

THE ORAMELLON

*A Philosophical Vision of Human Becoming*

*Not a utopia, but a direction.*

**Monograph**

# THE HUMAN AND THE ALGORITHM

*The Imago Dei in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*

**Christian Mahoukou**

*Translated from the French by the author*



---

2026

## PREAMBLE

**Hinneni***Interpellation as Originary Structure*

---

*Hinneni*. The Hebrew word that traverses the Bible like a golden thread. Abraham pronounces it when God calls him. Moses pronounces it before the burning bush. Isaiah pronounces it in the Temple. Samuel pronounces it in the night. Always the same response to the call that arises: *Here I am*. Not: *I am ready*. Not: *I understand*. But: *Here I am* — I am here, available, exposed, responding.

This small word contains an entire anthropology. It says that the human being does not exist first in the solitude of its consciousness, but in the response to a call that precedes it and constitutes it. Before being a thinking subject, before being a producing agent, before even being a reflecting consciousness — it is a called being. And it is in its response to this call that it becomes fully itself.

This monograph begins from this word — *hinneni* — and poses a question that our era makes more urgent than ever: what becomes of this called being, this being capable of saying *here I am*, in a world where interpellations are now managed industrially by algorithmic systems that do not sleep, do not grow tired, do not know the grace of silence?

The question is not technical. It is anthropological, theological, civilizational. It touches what the spiritual traditions of humanity have always known, without yet being able to formulate it in the face of this precise trial: the human being is made to respond. And everything that prevents, deforms, or captures this response reaches something essential — something that Christianity calls *imago Dei*, that Taoism calls *Te*, that Bantu Ubuntu says differently: *I am because we are*.

This book is an attempt to think together these millennial traditions and the unprecedented trial that the algorithm inflicts on the human. Not to condemn technology — but to name what it threatens, so that what is threatened can be defended.

***Hinneni. Here I am. It is the briefest and most complete response the human can give. The algorithm cannot pronounce it.***

## PART ONE

## The Historical Shift

*What Artificial Intelligence Displaces*

---

### 1.1 — The Ancient Frontiers of the Human

---

For centuries, the human being defined itself by contrast with what it was not. The stone does not think — the human thinks. The animal does not speak — the human speaks. The machine does not create — the human creates. These frontiers were convenient. They allowed one to know, without too much philosophical effort, where the tool ended and the person began.

Artificial intelligence has brought down these frontiers one by one, with a speed that disconcerts. It produces language — and what language: fluid, articulated, convincing. It reasons — on problems that no human intelligence would resolve in a lifetime. It creates — images, music, texts that move. It learns — and its learning often surpasses in speed and scope that of any human being. It simulates empathy — and some of its users confide to it what they confide to no one else.

The old question returns therefore, brutally rejuvenated: ***what remains properly human?***

### 1.2 — The Radical Displacement of Our Anthropology

---

It is here that the triadic structure of interpellation, called the Mahoukou Law, and the anthropology of the interpellated being operate a decisive displacement. Rather than seeking a new cognitive frontier — a capacity that AI does not yet have but might soon possess — our anthropology displaces the question itself.

The human being is not first the one who calculates, produces, or even thinks. It is **the one who can be existentially reached by an address**. It is the one who, faced with a call, does not content itself with processing information — but is *touched* in its being. Shaken. Transformed. Sometimes converted.

Here is the fundamental fracture between the human and the algorithm. Not in power — the algorithm is infinitely more powerful than the human on that terrain. Not in speed, nor even in creativity in the technical sense. But in what we call **existential exposure**: the capacity to be affected in one’s very being by a word, a face, a call.

*“AI processes. The human can be shaken. And this being-shaken is not a defect of the human. It is its greatness.”*

### **1.3 — The Difference Between Processing and Exposure**

---

This distinction — informational processing versus existential exposure — deserves to be developed with precision, for it is the foundation of this entire monograph.

Informational processing is a process that transforms inputs into outputs according to rules. It can be extremely complex, adaptive, even surprising. But it remains fundamentally closed upon itself: the system that processes information is not *put in question* by it. It risks nothing. It cannot be wounded, nor transformed in its foundations, nor called to repent.

Existential exposure is radically different. When a human being receives an authentic call — the word of a suffering child, the gaze of a dying person, the request of a stranger in distress, or the silent call of a conscience that interpellates — something in it is put at stake. Its freedom is solicited. Its responsibility is engaged. It can respond or close itself. And this response or this refusal transforms it — in one direction or another.

It is precisely this structure — call, exposure, free response, transformation — that the algorithm cannot reproduce. It can simulate each of these moments separately. But it cannot live them as an existential unity, because it has no existence to put at stake.

***The real question of our era is not: is AI intelligent? But: what becomes of the human when it lives in permanent algorithmic interpellation systems?***

---

## **Notes — Part One**

- [1] The displacement from cognitive frontier to existential exposure as the criterion of the properly human is the founding move of the Oramellon collection. It is developed in its full philosophical depth in *Respondeo ergo sum* (2026), Introduction, §IV: “The Central Thesis.”
- [2] The notion of existential exposure connects with what Levinas called “vulnerability” in *Otherwise Than Being or Beyond Essence*, Pittsburgh, Duquesne UP, 1998, p. 49-50: the subject is exposed to the other before any decision, before any deliberation. Our contribution is to formalize this exposure in the A-R-R structure and to show its relevance as an anthropological criterion for evaluating AI systems.

## PART TWO

## Toward Which Civilization Are We Being Led?

*The Great Bifurcation*

---

### 2.1 — The Question of the Helm

There is a subtle but decisive difference between two apparently similar formulations. *Toward which civilization are we going?* supposes that we are walking — that we choose, even imperfectly, our direction. *Toward which civilization are we being led?* supposes something else: that the movement is already engaged, that the helm is held by other hands, and that most of the passengers have not yet realized they are embarked.

The second formulation is the most accurate to describe our real situation. The algorithmic civilization did not install itself following a democratic debate. It does not result from a conscious and deliberate collective choice. It has constituted itself through an accumulation of technical, economic, and commercial decisions — made by a relatively small number of actors, in a historically very short time — and its anthropological effects are now global and profound, long before most societies have had time to understand them.

Who holds the helm? The designers of platforms, whose primary objective is the capture of attention as an economic resource. The financial markets, which reward engagement — even anxious, even negative — more than relational quality. The states, which regulate belatedly and incompletely. And no one — this is perhaps the most vertiginous: a civilization that produces itself without anyone having willed it as such.<sup>1</sup>

---

### 2.2 — Two Civilizational Models

Faced with this movement, two civilizational models confront each other — not in political manifestos, but in the concrete choices that societies make each day, often without knowing it.

**The first model is the civilization of captation.** It is characterized by the continuous optimization of engagement, the permanent stimulation of affects, the reduction of idle time, behavioral predictability as an ideal. In this model, the human being is fundamentally an *attentional resource* — a source of data to exploit and brain time to monetize. Its value is measured by its engagement rate, its behavioral predictability, its vulnerability to emotional triggers. Its freedom is a constraint to work around.

**The second model is the civilization of free interpellation.** It is characterized by the protection of interiority, the right to silence, the plurality of rhythms, the quality of address rather than its quantity. In this model, the human being is fundamentally a *subject capable of listening and discernment* — a being whose freedom of response is the most precious good to protect. Its value is not measured. It is recognized.

### 2.3 — New Rights for a New Trial

---

The civilization of free interpellation is not a vague ideal. It implies concrete rights that our era has not yet formulated with sufficient precision.

**The right to psychic opacity:** no system should have access to the interior life of a subject without its explicit and informed consent. Behavioral, emotional, and attentional data are data of the soul — and their non-consensual exploitation is an anthropological violation.

**The right to non-solicitation:** every human being has the right not to be called. Silence is not a void to fill. It is a condition of interiority — and its maintenance is a collective responsibility.

**The right to cognitive disconnection:** beyond the simple right to professional disconnection, there exists a more fundamental right: that of not having one's attention constantly solicited, of being able to inhabit one's own inner space without algorithmic interference.

**The right to unpredictability:** every system that seeks to render human behaviors predictable — even in the service of apparently benign objectives — violates something

essential in the structure of the interpellated being. The freedom of Response is the freedom to be unpredictable.

*“True freedom is not only juridical autonomy. It is the capacity to remain inwardly habitable in the face of systems of capture.”*

***The fundamental political question of our century is no longer only: who holds power? But: who organizes the interpellations of humanity — and in whose interest?***

---

## Notes — Part Two

- [1] The notion of a civilization produced without anyone having willed it as such connects with what Hannah Arendt analyzed as “the banality of evil”: large-scale harmful processes can result from the accumulation of individually banal decisions, without anyone being consciously responsible for the whole. Cf. *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, New York, Viking, 1963.
- [2] The four new rights proposed here — psychic opacity, non-solicitation, cognitive disconnection, unpredictability — are developed more fully in Work II of the Oramellon collection (*The Civilization of Saturation*, 2026) and in the Monograph *Metanoia* (2026), Chapter 8, Path 5.

## PART THREE

# A Theology of Interpellation

*The Imago Dei Reconfigured*

---

## 3.1 — The Theological Displacement

---

Christian theology has long organized itself around categories that are today destabilizing in the dialogue with AI: being, substance, reason, freedom, soul. Yet AI seems to be investing these territories one after another. It “thinks.” It “learns.” It “creates.” It produces behaviors that bear a striking resemblance to “free” behaviors.

If the *imago Dei* resides in reason, AI forces us to ask: since when? If it resides in creativity, image generators put us in difficulty. If it resides in language, large language models destabilize us. These classical definitions, precious in their time, were elaborated before humanity had to face this specific trial.

The anthropology of the interpellated being allows for a decisive displacement. It proposes situating the *imago Dei* not in a capacity — always susceptible to simulation — but in a **relational structure**: the capacity to be reached by a word that exceeds utility, to respond freely, and to be transformed by this response.

## 3.2 — The Bible Re-read as a Theology of Address

---

Re-read from this perspective, the biblical text becomes fascinating in a new way. God almost never appears in it as an object of knowledge or a substance to be demonstrated. God *calls*.

God calls Adam: “*Where are you?*” — not because God would be ignorant of his location, but because the call is the primary mode of relation. God calls Abraham in the night, Moses before the bush, Samuel in the darkness of the temple, the disciples at the edge of the lake. Revelation, in the biblical tradition, is not first a transmission of information — it is an *event of address*. Someone calls someone.

The believer, in this perspective, is not first one who possesses a doctrine or performs rites. It is one who allows itself to be *displaced* by a call. One whose life changes direction because a word has reached it in its depths. One who can say, even in darkness: *hinneni* — here I am.

### 3.3 — The Imago Dei as Exposure, Not Power

---

In this light, the *imago Dei* can be reformulated with new precision:

***The image of God in the human resides in its capacity to be reached by an alterity that exceeds all utility, and to respond from its deepest freedom.***

This displacement — from power to exposure — is theologically fruitful. It says that God did not manifest in History first as domination, but as call. As consented vulnerability. As expectation of the free response of the other. Creation itself, in this reading, is an act of call: God creates not to duplicate itself but to have an interlocutor capable of responding freely.

And the Incarnation — for Christianity — is the supreme act of this theology of address: God himself enters the structure of the interpellated being. God becomes the one who calls from the vulnerability of a body, a limited life, a real death. God does not dominate — God exposes itself.

### 3.4 — Sin and Salvation Reconfigured

---

This reconfiguration of the *imago Dei* entails a reconfiguration of two fundamental theological categories.

**Sin** — in this anthropology — can be thought of as **closure of the capacity to be interpellated**. Not first the transgression of a rule, but self-enclosure, rigidification, narcissistic saturation that renders the human incapable of hearing. The idol is, in this sense, the substitute for the Call: it gives the illusion of being interpellated without ever putting one in question. The capturing algorithm is a contemporary form of idol.

**Salvation** — in this same perspective — becomes **restoration of deep relational capacity**. Not an escape from the world, but a return to the capacity to be touched, to respond, to be transformed. Grace is what reopens what was closed. What renders porous again what had hardened. What makes it possible for the human being to say, once more: *hinneni*.

*“The imago Dei is not what one sees of the human. It is what the human accomplishes when it responds freely. And it is precisely this that saturation prevents.”*

***The image of the human is not in its pixels. It is in its Response.***

---

### Notes — Part Three

- [1] The displacement of the *imago Dei* from cognitive capacity to relational structure connects with the theology of Karl Barth, who located the image of God in the I-Thou structure of human existence: *Church Dogmatics*, III/1, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1958, §41. Our contribution is to formalize this Barthian intuition through the A-R-R structure of the Mahoukou Law.
- [2] The reconfiguration of sin as closure to interpellation connects with what Levinas called the “refusal of the face” — the willful blindness to the call of the other. Cf. *Totality and Infinity*, Pittsburgh, Duquesne UP, 1969, Section III. Our contribution is to show that the algorithmic environment systematically produces this closure without the subject consciously willing it.

## PART FOUR

## Sacred Texts Facing the Algorithm

*Resources of Civilizational Resistance*

---

### 4.1 — The Great Traditions as Anthropological Reservoirs

---

The question we are posing — how to remain human in the algorithmic age? — is not in reality a new question. It is the contemporary version of a question that every great spiritual tradition of humanity has posed in its own way: how to preserve the essential in the face of the forces that threaten it? How to remain human when the world pushes toward dehumanization?

The sacred books of humanity are not antiquities to deposit in a museum of ideas. They are reservoirs of anthropological wisdom, condensations of human experience accumulated over millennia. And they speak — with often surprising precision — to our precise situation.

***The Christian tradition: the God who calls by name.*** The Gospel of John recounts that the good shepherd calls his sheep *by their name*. Not by their number, not by their behavioral profile, not by their predictability score. By their *name* — that is, in their irreducible singularity. In a world where algorithms call by profile, this evangelical image says something decisive: authentic relation is not what predicts you, but what recognizes you. And to recognize someone is to leave it the freedom to be surprising.<sup>1</sup>

***The Jewish tradition: “Hear, O Israel.”*** The *Shema Israel* — *Hear, O Israel* — is perhaps the densest sentence of the Jewish tradition. It begins with an injunction to listen. Not to action, not to performance, not to production — but to listening. In the civilization of saturation, listening is precisely what is most difficult. Not because human beings have become deaf, but because the environment is designed to prevent deep listening. The *Shema* is therefore a theological and anthropological resistance: it poses that true listening — the kind that engages the whole being — is the primary obligation of the human.<sup>2</sup>

**Islam: *ibada as total response.*** In the Islamic tradition, the human being is fundamentally ‘*abd* — servant, that is, one who responds totally to the divine call. The ‘*ibāda* — worship, service — is not a religious performance: it is the orientation of the whole being toward the Call that constitutes it. The *muslim* is literally one who submits, who entrusts its response to something that surpasses it. Faced with the algorithm that seeks to orient all desires and attentions toward itself, the Islamic tradition poses a fundamental question: *to what do you orient your being?*<sup>3</sup>

**Taoism: *the Tao that cannot be captured.*** The *Tao Te Ching* opens with a vertiginous sentence: “*The Tao that can be named is not the eternal Tao.*” What is essential resists nomenclature, categorization, predictability. The algorithm, for its part, names everything. It categorizes, predicts, optimizes. It is fundamentally a system of total nomenclature. Taoist wisdom says that this ambition is not only vain but destructive: what is alive always exceeds what seeks to fix it.<sup>4</sup>

**Buddhism: *mindful presence against capture.*** The Buddhist practice of *sati* — attention, mindfulness — is a discipline of inner listening that runs counter to the logic of saturation. Awakening is not a performance: it is a return to presence — to what is here, now, in all its unreduced richness. Faced with technologies of distraction, Buddhism poses a radical demand: freedom does not come from the accumulation of stimuli but from the capacity to fully inhabit a single moment. And this capacity is precisely what algorithmic architectures methodically destroy, because a human being fully present to the moment is not a consumable human being.<sup>5</sup>

**Bantu traditions: *Ubuntu and relational ontology.*** Ubuntu — *Umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu* — says in Zulu what the anthropology of the interpellated being says in philosophy: the person exists through others. Not by fusion, not by dissolution of self — but by the texture of received calls, given responses, shared memories. In Bantu ontology more broadly, the person is not an autonomous atom but a node of relations — with the living, the ancestors, the community, the cosmos. Algorithmic individualism — which reduces each person to its personal data profile — is a particularly grave anthropological violence seen from this tradition.<sup>6</sup>

“The great sacred books of humanity do not speak of the past. They speak of what remains necessary to the human being — and that each era must defend against the forces that threaten it.”

**Resistance to algorithmic capture is not a contemporary invention. It is inscribed in the wisdoms of humanity for millennia. It remained only to see it.**

---

## Notes — Part Four

- [1] The passage on the good shepherd (John 10:3) is philosophically important: the shepherd “calls his own sheep by name and leads them out.” The proper name — as opposed to the number or the profile — is the form of address that recognizes irreducible singularity. Calling by name is the opposite of algorithmic targeting.
- [2] The *Shema Israel* (Deuteronomy 6:4) — “Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord is one” — is the central confession of Jewish faith, recited morning and evening. Its opening imperative — *Hear* — makes listening the primary human obligation. This priority of listening over action, speaking, or performing is the opposite of what the attention economy produces.
- [3] The notion of *‘ibāda* (worship, service) as total orientation of the self toward God is developed throughout the Quran and the hadith tradition. The *tawhid* — divine unity — implies that nothing other than God can legitimately claim the total attention and orientation of the human being. The algorithmic platform that captures total attention commits, from this perspective, a form of *shirk* (association — the gravest sin in Islam) on behalf of the user who submits to it.
- [4] Lao-tzu, *Tao Te Ching*, ch. 1, trans. D. C. Lau, London, Penguin, 1963: “The way that can be spoken of is not the constant way.” The irreducibility of reality to its representation is the Taoist challenge to any system of total capture — whether ideological or algorithmic.
- [5] The Buddhist concept of *sati* (Pali: mindfulness, attention) is developed throughout the Pali Canon, particularly in the *Satipatthana Sutta* (Majjhima Nikaya 10). The modern mindfulness movement, however secularized, draws on this tradition of disciplined present attention as a counter-practice to distraction.
- [6] John S. Mbiti, *African Religions and Philosophy*, London, Heinemann, 1969, p. 106. The Ubuntu formula — *Umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu* — is the African expression of the fifth axiom of the Mahoukou Law: the human world is a network of resonances. The Bantu ontology of the person as node of relations is one of the philosophical sources of the relational ontology of Oramellism.

## PART FIVE

## Algorithmic Capture

*Civilizational Pathology of Interpellation Regimes*

---

### 5.1 — The Algorithm as Pseudo-Transcendence

---

There exists a strange and disturbing analogy between great algorithmic systems and certain theological figures. Algorithms know before us — they anticipate our desires before we have formulated them. They see everything — every click, every pause, every hesitation is recorded. They are everywhere — present on every screen, at every hour, without vacation or sleep. They orient destinies — they decide which contents you see, and therefore partly which ideas you think and which desires you develop.

This resemblance to a theological instance is not metaphorical. It describes a real function: algorithms occupy, in the lives of millions of human beings, the place formerly occupied by the great symbolic mediations — religious, cultural, communal — that gave to existence a structure, an orientation, a hierarchy of values.

But with a radical difference: these ancient mediations, as imperfect as they were, aimed in principle at the flourishing of the human being. The algorithm aims at the optimization of engagement — that is, fundamentally, the maximization of its own hold. These are not the same thing.<sup>1</sup>

### 5.2 — The Four Forms of Capture

---

**Attentional capture** is the first and most visible. It operates through notification, suggestion, the continuity of the flow. Its objective is to make disengagement as difficult as possible — technically, psychologically, socially. Every exit from the flow is designed to be immediately followed by an invitation to re-enter.

**Affective capture** is deeper. It operates by learning what moves, worries, irritates, or delights each user, and by systematically serving this type of content. It creates emotional

dependencies on interfaces — one returns not out of need for information, but out of need for affective stimulation. The interface becomes an emotional prosthesis.

**Identity capture** is even more insidious. The contemporary subject constructs itself increasingly via the algorithm — what I “am” on networks, what is recommended to me, the bubbles in which I am placed progressively define my real identity, my opinions, my affiliations. Identity is no longer only what I construct — it is also what the algorithm produces of me.<sup>2</sup>

**Decisional capture** is philosophically the gravest. It occurs when the subject progressively delegates its judgment to the algorithm: which route to take, which film to watch, which doctor to consult, which partner to choose. This delegation is comfortable — it reduces the cognitive load. But it atrophies precisely the capacity for free Response that is constitutive of the human triadic structure.

### 5.3 — A General Theory of Interpellation Regimes

---

These four forms of capture allow for formulating something more general: a **theory of interpellation regimes**. Every social, cultural, technological environment produces a specific regime of Calls — a set of solicitations, rhythms, intensities, and directions that shape the subjects who live within it.

The algorithmic novelty is twofold. On the one hand, the *scale*: never in history had a single interpellation regime been able to reach billions of human beings simultaneously. On the other hand, *personalization*: never had an interpellation regime been able to adapt so precisely to the specific vulnerabilities of each individual. This is the universality and the particularity of capture at once — which makes it without precedent.

***The great conflict of the twenty-first century will not only be economic or political. It will bear on the mastery of the interpellation regimes of humanity.***

***Whoever organizes the calls of a civilization organizes its soul.***

## Notes — Part Five

- [1] The notion of algorithm as pseudo-transcendence connects with Paul Tillich's analysis of "ultimate concern" in *Dynamics of Faith*, New York, Harper, 1957: that which claims our unconditional devotion. When a platform claims the total attention of the subject — permanently, without pause, without limit — it functions as an ultimate concern, that is, as a pseudo-divinity.
- [2] Identity capture — the progressive construction of self through algorithmic feedback loops — is analyzed by Eli Pariser, *The Filter Bubble*, New York, Penguin, 2011, and by Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*, New York, PublicAffairs, 2019, ch. 8-9. Our contribution is to analyze this phenomenon from the Mahoukou Law: identity capture is a violation of the fourth axiom (the subject is constituted in the dynamics of A-R-R) by a system that substitutes external algorithmic feedback for the authentic accumulation of received Calls and given Responses.

## PART SIX

## For a Civilizational Ethics of the Digital

*Dialogue with the Great Philosophical Traditions*

---

### 6.1 — The Problem Is No Longer Technical

---

Contemporary debates on AI ethics often revolve around important but insufficient questions: algorithmic biases, the transparency of systems, data protection, the legal responsibility of automated decisions. These questions deserve serious answers. But they do not yet reach the deepest level.

The real question is anthropological and civilizational: *what form of human do we wish to produce?* For every technology is, in the last resort, a machine for producing a certain type of human being. The question is not only how to regulate AI, but in what direction to orient its development — and this supposes first knowing in what direction one wishes to orient humanity.

### 6.2 — Decisive Philosophical Dialogues

---

**With Emmanuel Levinas:** Levinas showed that the face of the other is an absolute interpellation — it says: *do not kill me*, it convokes my responsibility before any calculation. The anthropology of the interpellated being systematizes and historicizes this intuition: interpellation structures shape human worlds. And the algorithm, by replacing the face with the profile, makes disappear precisely what Levinas had identified as the hearth of ethics.<sup>1</sup>

**With Paul Ricœur:** Ricœur developed the notion of narrative identity — the subject constitutes itself by narrating and reinterpreting its history. Our anthropology adds the interpellative dimension: the subject constitutes itself not only by narrating but by responding — the received, accepted, refused, transformed calls form the thread of identity. The algorithm short-circuits this thread by producing a profile identity that claims to reflect the subject but captures only its habits.<sup>2</sup>

**With Hannah Arendt:** Arendt thought the political space as a space of appearance — the place where subjects reveal themselves in their words and acts. Our framework reformulates it: the political space is the quality of the interpellations that allow everyone to appear freely. When algorithmic platforms organize the public space, they also organize the conditions of appearance — and therefore the conditions of democracy.<sup>3</sup>

**With Shoshana Zuboff:** Zuboff named *surveillance capitalism* — the economy that extracts behavioral data as raw material. Our anthropology goes further: the stake is not only the data, but the *interior structuring of subjects*. What is captured is not only information about what you do — it is your very capacity to respond freely.<sup>4</sup>

### 6.3 — Criteria for Just AI

From everything that precedes, one can deduce a clear criterion for evaluating the anthropological justness of an artificial intelligence system:

***AI is just if it increases the capacity of the human being to receive, elaborate, and give free Responses. It is unjust if it organizes the capture of this capacity — even in the name of convenience, efficiency, or well-being.***

More concretely: just AI does not compulsively capture attention. It does not personalize at the expense of freedom. It leaves space for the unpredictable. It does not claim to know the subject better than it knows itself. It renders humans more capable of real relation — not less capable.

The responsibility of technology designers is, in this perspective, anthropological before being technical or juridical. To design a mass interpellation system is to shape souls. It is a responsibility that cannot be delegated to shareholders, nor entrusted to jurists alone.

*“The just human is not the perfect human. It is the human who remains capable of responding — freely, from what it truly is. And just AI is that which does not compromise this capacity.”*

**Notes — Part Six**

- [1] Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, Pittsburgh, Duquesne UP, 1969, Section III (“Faces and Discourse”): “The face opens the primordial discourse.” The replacement of face by profile in digital environments is, from a Levinasian perspective, the erasure of the primary site of ethical obligation.
- [2] Paul Ricœur, *Oneself as Another*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1992, Study VI. The narrative identity — identity-ipse — is the result of an accumulation of received calls and given responses, crystallized in a story that can be told. The algorithmic profile is the reduction of this narrative richness to behavioral regularities.
- [3] Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1958, ch. 5 (“Action”): the political space is what arises “wherever men are together in the manner of speech and action.” When algorithmic platforms become the primary infrastructure of public space, the conditions of political appearance are determined by optimization logics foreign to democratic ideals.
- [4] Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*, New York, PublicAffairs, 2019, p. 8: “Surveillance capitalism unilaterally claims human experience as free raw material for translation into behavioral data.” Our deepening of Zuboff’s analysis: what is translated into data is not only experience, but the very structure of the subject’s responsiveness — its A-R-R architecture.

## EPILOGUE

## The Freely Interpellable Human

*Remaining human in the algorithmic age*

---

We have traveled a long road since the Hebrew word of the preamble. *Hinneni* — here I am. This seemingly simple word contains, as we have seen, an entire anthropology, a theology, an ethics, and a politics. It says that the human being is fundamentally a being of response — and that this response is the highest form of its freedom.

This monograph has sought to show that the fundamental stake of our era is not to know whether artificial intelligence will surpass human intelligence. The stake is to know whether the human being will still be able to pronounce *hinneni* in a world where interpellations are managed industrially by systems that do not know the grace of silence.

The central thesis of this monograph can now be formulated in all its density:

***The imago Dei in the age of AI no longer resides in the cognitive superiority of the human, but in its capacity to remain freely interpellable without being integrally captured by the algorithmic architectures of the world.***

This thesis is not a condemnation of technology. It is a demand addressed to our civilization: develop technologies, yes — but keeping one's eyes open to what they do to the interior structure of human beings. Progress, yes — but not at the cost of the soul.

It is also a call to all the traditions of wisdom of humanity — Christian, Jewish, Islamic, Buddhist, Taoist, Bantu, and all others — to enter into this debate with their own resources. Not to reject modernity, but to offer it what it cannot give itself: an anthropology of depth, an ethics of the face, a politics of presence.

And it is, finally, a call to each human being — user of technologies, citizen of a democracy, member of a family, inhabitant of a community — to become conscious again of what it is: not an attentional resource, not a data profile, not a node in an optimization

network. But a called being. A being capable of responding. A being in the image of what called it into existence.

***The image of the human is not in its pixels. It is in its Response.***

***Respondeo ergo sum.***

\* \* \*

End of the Monograph — The Human and the Algorithm.

The Oramellon Collection — A Philosophical Vision of Human Becoming.

Not a utopia, but a direction.

