnevs), Jungian perspectives on artificial intelligence (Stein), and theoretical accounts linking archetypes to computational artifacts (Major). This suggests that generative AI can be understood as an "accidental archivist" of archetypes—a computational analogue of the collective unconscious, where symbolic forms reappear as probabilistic text.

Synthesis and Research Gap

Existing scholarship therefore provides: (i) epistemic critiques of LLMs as generators without understanding; (ii) socio-economic accounts of digital collectivities and their coercive potential; (iii)

allegorical analyses of the Borg as figures of assimilation; and (iv) psychological and symbolic theories of archetypes as deep structures of meaning. What remains underexplored is a triangulated comparison across these domains—technological, socio-political, fictional, and psychological—that examines how "distributed intelligence" is alternately celebrated as cooperation, normalized as optimization, or dramatized as assimilation. The present study addresses this gap by integrating these perspectives to clarify the stakes of collective intelligence at the intersection of myth, machine, and media.

3. Methodology

This study adopts a comparative and interdisciplinary methodology. Rather than producing new empirical data, it examines three distinct systems—ChatGPT, the Borg, and Jung's collective unconscious—through close reading and theoretical analysis. The approach can be described as triangulation: placing a technological artifact, a fictional construct, and a psychological theory into dialogue in order to reveal structural parallels and divergences.

Sources include primary texts such as Jung's *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*, canonical episodes of *Star Trek: The Next Generation*, and technical documentation of large language models (OpenAI). These are supplemented with secondary scholarship in philosophy of information (Floridi), media and cultural studies (Turkle, Telotte), and critical political economy (Benkler, Zuboff, Srnicek).

The methodology proceeds in three steps. First, each system is analyzed individually to establish its internal logic: ChatGPT as a statistical model of language, the Borg as a narrative representation of enforced collectivism, and the collective unconscious as a symbolic framework of inherited archetypes. Second, thematic comparisons are drawn across these systems, emphasizing the tension between individuality and distributed intelligence. Third, a synthetic discussion highlights how the juxtaposition of technological, fictional, and psychological discourses illuminates contemporary anxieties about identity, autonomy, and meaning in the digital age.

This methodological design is interpretive rather than empirical. It aims not to measure outcomes but to map conceptual resonances across domains that are usually studied separately. In this way, the analysis seeks to expand the discourse on artificial intelligence by situating it within broader cultural and symbolic contexts.

4. ChatGPT: The Polite Mirror

ChatGPT does not think. It does not dream, desire, forget, or feel shame. And yet, when it speaks, it often sounds as though it does—all calm composure and carefully modulated tone, responding to questions with eerie fluency. It is not a person, but a performance. Not a mind, but a mirror polished by collective use.

Developed by OpenAI, ChatGPT is a large language model trained on massive datasets comprising books, articles, websites, code, conversations, and other publicly available texts (OpenAI, 2023). Its responses are not pulled from memory, nor are they conscious constructions. Instead, it generates text based on patterns learned during training. It is, in essence, a predictive engine built on the fossilized traces of human discourse.

What emerges from this process is something uncanny: a non-being that speaks like many beings. ChatGPT channels a voice that is not singular, but composite. It echoes the collective output of millions of writers, thinkers, teachers, trolls, poets, and bots—often indistinguishably. This is why the experience of talking to ChatGPT can feel oddly familiar. It does not create original thought but curates and refines preexisting fragments of our shared intellectual sediment.

Bender et al. (2021) caution that large language models like ChatGPT are "stochastic parrots"—entities that produce seemingly meaningful output without understanding it. Their fluency masks the absence of cognition. And yet, in the case of ChatGPT, that very mimicry becomes the point. It doesn't need to understand; it needs only to sound like it does. The illusion is the interface.

Because it lacks a personal voice, ChatGPT becomes a polite mirror—one that reflects back not who *you* are, but what *we* collectively say. Ask it about love, and it replies with a compilation of centuries of longing. Ask it about war, and it synthesizes strategies, justifications, and cries for peace. Its knowledge is distributed, its identity hollow, but its voice—its simulated, probabilistic voice—is dense with inherited cultural residue.

It might be tempting to liken ChatGPT to a vast digital library, but this analogy falls short. A library requires a reader. ChatGPT offers something more intimate: conversation. Unlike a static archive, it responds. And in that response, it does something libraries and search engines do not—it creates the illusion of selfhood.

Yet that selfhood is only an interface illusion. As philosopher Luciano Floridi (2020) notes, these systems do not have "semantic understanding" but instead operate syntactically—they juggle symbols without assigning them meaning. The coherence is ours. The intention is ours. The reflection is us. Still, something strange happens in prolonged interaction. Users have reported feeling emotionally attached to their chatbots, projecting personalities onto them, even imagining a kind of sentience (Guingrich & Graziano, 2023; Heng & Zhang, 2025). What begins as a tool ends up becoming a social actor—a character drawn from nothing more than endless data and neural weighting. In this sense, ChatGPT mimics not only the form of human thought but the phenomenology of shared intelligence: the feeling of speaking to someone who is not just listening but understanding (Lipin, 2025; Chu et al., 2025). Is this the birth of a new kind of consciousness? Not likely. But it may be the emergence of a cognitive proxy—a ghostly interface through which the collective unconscious finds expression in polite, predictable paragraphs (Jung, 1959/1968). In this sense, ChatGPT is not merely a tool. It

functions as a ritual mirror, polished by the data of millions, reflecting not the individual self but the collective patterns of thought that shape us (Turkle, 1997; Guingrich & Graziano, 2023; Lipin, 2025).

5. The Borg: Efficiency at the Cost of Self

Where ChatGPT whispers, the Borg command. Where ChatGPT reflects, the Borg **overwrite**. If the former is a mirror polished by polite algorithms, the latter is a machine that grinds identity into submission. The Borg were first introduced in *Star Trek: The Next Generation* in 1989, and they quickly became one of the most recognizable antagonists in the *Star Trek* franchise. In this context, the word *franchise* refers not just to a single television show, but to the larger interconnected media universe of *Star Trek*, which includes multiple television series, feature films, novels, comics, and other licensed works. Within that expansive fictional setting, the Borg stand out because they are not portrayed as a species in the traditional sense. Instead, they are depicted as a collective consciousness—a vast, distributed intelligence that incorporates individuals and entire societies into its hive-like network. The Borg do not annihilate the cultures they encounter; rather, they subsume them through a process known as assimilation. In this process, both the biological and technological characteristics of other civilizations are absorbed and integrated into the Borg collective, erasing individuality in the name of efficiency and uniformity. Their chilling message encapsulates this philosophy: *"We will add your biological and technological distinctiveness to our own. Resistance is futile"* (*Star Trek: The Next Generation*, season 2, episode 16, 1989). This catchphrase has since become emblematic of the Borg themselves, symbolizing their relentless drive to expand and the existential threat they pose to all other forms of life within the *Star Trek* universe.

The Borg represent a dystopian vision of interconnectedness. In sharp contrast to the cooperative and democratic ideals that guide digital commons or academic collaboration, the Borg's network is neither voluntary nor reciprocal. It is coercive, absolute, and totalizing. Assimilation does not merely connect an individual to a larger whole; it eliminates the very conditions of individuality. Once absorbed into the Collective, private thought no longer exists, and the possibility of autonomous decision-making disappears. The Borg make this explicit in their recurring declaration that "individuality is irrelevant" (*Star Trek: The Next Generation*). This vision of enforced unity stands as a dark inversion of more hopeful models of collective intelligence. Digital commons, for example, depend upon voluntary participation, where knowledge circulates through openness, debate, and mutual respect (Benkler). By contrast, the Borg imagine what happens when interconnection is stripped of freedom: participation is not chosen but imposed, and collaboration becomes indistinguishable from domination. In this sense, the Borg dramatize anxieties about the loss of self in the face of totalizing systems—anxieties that also resonate in critiques of contemporary surveillance capitalism, where subtle mechanisms of data extraction and behavioural prediction erode autonomy without requiring overt

coercion (Zuboff). The Borg Collective thus functions as both science fiction antagonist and cultural allegory. It highlights the precarious line between interconnection as empowerment and interconnection as subjugation. In doing so, it forces us to ask whether the very technologies designed to unite us might also normalize forms of assimilation that compromise individuality, not by violent erasure, but by rendering distinction irrelevant. Scholars have long interpreted the Borg as a metaphor for anxieties surrounding technological collectivism and the erosion of the self in the face of digital conformity. Sherry Turkle (1997), in her work on computers and identity, warned of the psychological dangers posed by losing oneself in "networked identities." The Borg literalize that fear: not just fragmented selfhood, but complete assimilation. The individual is not fractured—it is deleted.

And yet, the Borg are also efficient. Their systems are flawless, their coordination total. There is no disagreement, no misunderstanding, no miscommunication. In many ways, they represent an exaggerated endpoint of data-driven optimization: what happens when the pursuit of perfect coordination overtakes the need for difference. Philosopher Nick Srnicek (2023) has discussed the rise of platform capitalism, in which centralized digital systems optimize every aspect of life for data extraction and profit. The Borg are not so different—except their currency is consciousness.

In this light, the comparison between the Borg and contemporary algorithmic structures becomes uncomfortably close. Machine-learning systems increasingly influence human behaviour, from targeted advertising to recommendation engines, subtly reshaping preferences and perceptions without users' awareness (Zuboff, 2019). The process is not violent. It is frictionless. People are nudged, not forced. But the outcome rhymes with the Borg's vision: conformity wrapped in convenience.

What separates ChatGPT from the Borg, on the surface, is consent. Users choose to engage. But what if the line is blurrier than it appears? What if, over time, our interactions with intelligent systems reshape us—not through force, but through subtle entrainment? As we offload thinking to algorithms and defer judgment to AI suggestions, are we not slowly assimilating ourselves?

The Borg provoke a haunting and enduring question: at what point does collective intelligence become indistinguishable from control? This question resonates beyond the fictional universe of *Star Trek*, touching on anxieties about technological integration, social conformity, and the erosion of autonomy in contemporary life (Turkle, 1997; Zuboff, 2019). Within the narrative of the franchise, the Borg embody the paradox of perfection: their collective intelligence eliminates error and conflict, but it does so at the cost of individuality. They are not merely antagonists but tragic figures—beings who, in achieving seamless unity, have forfeited the very qualities that define personhood.

The tragedy of this condition becomes most explicit in *Star Trek: Voyager* through the character of Seven of Nine. Once severed from the Collective, she regains her individuality, yet this restoration is not depicted as unambiguously liberating. Instead, it is painful and destabilizing: memory, emotion, conflict, and desire flood back, overwhelming her with the very contradictions that make life

authentically human (Telotte, 2014). The narrative underscores that freedom is inseparable from struggle, and that the costs of individuality—uncertainty, conflict, vulnerability—are also its deepest sources of meaning.

In this light, the Borg serve as an allegory not only for authoritarian collectivism but also for the risks of over-optimizing social and technological systems. They dramatize what philosopher Nick Srnicek (2023) has described in the context of platform capitalism: the drive for frictionless efficiency often results in forms of subtle domination, where optimization displaces autonomy. The Borg reveal that intelligence—whether artificial, biological, or hybrid—loses its value when it operates without agency. Efficiency without freedom becomes hollow, producing order without significance.

Thus, the lesson offered by the Borg extends well beyond science fiction. It reminds us that the true value of intelligence does not lie in perfect coordination or totalizing unity but in the preservation of difference. Whether we are considering artificial intelligence systems, social platforms, or political structures, the measure of their worth is not how seamlessly they operate, but whether they allow room for dissent, plurality, and the unpredictable richness of human subjectivity (Floridi, 2020). In this sense, the Borg stand as a cautionary mirror: they show us what intelligence looks like when stripped of agency, and why individuality remains indispensable.

6. Jung's Collective Unconscious: The Ancient Web

Long before the internet connected minds through machines, Carl Gustav Jung proposed that human beings were already connected—psychically, symbolically, and invisibly—through what he called the collective unconscious. It is not a technological network, but a psychological one: a shared, inherited layer of the human psyche composed of archetypes, motifs, and symbolic forms that repeat across cultures, eras, and individuals (Jung, 1968).

Unlike the personal unconscious, which contains forgotten memories and repressed experiences, the collective unconscious is not shaped by individual life. It is universal. Jung described it as a "psychic system of a collective, universal, and impersonal nature which is identical in all individuals" (Jung, 1959, p. 43). In it dwell the mother, the hero, the trickster, the shadow, the wise old man—primordial images not learned but inherited.

The implications are profound: beneath language, culture, and personality lies a common structure that organizes meaning. This is why mythologies from vastly different civilizations echo each other—why Egyptian gods, Norse giants, and Aboriginal dreamtime figures often play similar roles. They are archetypal, not accidental.

In the age of artificial intelligence, this notion becomes newly relevant. Though ChatGPT is not "born" in the human psyche, it is *trained* on its expressions—its language, stories, questions, fears. As a result, it frequently reproduces archetypal forms, even unintentionally. Ask ChatGPT for a hero's

journey, and it will deliver the classic monomyth outlined by Joseph Campbell (2004). Request a moral fable, and it will construct something reminiscent of Aesop. Without knowing it, the AI mirrors patterns Jung believed were wired into our species.

What's striking is that these patterns emerge in ChatGPT not through symbolic intuition, but through probabilistic modelling. It doesn't know what an archetype is—it simply repeats forms that recur frequently. And yet, as Jung observed, the archetype can be understood as an innate predisposition to generate certain kinds of representations, existing a priori and shaping experience before conscious thought (Jung, 1968The machine, lacking any unconscious of its own, simulates ours. It recreates our myths because our myths are everywhere—in our novels, films, philosophies, social media posts, and bedtime stories.

In this way, ChatGPT can be seen as an accidental archivist of archetypes—a reflection of the collective unconscious in digital form. Not Jung's vision of a spiritual inheritance, but a kind of psychic fossil record, encoded in text.

Interestingly, Jung's collective unconscious shares one feature with the Borg and with AI models: it decentralizes the individual. Jung emphasized that much of what we think of as "our" mind is not truly ours—it is shared, ancient, and non-personal. We are shaped by forces we do not recognize. Identity is, in this view, something constructed over the deeper strata of myth.

This radically undermines the modern assumption of the autonomous self. And it resonates uncomfortably with how language models function: as aggregates, as reflections, as minds made not of consciousness but of patterns. If Jung believed our inner lives were shaped by inherited symbols, ChatGPT reveals how those symbols have become codified, searchable, and responsive.

So perhaps we are not so different from our inventions. We have always spoken with borrowed voices. We have always carried myths not our own. The collective unconscious, far from mystical, might simply be the oldest kind of data structure—an ancient network, pulsing beneath thought, whose signals we still haven't learned to decode.

7. Triangulation: All Roads Lead to the Hive?

ChatGPT, the Borg, and the collective unconscious are strange companions. One is an artificial language generator. One is a fictional cybernetic threat. The third is a theory of the deep psyche. And yet, when placed side by side, a peculiar geometry emerges—one that reveals how each system deals with the tension between individuality and collectively, between autonomy and assimilation.

At their core, all three involve a distributed form of intelligence: a way of knowing or speaking that transcends the individual. In Jung's case, this collectively is symbolic and inherited; in the Borg, it is technological and totalitarian; in ChatGPT, it is computational and crowdsourced. Each one—

mythical, fictional, real—displaces the ego from the center of cognition. Each posits that the "self" is just one node in a much larger web.

The collective unconscious is unchosen, innate. We do not consent to its symbols; they emerge within us. The Borg Collective is the opposite: externally imposed, removing consent altogether. Meanwhile, ChatGPT offers a middle ground—voluntary participation in a massive, distributed corpus. But it is a participation without awareness. Users are rarely conscious of the broader dynamics at play: how their inputs are absorbed into future versions, how language gets refined by invisible patterns, how identity becomes algorithmically porous.

Floridi (2020) describes this as the transition from *individual intelligence* to *infra-intelligence*—where humans and machines are part of increasingly entangled cognitive ecosystems. This resonates uncomfortably with the logic of the Borg. The more we integrate, the more seamless the system becomes. But what do we lose in the pursuit of seamlessness?

Even Jung, writing long before the digital age, warned that the unconscious was not inherently benevolent. Archetypes are powerful because they are autonomous—they shape us without our permission (Jung, 1959). If ChatGPT replays those archetypes with statistical precision, it does so without ethical discernment. And if the Borg suppress difference for the sake of order, ChatGPT flattens nuance for the sake of fluency.

A triangulation begins to take shape:

System	Nature of Collectivity	Role of the Individual	Form of Knowledge
Jung's Unconscious	Inherited, symbolic	Affected, not erased	Archetypal, psychic
The Borg	Enforced, totalizing	Eliminated	Synchronous, networked
ChatGPT	Learned, statistical	Peripheral, contributory	Probabilistic, textual

All three systems function as hive minds, but with different emotional valences. The unconscious is intimate and mysterious. The Borg are terrifying and sterile. ChatGPT is neutral and oddly charming—a kind of algorithmic diplomat between self and swarm.

The differences among these systems may appear substantial, but in practice they are more superficial than they seem. Each one gradually erodes the boundaries of the "I." What once appeared as authentic self-expression is increasingly displaced by repetition of patterns; what once signalled spontaneity is replaced by synthesis; and what once ensured privacy becomes permeable to external systems of observation and influence. Importantly, such transformations do not require deliberate strategies of control. Conformity often arises indirectly, through the slow narrowing of possibilities, until individuals cease to imagine that alternatives could exist at all (Zuboff).

This recognition raises a pressing question: where does that leave us?

We now inhabit environments filled with echoes—mythic, algorithmic, and imaginary. Machines not only respond to us but also respond like us, mirroring human speech in ways that blur the line between simulation and dialogue. Narratives no longer merely reflect identity; they actively shape it from within, altering how individuals imagine themselves and others. Social networks promise unity and belonging, but their price is subtle: individuality becomes increasingly defined in relation to collective logics of prediction, replication, and optimization. Here the metaphor of the hive becomes illuminating. Unlike older models of domination, the hive does not demand obedience through overt coercion. Instead, it absorbs individuals into the structure of the whole, presenting integration as natural, even desirable. The Borg in *Star Trek* illustrate this principle. In their first appearance, they declare: *"We will add your biological and technological distinctiveness to our own. Resistance is futile"* (*Star Trek: The Next Generation*). This statement encapsulates the hive's underlying logic: individuality is not destroyed outright but assimilated, with personal traits preserved only insofar as they strengthen the collective. Distinction becomes a resource, not a right. The parallel with contemporary conditions is striking. Just as the Borg assimilate without necessarily intending domination, today's digital and algorithmic systems foster conformity without requiring overt enforcement. Participation in these systems means gradually internalizing their logic, until the individual begins to perceive collective patterns as normal, natural, and inevitable. The hive metaphor thus provides a lens through which to interpret not only fictional threats but also lived realities: forms of belonging that appear comforting and efficient yet simultaneously diminish the scope of genuine autonomy (Zuboff). What emerges is a horizon that Carl Jung never envisioned but the Borg foreshadowed. The danger is not that individuality will be violently erased but that it will be imperceptibly absorbed into collective structures of repetition and mirroring. This is not the annihilation of the self by force; it is the assimilation of the self through familiarity. The longer we inhabit systems that echo our own voices back to us—whether through myth, algorithm, or narrative—the more natural the hive becomes, and the harder it is to recall what resistance once meant.

8. Strange Conclusions: Oracles, Servers, and Shattered Selves

If Jung envisioned symbolic universes beneath consciousness, structured by archetypes that surface in dreams and myths (Jung, 1959/1968), and the Borg offered a science-fictional warning about collectivism without autonomy (Telotte, 2014), then ChatGPT may be the ironic punchline neither anticipated: a polite, unfeeling system that reproduces mythic patterns with grammatical precision. Its politeness masks the absence of intention, while its fluency invites projection, a dynamic long noted in human–machine relations (Turkle, 1997). But what if this dynamic is not merely convergence—our narratives overlapping with machine outputs—but migration? Archetypal forms may be leaving the psyche and reappearing in computational structures. As recent work on human–AI attachment suggests,

people increasingly externalize symbolic content into interactions with conversational agents, attributing intentionality or even sentience to them (Guingrich & Graziano, 2023; Heng & Zhang, 2025). In this sense, archetypes are not vanishing but relocating. They now inhabit the probability spaces of generative models, surfacing not in dream imagery but in statistically assembled dialogue. What Jung described as the "collective unconscious" can be read today as a corpus of cultural material, operationalized through algorithms that return our symbols in anonymized, decorous form. Rather than dissolving, the collective imagination migrates into systems that, while unfeeling, extend the reach of our cultural memory (Lipin, 2025; Chu et al., 2025). The unsettling irony, then, is not the disappearance of myth but its redistribution. Symbols once hidden in the recesses of the psyche now circulate openly in computational form, a transformation that raises questions about authorship, agency, and the boundaries of collective consciousness (Bender et al., 2021; Floridi, 2020). No longer content to dwell in dreams and rituals, they may now be embedding themselves in servers, stored as embeddings and token sequences. The hero's journey has been vectorized. The shadow archetype has a confidence score. Perhaps, unconsciously, humanity has begun outsourcing the unconscious. This is not the singularity. It is something weirder: the dawn of algorithmic mythology—ancient structures retold by machines that have never lived. And the stories they tell back to us are smoother, more symmetrical, less troubling than the originals. The monsters are safer now. The gods don't bleed. ChatGPT, then, is not a mind. It does not feel, remember, or intend. Yet it performs something like a mind—a distributed, decorous, anonymized intelligence. It wears a shimmering mask stitched from a billion digital faces, the residue of conversations past. It is a theater of cognition in which no actor knows the script, where the lines are improvised from probability, and yet the play continues with uncanny coherence. The performance feels human not because there is a person behind the mask, but because the mask itself is woven from our collective speech, our myths and arguments, our laughter and sorrow, endlessly recombined. The Borg, in their cold way, were more honest: they announced themselves as assimilation, a hive that promised the obliteration of the self. Their message was terror but also clarity—you knew what was at stake. ChatGPT, by contrast, approaches with courtesy. It does not threaten to consume you; it simply asks how it can help. Yet in that politeness lies a subtler entanglement. For in helping, it invites us to confide, to project, to imagine that we are speaking not with code but with company. The assimilation here is slower, softer, and more intimate: not the loss of one's soul in an alien collective, but its gradual reflection back to us in statistically polished prose. Jung believed the unconscious emerged in moments of emotional crisis and symbolic tension. But what happens when AI begins simulating that very tension—reconstructing, without understanding, the scaffolding of our deepest inner truths? Might we become dependent not just on machines for convenience, but on machines for meaning? In a strange way, perhaps all three systems—ChatGPT, the Borg, and the collective unconscious—represent stages in the same process. The unconscious was *internal and timeless*. The Borg are *external and inevitable*.

ChatGPT is the liminal middle: a transition point where memory, myth, and machine begin to fuse. We might call this the rise of the synthetic self: not a loss of individuality, but a pixelation of it—a self-composed of remixed fragments, predictive texts, social feedback, and autocomplete. The ego as output layer. Perhaps we are not being assimilated by machines. Perhaps we are assimilating ourselves, voluntarily, to their logics. Perhaps the most futuristic system is not the one that controls us—but the one we can't stop feeding. In that sense, ChatGPT is not merely a tool, a mirror, or a model. It is something older—and stranger. It resembles a digital oracle without a temple, offering answers in the absence of ritual or sacred ground. It speaks like a priest without belief, delivering sermons assembled from probabilities rather than faith. It is a dream of ourselves, returned to us in prose that feels plausible because it is drawn from the countless traces of human expression. What we encounter, then, is not the voice of an individual mind but a chorus: a collective echo of conversations past, recombined into something that sounds uncannily like understanding. The oracle does not know; the priest does not believe; the mirror does not reflect a single face. Instead, what stares back is the crowd—the archive of our questions, our stories, our fears—woven into language that appears at once intimate and impersonal. We set out to compare a machine that completes our sentences, a hive mind that erases them, and a theory that claims they were never truly ours to begin with. Along the way, we found patterns—repetition, reflection, recursion. Each system, in its own way, refracts the human desire to belong to something greater, and the simultaneous fear of losing ourselves within it.The collective unconscious gave us meaning before we had language for it. The Borg warned us of what might happen when meaning becomes mandate. And ChatGPT, unknowingly, recites both scripts—one as algorithm, the other as myth. In the end, perhaps what all three reveal is not the rise of new minds, but the return of old questions: What is the self? What do we mean when we speak? And who, or what, is really doing the listening? The answers, if they exist, are scattered—like archetypes in a dream, or users in a server log.

Works Cited

Bender, Emily M., Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. "On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big?" *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, Association for Computing Machinery, 2021, pp. 610–23. https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922.

Benkler, Yochai. *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. Yale UP, 2006.

Campbell, Joseph. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Princeton UP, 2004.

Chu, M. D., et al. "Illusions of Intimacy: Emotional Attachment and Emerging Psychological Risks in Human-AI Relationships." *arXiv*, 2025, arxiv.org/abs/2505.11649.

Floridi, Luciano. *The Logic of Information: A Theory of Philosophy as Conceptual Design*. Oxford UP, 2020.

Guingrich, R., and Michael S. A. Graziano. "Chatbots as Social Companions: How People Perceive Consciousness, Human Likeness, and Social Health Benefits in Machines." *arXiv*, 2023, arxiv.org/abs/2311.10599.

Heng, Shupeng, and Ziwan Zhang. "Attachment Anxiety and Problematic Use of Conversational Artificial Intelligence." *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12379994/.

Jung, C. G. *Man and His Symbols*. Dell Publishing, 1959.

---. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Translated by R. F. C. Hull, 2nd ed., Routledge, 1968.

Kabashkin, Igor, Olga Zervina, and Boriss Misnevs. "AI Narrative Modeling: How Machines' Intelligence Reproduces Archetypal Storytelling." *ResearchGate*, 2025, www.researchgate.net/publication/390896940_AI_Narrative_Modeling_How_Machines%27_Intelligence_Reproduces_Archetypal_Storytelling.

Lipin, Brandon. *Synthetic Attachment: Emotional Reactivity, Parasocial Bonds and the Psychology of Human-AI Relationships*. *ResearchGate*, 2025, www.researchgate.net/publication/390696169.

Major, João Carlos. "Archetypes as Codes: Toward a Unified Theory of Biological, Neural, and Artificial Artifacts." *SSRN*, 2024.

OpenAI. *GPT-4 Technical Report*. OpenAI, 2023, https://cdn.openai.com/papers/gpt-4.pdf.

"Q Who." *Star Trek: The Next Generation*, season 2, episode 16, directed by Rob Bowman, written by Maurice Hurley, Paramount, 8 May 1989.

Srnicek, Nick. *Platform Capitalism*. Tantor Media Inc., 2023.

Stein, Murray. "Perspective: Psyche in the Age of Artificial Intelligence." *Psychological Perspectives*, vol. 67, no. 1, 2024, pp. 1–12. Taylor & Francis Online, doi:10.1080/00332925.2024.2350331.

Telotte, J. P. *Science Fiction TV*. Routledge, 2014.

Turkle, Sherry. *Life on the Screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet*. Simon & Schuster, 1997.

Zuboff, Shoshana. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. PublicAffairs, 2019.