Editorial

A categorical approach to philosophy in the age of digitalization

Humanity is going through a period marked by what is known as "digital ubiquity and algorithmic protagonism," in which philosophical inquiry requires us to rethink some fundamental questions, such as: How can we preserve ethical integrity, the formation of critical subjectivity, and a sense of community when artificial intelligence (AI) is redefining the human experience? For a better understanding of the contextual reality, it is necessary to briefly explain the categories mentioned above.

On the one hand, *digital ubiquity* refers to the constant, invisible, and cross-cutting presence of digital technologies in all areas of everyday life. It is important to understand that this is not just about access to the internet or devices, but also involves deep integration into learning, communication, work, emotional, entertainment, and leisure environments. This transforms the way we experience the world and relate to others. As Floridi (2021) argues, we live in an "infosphere" where the digital is no longer an environment, but a lived reality.

In the context of advanced digitalization, digital ubiquity not only describes the technical availability of connection anywhere and at any time, but also a way of life deeply mediated by devices, platforms, and computer systems that structure our daily actions. This phenomenon involves the dissolution of the boundaries between the physical and the virtual, and shapes a new way of existence marked by constant connectivity. As Byung-Chul Han (2014) states in *The Transparency Society,* "we no longer inhabit the world, we navigate it," which leads to an experience of the real as an interface, as an uninterrupted flow of data that must be interpreted, shared, or reacted to immediately.

This permanent hyperconnection is linked to what Antoinette Rouvroy (2013) calls "algorithmic government," i.e., a form of power that is not based on classical legal norms or Foucauldian panoptic surveillance, but on statistical prediction and behavioral anticipation. Instead of prohibiting or commanding, algorithms operate on probabilities, predict behaviors, and adapt digital offerings in terms of content, routes, deci-

Sophia 39: 2025.

Print ISSN:1390-3861 / Electronic ISSN: 1390-8626, pp. 39-47.

sions, and even emotions, without the need for visible coercion. This form of power, as explained by Rouvroy (2013), "operates in the preconscious," nullifying the very possibility of autonomous deliberation.

On the other hand, *algorithmic protagonism* refers to the growing role of algorithms as agents that mediate, filter, and anticipate our decisions, tastes, movements, and interactions. These systems not only organize information, but also govern experience. From social media to personalized education systems, algorithms have become invisible structures of power that condition what we see, think, and choose, raising urgent ethical and philosophical questions.

Algorithmic protagonism refers to the central role these resources play in the organization of knowledge, the management of attention, and the production of subjectivities. Platforms such as Google, YouTube, Instagram, TikTok, and the systems used in education personalize the experience to such an extent that what one sees or learns no longer depends on personal choice, but on predictive models. This, as Noam Chomsky (2011) warns, poses a paradox because while we are promised freedom and individualization, structures of ideological control are reinforced. In his critique of digital capitalism, Chomsky (2011) points out that large technology corporations not only sell products, but also "sell users to advertisers," turning our interactions into raw material for symbolic and commercial exploitation that gradually displaces people's consciousness.

Thus, the convergence of digital ubiquity and algorithmic protagonism demands a philosophical response that is not limited to a "technophobic" rejection or a naive celebration of innovation. As Han (2014) argues, it is a matter of recovering negativity, silence, and slow thinking in the face of information overload and the compulsion for positivity and exposure. For Rouvroy (2013), the challenge is to restore the "spaces of subjectivation," i.e., areas where the subject can reflect and act outside of algorithmic calculation. In other words, thinking critically about the digital age means understanding how technology reconfigures ethics, politics, and pedagogy. In this sense, philosophy is not a peripheral knowledge, but a condition of possibility for questioning the present and opening horizons of meaning beyond automated efficiency.

About the content of the journal

This issue of *Sophia, Philosophy of Education Collection,* is framed in a context where digitalization is not only a functional tool, but an *ontological*

Print ISSN:1390-3861 / Electronic ISSN: 1390-8626, pp. 39-47.

transformation that redefines knowledge, experience, and subjectivity. Technological acceleration, marked by the expansion of AI, has generated a profound reconfiguration of the ways we learn, teach, and inhabit the world.

Faced with this scenario, philosophy is essential for critically reflect on the processes that, in the name of progress, blur the boundaries between the human and the world of machines, between the educational and the technical. Likewise, the philosophy of technology becomes essential for understanding the meaning of technological reality and its implications in all areas of human existence.

Therefore, the main objective of *Sophia* 39 is to philosophically investigate the implications of digitalization, problematizing the role of ethics, subjectivity, language, education, and power in an environment mediated by intelligent technologies. This task is urgent, as the ideal of a neutral and universal technology—still present in many digital narratives—omits the ideological, epistemic, and affective conditions that shape our contemporary experiences. As Heidegger (1954) warns, technology is not merely an instrument, but a way of unveiling the world: "The way in which truth happens" (p. 19). In this sense, thinking about digitalization implies questioning the ways in which reality is revealed (and hidden) through technological mediation.

To fulfill the stated purpose, it is necessary to reclaim philosophy as an instigator of questioning in the face of digitization, which promises efficiency but overlooks human fragility. We must keep alive the question: Who are we as individuals and communities when the virtual predominates? Critical philosophy of technology—heir to Kant and Foucault's *pensée* critique—thus takes on a refreshing urgency and invites us to rethink the role of ethics in the face of automation. It leads us to consider how to delimit the field of AI from the human *ethos*, and to rethink who thinks when thinking digitally, how is subjectivity mediated by technology configured? How can we explain the dialogue between subjectivity and the phenomenology of technological existence?

We live in a time when digitalization is not only transforming social, economic, and educational practices, but also reconfiguring ways of thinking, inhabiting the world, and being. Philosophy, as a critical exercise in understanding and meaning, cannot remain oblivious to this technocultural restructuring. Faced with the rapid advance of digital technologies (mainly AI), there is a need to think philosophically about the limits, conditions, and possibilities of this transformation that affects both knowledge and subjectivity.

Print ISSN:1390-3861 / Electronic ISSN: 1390-8626, pp. 39-47.

Digitization raises new questions, but it also reactivates other fundamental questions, such as: How can we form critical subjectivities in a culture of algorithms? What place does ethics occupy when decisions are delegated to intelligent systems? How can we preserve ethical integrity, the formation of critical subjectivity, and a sense of community when AI redefines the human experience? How is the educational experience transformed in environments mediated by intelligent technologies? Does the school educate citizens or train docile users of algorithmic platforms?

The urgent need is to understand that the current scenario requires immediate contributions from digital education, in which schools play a leading role. This requires training and educating critical teachers who recognize the role of technology without losing sight of the educational mission; promoting interdisciplinary spaces to rethink otherness in digital contexts, taking into account the presence of others and avoiding pure labeling; deepening a philosophy educated in contingency (not in immediate access), thought out from error, delay, and deep reflection; understanding technological agency, the meaning of the body in virtual environments, and the role of the teacher as a figure of otherness in the face of increasingly naturalized AI.

The importance of the theme proposed in this issue of *Sophia* lies in its philosophical and educational relevance. In times when algorithms and language models increasingly mediate our decisions, emotions, and knowledge, philosophy faces the challenge of preserving its critical power without succumbing to technical fascination or reactionary rejection. Byung-Chul Han (2014) warns of the disappearance of negativity in the digital age, a logic of performance and transparency that excludes conflict, silence, and otherness as foundational moments of thought. In this context, the main issues revolve around how AI redefines the conditions of learning, teaching, and living; how subjectivities are formed in this new horizon; and what place ethics occupies when the limits of the human are displaced by machines that reason, dialogue, or even appear to have consciousness.

The ten papers approved for this edition explore these concerns from multiple approaches and trends. Some focus on the teaching of ethics as a limit to the power of AI, while others analyze the configuration of subjectivities through algorithmic platforms. Issues such as the feasibility of the Turing machine child, the role of *prompting* in the phenomenology of artificial language, the challenges of learning in the face of automated heuristics, and the frictions between personal development and digital optimization environments are also addressed. Special atten-

Sophia 39: 2025.

Print ISSN:1390-3861 / Electronic ISSN: 1390-8626, pp. 39-47.

tion should be paid to the texts that examine the devices of power in socio-emotional education, the youth experience of social media and the internet, and the transformations in teachers' perceptions of otherness in the age of AI. Taken together, they all warrant a rethinking and new research in pursuit of the construction and consolidation of knowledge.

The articles are divided into two sections of the journal: five articles related to the central theme and five articles in the miscellaneous section, whose reflections on the central theme contribute to the enrichment of the philosophical debate in this volume.

In the central theme, the reflection begins with the article "The question about ethics teaching as a boundary of artificial intelligence" by Alejandro Recio Sastre, from Ecuador, who sets out to answer the question: how can ethics be taught in a world where decisions are mediated by intelligent systems? He establishes ethics as the limit to AI without conscience or responsibility, arguing that "education faces great challenges in the face of the changes that ICT and AI are bringing about in social relations." The aim of the article is "to propose a theoretical approach that discusses the problems raised by transhumanist theses within education, given the current challenges posed by AI in relation to the learning of values."

The intellectual journey is undertaken by Hernando Barrios Tao, from Colombia, who presents the manuscript "Configuration of subjectivities through artificial intelligence systems," in which he argues that "artificial intelligence (AI) was configured as a system that impacted ways of being and existing, with the potential to invade the innermost being of human beings and reconfigure them in their social, ethical, identity, and ontological dynamics." The objective of this document is to "interpret the configuration of subjectivities through AI systems." It aims to analyze the construction of the self in the age of platforms and, in this vein, seeks to answer the question: What configurations of subjectivity emerge when identities are shaped by algorithms?

Along the same lines is the document "The feasibility of Turing's child machine" by Rodrigo Alfonso González Fernández, from Chile. The author analyzes the child machine project linked to programmed machine learning or digital computers, "showing that Turing's desideratum is not achievable through algorithms." He analyzes the reasons that "prevent the MT child from becoming a thinking adult mind" and presents an interesting analysis between the Turing test and simulation pedagogies. The text seeks to answer the question: is it possible to consider the feasibility of Turing's child machine in educational contexts?

Sophia 39: 2025.

Print ISSN:1390-3861 / Electronic ISSN: 1390-8626, pp. 39-47.

For his part, Jorge González Arocha, from Serbia, presents the article "Critical phenomenology of prompting in artificial intelligence," in which the author analyzes "the philosophy of *prompting* as a tool in the context of the rise of AI, particularly in large-scale language models (LLMs)." He seeks to explain how *prompting* is a mediating space between human intentionality, language, and the sociopolitical structures that shape interaction with these technologies. The main objective is to "examine how *prompting* reflects ethical, ontological, and epistemological tensions that emerge in the construction of meaning within AI systems." The author considers that "it is essential to adopt an interdisciplinary approach that combines technical development with philosophical reflection." By understanding *prompting* as an act of meaning, language, and power, the question it seeks to answer is: what does a critical phenomenology of *prompting* in AI reveal?

Next, authors Néstor Alexander Zambrano-González (Brazil) and Jordi Vallverdú Segura (Spain), in the article "Challenges of learning in the age of artificial heuristics," examine the keys to developing a comprehensive model of human cognition from a philosophical-educational perspective. They consider variables such as the multimodality of knowledge, the complementary role of languages, the imitative sensorimotor foundation, and the main role of imitation in learning and cognitive development in the early stages of life. The text reviews the impact of AI-based educational *chatbots,* using ChatGPT as a representative case study; it addresses the challenge of thinking beyond automated recommendations and attempts to answer the question: what does learning under the mediation of artificial heuristics imply?

In the miscellaneous section, the article "Friction and personal development in digital environments" by Iago Ramos Fernández from Spain discusses "how the 'lack of friction' in digital environments affects personal development." Friction is presented as a condition that forces us to come to terms with our limits and find our place among others. This approach is taken from Rousseau's anthropological theory, specifically the dichotomy between negative and positive education, i.e., the differences between a formative process that forces us to be aware of our existence and a formative process that dilutes us into cultural products. The question it seeks to answer is: where do friction, error, and resistance fit as conditions of human development in hyper-optimized environments?

Next the article "Captures and ruptures in the power dispositive of social-emotional education" by Francisco de Borja Castro-Serrano and

Print ISSN:1390-3861 / Electronic ISSN: 1390-8626, pp. 39-47.

José Miguel Garay Rivera, from Chile. The authors critically reflect on the current educational institutionality in light of how power is organized in society. The aim of the paper is to "examine, philosophically, the social field and the notion of dispositive based on Deleuze's reading of Foucault, opening up an analysis of power in education tensioned by its classic plot of capture vs. a potentially critical and transformative path via escape." The education-emotions binomial opens other "educational cartographies" for thinking about knowledge and ways of intervening in the emotional sphere, assessing the management of affects, their mechanisms of power, but also, their critical ethical-political openings. In analyzing affective capture and the management of subjectivity, they propose to answer the question: How do power dispositive operate in digital social-emotional education?

The article "The relationship between young people and social networks in virtual spaces" by José Rolando Alegría-Morán, from Chile, continues this line of reflection. The author recognizes the importance of "the phenomena of the internet in the development of individuals, understanding that a large part of everyday actions are mediated by virtual elements." The objective is to explore the possibility that today's young people view their social networks as spaces that can be inhabited and not as technological tools valued for their usefulness and user experience. By understanding virtuality as an existential territory, the document seeks to answer the question: What does it mean for young people to inhabit social networks as an extension of the world?

The manuscript "Teachers' perceptions of otherness in the age of artificial intelligence" by Ricardo Alberto Reza Flores (Mexico), Rosa Maria Vicari (Brazil), Cristiano Galafassi (Brazil), and Mireia Usart Rodríguez (Spain) continues the reflection process. The authors consider the need to recognize the "other" in their uniqueness from the perspective of otherness to establish meaningful social bonds, especially in teaching. The objective of the manuscript is to "assess, from the paradigms of higher education teachers in Mexico City, how they recognize otherness and its possible existence in AI." It is established that from post-human nomadism, otherness could be understood in the future with "general AI" or "super AI," as organic, artificial, or hybrid. In this regard, considering otherness in times of dematerialized interaction, they propose to answer the question: How do teachers perceive others in an era where the artificial simulates humanity?

The volume closes with the document "Artificial intelligence and the risk of a reversed analogy" by Juan David Quiceno Osorio, from Peru.

Print ISSN:1390-3861 / Electronic ISSN: 1390-8626, pp. 39-47.

This work aims to present the general elements that allow for a discussion of the reality of AI and its place in the world as a technological object. The author raises the need to reverse the "analogy of intelligence," which is primarily human and only derivative in nature. To this end, he takes a conceptual journey through some important aspects of human intelligence provided by philosophy and establishes a distinction between mechanical and technological objects with the intention of highlighting some of the specific characteristics of AI. The text reflects on the danger of reducing living beings to algorithmic patterns and leads the researcher to answer the question: is there a risk of a reverse analogy, where the human is interpreted from the artificial?

The set of ideas, reflections, and findings presented in this issue of *Sophia, Philosophy of Education Collection*, aims to open new spaces for philosophical criticism, resistance, and the reimagining of the present, reminding us that technology is not a destination but one of the problems that human beings must face, something that must be thought about and not simply used. Philosophy, as Foucault (1984) said, is not a discipline of knowledge, but a practice of freedom: "The attempt to know how and to what extent it would be possible to think otherwise" (p. 9). Thus, thinking about digitalization from a philosophical perspective implies not simply adapting to the digital age, but radically questioning it.

Issue 39 of *Sophia* aims to open not a manual of solutions, but a critical set of philosophical questions: to recover Kantian anxiety in the face of the unknown, Socratic dialogue in digital environments, and human fragility in the face of algorithmic perfection. Digitalization cannot rewrite human dignity or extinguish thought. Only a philosophy that renounces technocratic and instrumentalist ideologization can guarantee authentic ethical and civic education.

With this issue, *Sophia* reaffirms its commitment to a philosophy that questions the present, thinks rigorously about technical devices, and contributes to the strengthening of humanistic thought in an increasingly automated world.

Floralba del Rocío Aguilar-Gordón
Editora

Print ISSN:1390-3861 / Electronic ISSN: 1390-8626, pp. 39-47.

Bibliography

Chomsky, Noam. 2011. *How the World Works*. Soft Skull Press.
Floridi, Luciano. 2021. Tiempo digital: latencia, tiempo real y la experiencia en vivo del tiempo cotidiano. *Filosofía y Tecnología*, *34*(3), 407-412. https://bit.ly/3GtAHog
Foucault, Michel. 1984. *¿Qué es la Ilustración?* En H. L. Dreyfus, & P. Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: más allá del estructuralismo y la hermenéutica* (pp. 7-22). Fondo de Cultura Económica.
Han, Byung-Chul. 2014. *La sociedad de la transparencia*. Herder.
Heidegger, Martin. 1954. La pregunta por la técnica. En Autor, *Conferencias y artículos* (pp. 13-45). Ediciones del Serbal. (Obra original publicada en 1954).
Rouvroy, Antoinette. 2013. *El gobierno de los algoritmos: un nuevo régimen de poder y conocimiento*. Tecnopolítica.

Sophia 39: 2025.

Print ISSN:1390-3861 / Electronic ISSN: 1390-8626, pp. 39-47.