

# Human Persona

Marcia R. Pinheiro

IICSE University, USA

---

**Abstract** In this paper, we try to provide a theory that explains human behaviour and thinking in their totality. We missed the corporeal part when writing the theory about our new model for the human psyche: It was missing explaining that some things are physical, such as memories, involuntary organic movements, disease, etc. If we had developed a philosophical model for the soma, we would also miss the essence of the individual, what we have decided to call psyche. In order to explain how our hand could not stand the pressure and ended up releasing the link that then got loose and killed somebody, we need the philosophical explanation involving the soma. In order to explain why a person had a shared-ego moment, we need the philosophical explanation involving the psyche. In this way, it is missing creating a theory that unifies all in order to produce a set that can explain any situation that involves human behaviour and thinking. We are then calling the entity that collects all in one, which is needed for our better understanding, Human Persona. Persona because that reminds us of individuality, unique characteristics that tell us that the individual we call John Smith, of id 143, is someone special. Human because we do talk about personality of animals, and we would like to make sure we create an impression of difference and superiority when referring to humans. The tools we here use are logical analysis, deductive reasoning, selection and collection of real-life evidence, etc.

**Keywords** Psyche, Personality, Behaviour, Body, Human, Thinking

---

## 1. Introduction

In Pinheiro (2014), we talked about a new model for the human psyche. We then introduced the elements extended ego, extended id, and a few others. We talked about the human mind being something different from the human personality, so that we said that the extended ego and the extended id belonged to the human personality and the elements judgmental, non-judgmental, shared, and non-shared belonged to the human mind. Even though these elements belong to the human mind, we still have physical elements to account for, so that we could use the expression human brain and human body to point at those.

To the other side of the spectrum lie the supernatural forces, let's say, and we have called soul those that belong to the own individual (Pinheiro, 2015).

There is perhaps another sphere of the human essence, which appeared in the talk of Professor Chris Letheby at the Adelaide University, Philosophy, in 2016, on the 11<sup>th</sup> of November, Napier Building GO3, from 3 to 5 PM, a talk called Psychedelic Neuroexistentialism: The chemical sphere. Basically, our body parts do seem to hold a chemical essence, and that piece of our essence seems to be something different from the physical brain or body, from the personality and mind, and from the supernatural forces, even though it is something that seems to be closely associated to those, or perhaps more accurately, to the supernatural forces.

One could argue that our entire body and brain are made out of Chemistry. They would be right on this one. Notwithstanding, we refer to the dynamic part of this chemistry, the part that provokes modifications in our decisions, actions, and thinking in general, so that we could refer to an event that happened as a result of us taking psychedelic drugs, for instance. We drink something that contains heroin, let's say, and we then experience modifications that are temporary, of chemical nature, but modifications that will lead us to do certain things. That is not part of our personality, that is not part of our mind, that is not part of our body, that is not part of our brain, and that is not part of the supernatural forces. Yet, it is something that needs to be described, for it is commanding our decisions, thinking, and actions. That is what we are calling chemical sphere.

---

\* Corresponding author:

drmarciapinheiro@gmail.com (Marcia R. Pinheiro)

Published online at <http://journal.sapub.org/ap>

Copyright © 2017 Scientific & Academic Publishing. All Rights Reserved

We then have at least six divisions in our psyche. Each one of those divisions should lead to other divisions, which we will probably call subdivisions, and we perhaps will be able to explain the totality of the human actions, thinking, and decisions using those, which is the ultimate goal of this study.

## 2. Development

As we perform our daily activities, we make small decisions, so say I will turn right at the next corner or I will turn left instead. These small decisions would be made in our brain, as for how we feel, but they would sometimes involve supernatural forces, so say when we can't explain why we exotically turned right when we always, every day, turn left at that point. Yet, upon turning right, we saved the life of somebody else.

It could obviously be a memory failure instead. It could also be pure coincidence. It could be that we actually heard, in a way not to acknowledge it, the person asking us to help them.

It could also be supernatural forces: If we have tested our memory before and after, if it never happened before or after, if the person said they never said anything, and others, we should be surer about it being related to the supernatural. It is hard to prove that it is definitely the case, but we then consider what may be supernatural as a mandatory inclusion here.

It may be that we wanted to move our finger but our body did not let us do that because we now have an impairment of the joints. Some chemical reaction led to all that, and our chemical sphere was then where this event was located until its conclusion, which is the permanent impairment.

It may be that our arms involuntarily moved to stop an old person from falling. We then had our personality jumping in, our id.

If we are left alone and we keep on day dreaming, our mind is being used in an intense manner, not only our brain, for our imagination sometimes does create wings, as they say.

If we cracked our heads and the brain is now showing up, we certainly had an event involving our brain and our body, but nothing else can we say.

If we took drugs and we are now having the impression that we are living in the past, say twenty years ago, we are experiencing events in our body, brain, and mind. Notwithstanding, what is really active is our chemical sphere, since it is from it that all those events come.

If, as in the Jungian World, we start tilting our heads to the right and then left because people around us are doing that, we are having an event involving shared ego, not collective unconscious anymore.

When our mind and body wake up despite the alarm clock, so say it did not ring, and it is precisely 7:00 AM, the time the alarm was set up to ring, we are having an event involving the extended id, for now those instructions became part of our being.

If the alarm is now broken and we can't get any other, so say we are in the bush, and by the 20<sup>th</sup> day we cannot wake up at 7:00 AM anymore, that was because we had an event involving a temporary extension of the id, not a permanent one.

We cannot have shared id, but we can have equal instinctive reactions to something, also concomitant, so say Paul and Mary both extend their arms instinctively to stop the old woman from falling.

The reason why this is not a shared event, but a concomitant one, is because if Paul were on his own, he would still act in the same way, and the same applies to Mary.

We cannot have a shared superego event either, just a concomitant one. We decide for not taking the dollar bill that is at our face (Pinheiro, 2015a) despite the size of the temptation because we have the instruction *Thou Shall not Steal* in our minds. The fellow who is with us does the same thing, but his instruction might be *Stealing Makes You Ugly* instead.

The inhibiting channels might contain the same messages at least sometimes, but that does not mean that we are doing something because we are reading the other person's instructions: All that is happening is that we were brainwashed with the same instructions instead or we decided to add those instructions to our minds ourselves instead.

The superego is something we may decide not to follow someday, so say that today, after having our shop robbed for the 20<sup>th</sup> time by the own cops, we decided that stealing that dollar bill is OK, so that we simply changed that instruction to *Stealing Sometimes is OK*. The same person who was by our side on a previous occasion, when our decision was not stealing and our instruction was *Stealing Makes You Ugly*, is by our side today, and they will again not steal. That proves that we cannot have a shared superego event, that that simply does not happen.

It is clearly the case that we would have modified our superego voluntarily in the previous example, and that process was really easy. Modifying our ego or our id is way more complex than that.

We could have conflicting instructions coming to our mind in what regards a certain situation, so say this one, of stealing: one side of our mind, let's say, says that we can now steal because we are excused, like it is too many robberies, the person who owns that money is involved, etc.; the other side of our mind, let's say, says that stealing is a sin without proportions, so that we should never steal, in any hypothesis. We now have the ego to take the task of making the decision: What side will it go for? The instruction that says that we can do it is a new one. The instruction that says that we cannot do that at any expense

is a very old one. Does the ego care about tradition? Perhaps. If our superego says that we should always behave in the same way when subjected to the same pressures, our ego must worry about tradition. It looks like it is all about weighting factors to see with which we go, but each person has their own decision. Perhaps a more logical/mathematical person will indeed assign weights to each instruction, and, if they think that all instructions have the same value, they may decide for not stealing even having the new instruction together with the old ones. If they think that they can update the instruction keep on doing what you always did, they may do that, what then stops that instruction from being to the side of the don't do it. It now starts to sound very much like Nonclassical Logic, we reckon. Notwithstanding, it is not really there, since people may be irrational as many times as they like, and, even with, let's say, 10 instructions to the side of the don't do it, and a single instruction to the side of the do it, they may decide for doing it.

The ego is not as solid as Freud (Pinheiro, 2014) thought it was then: It may also change, and it can change even its decision processes, so that our mind seems to command it. Here the importance of including it in our model for the human persona. It is as if psyche were a wrong name for what we had before, since it was incomplete, but we are now stuck with that expression, so that we have to invent something new, which is then the Human Persona.

The id does change, even if in a temporary way, so say the capability of waking up without the alarm, yet exactly at the time needed. The superego does change, sometimes even via very rational processes, and therefore it is highly dependent on our minds, which depend on our brain, but also on our supernatural forces, so say our soul.

To make it all worse, the existence of the whole lot, of the Human Persona, also depends on our body as a whole, for it is only the capability of pumping blood to the brain, for instance, that keeps us as us.

### 3. Conclusion

We seem to have proven that the essence of each member of the human race is connected to way more than what we could see this far: To talk about ego, id, and superego, we have to be able to talk about brain, body, and supernatural forces, soul included in those. Human Persona seems to be therefore a good term to designate our individual essence.

There is still a group essence, which appears in events identified by Jung (Pinheiro, 2014) through the tag Collective Unconscious: This essence would include events involving the shared ego.

We must also have other fundamental essences yet to be described, so say the universes' essence: What is common to all universes, what is specific, etc.

Our model of human essence, in terms of individuals, now includes at least body, brain, mind, chemical sphere, supernatural forces, ego, superego, id, extended id, extended ego, and shared ego.

It seems that we can program our superegos, our egos, and even our ids to a certain level, like it is just a matter of technique.

When we start talking about the ways in which the ego decides on things we seem to reach the conclusion that we could have a wonderful application of Nonclassical Logic systems there, but we must then remember that being a human being means that we can be irrational at least sometimes, especially to inside of ourselves, so that thinking of using Nonclassical Logic here would mean committing the same mistakes we identified in (Pinheiro, 2012), (Pinheiro, 2015b), (Pinheiro, 2016), (Pinheiro, 2016a), and (Pinheiro, 2012a).

---

## REFERENCES

- Pinheiro, M. R. (2014). A New Model for the Human Psyche. *Quest Journals Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science*, 2(5), 61–65. Retrieved from [www.questjournals.org/pub/marcia-pinheiro/70/941/6a0/](http://www.questjournals.org/pub/marcia-pinheiro/70/941/6a0/)
- Pinheiro, M. R. (2015). *Anima Est*. IICSE University. Retrieved from <http://journals.abc.us.org/index.php/abcra/article/view/589>
- Pinheiro, M. R. (2015a). Words for Science. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, 5(5), 19–22. Retrieved from <https://www.worldwidejournals.com/ijar/articles.php?val=NjQ0MQ==&b1=853&k=214>
- Pinheiro, I. M. R. (2012). Concerning the Solution to the Liar Paradox. *E-Logos*, 21, 15. Retrieved from [http://www.academia.edu/9787988/Solution\\_to\\_the\\_Liar\\_Paradox](http://www.academia.edu/9787988/Solution_to_the_Liar_Paradox)
- Pinheiro, M. R. (2015b). The Unexpected Hanging Problem and a Trivial, but Unexpected, Solution. *Advances in Research*, 4(1), 36–44. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282624779\\_The\\_Unexpected\\_Hanging\\_Problem\\_and\\_a\\_Trivial\\_but\\_Unexpected\\_Solution](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282624779_The_Unexpected_Hanging_Problem_and_a_Trivial_but_Unexpected_Solution)
- Pinheiro, M. R. (2016). *The Sorites x Classical Logic*. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307936102\\_The\\_Sorites\\_x\\_Classical\\_Logic](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/307936102_The_Sorites_x_Classical_Logic)

Pinheiro, M. R. (2012a). Concerning the Solution to the Russell's Paradox. *E-Logos*, 20. Retrieved from [http://www.academia.edu/9817490/Solution\\_to\\_the\\_Russells\\_Paradox](http://www.academia.edu/9817490/Solution_to_the_Russells_Paradox)

Pinheiro, M. R. (2016a). First Decisions on the Modelling Work. *Journal of Progressive Research in Mathematics*, 7(3), 2016. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/302239624\\_FIRST\\_DECISIONS\\_NATURE\\_OF\\_THE\\_MODELLING\\_WORK](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/302239624_FIRST_DECISIONS_NATURE_OF_THE_MODELLING_WORK)