

Can the Definition of Lying as Known in Real Space be Applied to Lies Perpetuated in the Virtual, Particularly with Regard to the Behavioural Differentiations that Virtual Space Promotes?

Touzeau N*

Profiler, Net-profiler, researcher in behavior of cybercriminals, France

***Corresponding author:** Nadine Touzeau, Profiler, net-profiler, researcher in behavior of cybercriminals, France, Email: nt.profiler@gmail.com

Mini Review

Volume 3 Issue 2

Received Date: October 13, 2018

Published Date: October 26, 2018

DOI: 10.23880/ijfsc-16000140

Abstract

When I discovered that man's behaviour in virtual space is different from that of real space, I tried to understand how the work of other researchers could be integrated into these new behaviours. New behaviours that are sometimes reproduced in real space.

This is the whole point of some of my theories, such as "Avatarization", "Transverse Zone" and "Virtual Intelligence". They are part of my research work on behavioural differentiations between the real and the virtual, which is the subject of several publications and books.

Knowing that these behaviours behind the screen are conducive to playing a role, a kind of lie, I have often wondered how lies can be perceived. How can lying be defined? And above all, how to detect it?

As a graduate of Paul Ekman International on, among other things, Lie and True detection in real space, how can the techniques such as those of Paul Ekman, world leader in Lie and True detection, be used in virtual space?.

Net profiling makes it possible to make profiles in virtual space, and, in fact, to detect lies as well, which, faced with the behaviour of cybercriminals and according to my work, may not ultimately be lies as interpreted in reality.

Keywords: Net-Profiling; Lie & True; Paul Ekman; Transverse Zone; Cybercriminality; Behavioral Differentiation; Avatarization; Virtual Intelligence

Introduction

The most classic definition of lying is an assertion contrary to the truth. In other words, it means that you are lying for not telling the truth.

This definition seems to me to be totally reductive in the face of the many lies that exist. In reality there is not one, but many lies. They have as many different forms as possible reasons [1-3].

When I teach profiling, one of the first things I say to my students is: "Our work will never give the truth because we were not there, we are not in the place of others. It is up to us to find a set of truths that will be checked by several people involved in the case and will make our hypotheses conclusions".

Thus, I start from the observation that truth is specific to each person, according to our moods, knowledge, interpretations, influences, neutrality, etc. In profiling, we must absolutely avoid any influence of any kind whatsoever. For this reason, we work on our neutrality and many other skills necessary to do our job well. Net-profiling is not spared.

However, even if our results are verified and validated as "truths", personally, in my professional approach, I refuse to talk about conclusions. We present our report with hypotheses and conclusions. The same is true of our elements of analysis, which are not truths, but sets of truths.

This being said, truths are not unique. No more than the lies. I will therefore develop several examples of lies while trying to translate some of them. They will be evoked as much in real and virtual space in order to understand if we must redefine the lie, reconsider it according to the living space of the lie, considering that only the human being commits the lie.

Discussion

Danielle Steel wrote: "Lying can destroy everything, the truth only hurts for a moment" [4]. This sentence may be more about virtual space than real space.

Before explaining why, let's consider the lie. Personally, what interests me is not the lie itself, but the reason for the lie.

Two French sociologists tried to write an article under a pseudonym full of lies in order to raise awareness and make people think or, and I quote, "poach and use ploys... the only way to shake off our discipline of torpor" [5]. Raising awareness and forcing people to think differently does not necessarily mean lying. Unless the profile prefers to use excessive subterfuge rather than finesse.

However, this is also interpreted as a lie because the story is false. Sociologists have clearly revealed that this was not true after the article was published. Half-forgiven admitted fault. Not in all minds. This proves that the

notion of lying is really personal in its own definition. What is the boundary between truth and lies, knowing that it is subjective and specific to everyone?

Because indeed, any profile cannot lie knowing that the lie in one person is not necessarily a lie in the other. Culturally, saying that a person opposite is fantastic to tell someone else about the same person is usual. For these cultural profiles, that's not lying.

Lying in front of a camera, after taking the oath, is punishable in some countries, while in others, no one will pay attention to it. In fact, the notion of lying is mainly specific to his profile, his intentions, the context and his culture.

If I tell a person that this dress suits him better than another to please him, is that a lie? It will depend on how you say it, your voice, your behaviours, your posture. And especially how your interlocutor will receive this message. Will she be inclined to believe you, or will she not care if it's true or not. Lying will only be considered if, when putting on the dress, it does not fit.

If I refuse to tell the truth to a police officer because I swore to keep quiet, is that a lie? As far as there is a legal matter, must the vow of silence be respected? This is a real question and only the context and profile could make the wish betray.

If I certify that I have seen such a thing and that I am the only one to certify it in front of several other individuals, is it a lie? The question to ask is to check the positioning and the potential visibility and view of each person in order to verify the "true of the false". However, the interpretation of witnesses remains subjective according to many criteria. The only person who will not say the same words as the others may be, and often is, the person who has actually seen things. In order to make themselves known, witnesses appear without having seen or heard anything.

If I say I am fine in my words and the sound of my voice and my behaviour say otherwise, is that a lie? The body never lies. This observation has been validated by many researchers, including myself. It is enough to analyze the congruence between voice, behaviour, words, postures and context to know if you are lying or not. Ekman's work reveals universal facial expressions and micro expressions that, if not executed as detailed, are lies [6,7]. In all these cases, the profiler will thwart blocked

situations in order to understand verbal confessions that are not possible through the behaviour.

And what about Lying in Cyberspace?

Knowing that behind the screen, the behaviors of some profiles can change [1]. However, can Pinocchio's nose reveal itself behind the screen?.

Behaviour behind the screen can only be detected by the digital acts committed since the person is rarely seen. Except that videos, photographs, voluntary or not, are published concerning the cybercriminal, which seems practically improbable, the net-profiler analyses the use of virtual space by the cybercriminal. The very nature of the cybercriminal is to hide behind the screen, in fact, there is little chance of obtaining information specific to offenders.

My "Avatarization" theory states that behind the screen, some people, especially cybercriminals, develop new characters that they bring to life and sometimes also in real life. Behind the screen, they play one or more roles by desires, needs, fun, to satisfy a dream, revenge, etc. They create one or more Avatars. The desire to create these Avatars is facilitated by the fact that they think they are not being revealed behind the screen. They can also live their drive without being worried, more freely, always feeling comforted to be hidden behind the screen.

Can this be considered A Lie?

The fact of convincing and reassuring the other behind the screen, without having seen himself, is it a form of lie?. "Lying implies an informational asymmetry, thereby creating a balance of power: according to Saint Augustin's definition (De mendacio and Contra mendacium, dating from 395 and 420), lying refers to a conscious distortion of what is taken for real".

This balance of power behind the screen is also amplified by the assurance that it is not visible or detected. Behaviours are indeed modified, especially on profiles with a negative mind and malicious potential. In addition, it will be easier to hide behind the screen for some profiles than in person. Hiding your true face by presenting yourself virtually different from what you are seems like a lie. The confrontation with reality will give the measure of the lie.

These lies are seen on phishing cases by stealing data that is appropriated as if it were one's own in order to steal from people who believe you are reliable. This lies

can be detected on cases of emotional scams. False profiles are designed, sometimes with a skin colour, a first name and surname different from its original culture in order to swindle the "soul mate". These lies also concern scams on the President, by stealing information in real and virtual information about his target in order to "surf the rift" and turn it against the target.

All hide their real identity in the virtual world in order to achieve their purpose. We find this kind of lie in the real world, whose behaviour is analyzed in order to reveal it in the absence of proven evidence or doubts. But these behaviours that we see in real space are rarer because the lie is quickly revealed. It takes a lot of energy to lie. A high concentration and memory too. Not in the virtual world! Because hiding behind the screen avoids the mirror of whom you really are. This allows increasing the behavioural differentiations between the real and the virtual.

When the cybercriminal is arrested and questioned about his crimes with the impact on their victim, he often denies the impact. That is, he doesn't think he lied, but he thinks he played. In short, the cybercriminal does not hide his actions, but underestimates them in importance because they are avatarized for him. It's a game, he played an unreal character by being him, but without assuming it. He therefore thinks that his target is also an avatar, and therefore does not receive cyber attacks as a person. This is why cybercriminals are often surprised that their victims get depressed or end their lives.

Is it a lie to play an avatar knowing that consciousness assumes the avatar more than the acts committed by that avatar? How can we define this lie with regard to our criteria relating to real space?

Is the Avatar a Lie?

Knowing that the cyber universe is in constant evolution with humans, its occupants, in constant adaptation, I think this subject should be studied in order to evaluate the lie in virtual space in interpretation and act in comparison with that of reality because the human being is very real.

Conclusion

Lying has many faces and many objectives depending on who you are, what you want to do, to whom and how. We know that a born liar is difficult to identify and sometimes even does not recognize himself as a liar.

However, the analysis of the behaviour of these liars will eventually reveal one or more signs or even micro expressions revealing the lie. Behind the screen, lies also exist in other forms helped by the possibility of hiding. Which makes cybercriminals think we won't reveal them? Just as the profiler does in the real world, the net-profiler also detects and reveals behaviours in the virtual world.

Hiding behind a screen by creating characters, daring to do what you would never do in real space, surpassing what you often think of as a game. A victim receives his or her actions without considering them as a game. Is that lying?

When I ask the question if it is a lie, I specify that with regard to the Avatar generated by feeling protected behind a screen, is a psychological or psychiatric deviance? Or is it another form of lying? All this work on the behavioural differentiations behind the screen has led to the discovery that these behaviours challenge the definition of real-world landmarks including lying.

References

1. Touzeau N (2017) Behavioral Cybercriminals Differentiations between the Real World and the Virtual Space. *J Forensic Res* 8(6): 401.
2. Touzeau N (2018) Avatarization, Another Way to Understand Cyberbullies Behaviour in the Real and the Virtual Worlds as Described by Net-Profiling. *J Cogn Neuropsychol* 2(1):1.
3. Touzeau N (2018) Transverse Zone: Explanation and Definition in Comparison with Comfort Zones. *J Forensic Sci & Criminal Invest* 9(1).
4. Beaufils J, Escher C, Rakovsky D, Seitz A, Scholz L, et al. (2015) Mensonge et manipulation. *Le faux au prisme des sciences humaines et sociales*. trajectoires.
5. Touzeau N (2018) Virtual Intelligence the Ninth Family of Intelligences to be Added to Howard Gardner's List. *Crim Forensic studies* 1(1): 180004.
6. Touzeau N (2018) Some behavior differences between bullying and cyber bullying and impacts on adult victims. *Crim Forensic studies* 1(2).
7. Vrij A, Granhag PA, Porter S (2011) Pitfalls and Opportunities in Nonverbal and Verbal Lie Detection. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*.

