

PCollection "Interpellation of the World" — 1

THE ORPHANED CALL

Intersubjectivity, Digital Mediation and Dialogal Obstruction in the Age of Saturation

A Reading of the Digital Crisis through the Mahoukou Law

Christian Mahoukou

Philosopher, Independent Researcher in Phenomenology

Introduction

The Inaugural Paradox

There exists, at the heart of our epoch, a paradox that the classical philosophies of dialogue had not anticipated and for which they possess no adequate analytical tools. Never in human history have human beings been so connected — linked to one another by networks of unprecedented density and speed, capable of addressing anyone, anywhere, at any moment. And yet, never has the sense of loneliness, misunderstanding and absence of authentic encounter been so widespread, so documented, so painfully felt. Sociological surveys converge, testimonies accumulate, clinicians raise the alarm: something is happening in the digital world that produces, at the very heart of relational abundance, a novel form of interpersonal desert.

This paradox is not anecdotal. It is not the sign of a simple misunderstanding about the use of technologies, nor of an individual pathology that goodwill alone could correct. It is the sign of a structural crisis of intersubjectivity — a crisis that affects not the quantity of exchanges but their structure, not the frequency of contacts but the nature of what takes place within them or no longer takes place. What the digital world has multiplied to infinity are the occasions for exchange. What it has simultaneously fragilised, sometimes to the point of destruction, is the possibility of authentic interpellation — that structure in which someone calls to someone, someone responds, and something transformative occurs in both.

The Insufficiency of Habitual Diagnoses

Faced with this paradox, standard responses oscillate between two equally insufficient positions. The first is nostalgia: it deplores the loss of an embodied presence, an originary face-to-face, a relational authenticity that the digital would have destroyed. This position has the merit of pointing toward something real — the corporeal and temporal dimension of authentic encounter. But it idealises a pre-digital past that is largely fantasised, and it possesses no tools for analysing how the digital transforms the structure of exchange, nor which forms of authentic interpellation remain possible within it.

The second position is technophilic enthusiasm: it celebrates the unprecedented extension of human connectivity, the democratisation of speech, the horizontality of exchanges. This position has the merit of refusing nostalgic regression. But it commits a fundamental philosophical error: it conflates the quantity of

exchanges with the quality of interpellation, the number of connections with the depth of encounters, the reach of a message with the Resonance it produces. It ignores the fact that the multiplication of exchanges can constitute, under certain precise structural conditions, a form of dialogal obstruction — that saturation is not the fullness of dialogue but one of its most insidious forms of impossibility.

The Displacement Operated by the Mahoukou Law and the Article's Thesis

The Mahoukou Law does not ask whether the digital is good or bad for dialogue — a question too general to yield a philosophically interesting answer. It asks what the digital does to each moment of the triad: how it transforms the structure of the Call, how it affects the capacity for Response, how it obstructs or deforms Resonance. This analytical displacement is decisive: it enables us to exit the sterile debate between technophobia and technophilia and to enter a precise structural diagnosis of the forms of dialogal obstruction proper to our epoch.

The thesis this article defends may be formulated as follows: the digital world does not destroy dialogue through absence — it obstructs it through excess and substitution. The Call becomes orphaned through algorithmisation and saturation; the Response becomes a ghost through pre-formatting and delegation; Resonance is confused with metric reverberation and short-circuited by acceleration. These three forms of obstruction are not accidental — they are inscribed in the very architecture of contemporary digital environments. But the Mahoukou Law, precisely because it is a structural law rather than a nostalgic ideal, also allows us to identify the conditions of an authentic interpellation capable of resisting the logics of the platform.

To deploy this thesis, we will examine successively what the digital does to the Call (Part I), to the Response (Part II), and to Resonance (Part III) — before formulating, in conclusion, the conditions of a positive ethics of digital dialogue grounded in the Call–Response–Resonance triad.

Part I — The Digital Call: From Singular Address to Algorithmic Orphanhood

§ 1.1 — What the Authentic Call Requires: Singularity, Excess, Address

To understand what the digital does to the Call, one must first understand what an authentic Call is in the full rigour of its structure — and why this structure is precisely what the architecture of contemporary digital environments tends to undo.

The Mahoukou Law defines the Call by three essential and solidary properties that form an organic unity irreducible to its elements taken separately. The Call is first of all *singular*: it aims at an irreducible thou, an addressee whose existential singularity is constitutive of the address itself. A Call that could indifferently address anyone is not a Call in the phenomenological sense — it is an emission, a broadcast, a message without a real addressee. The singularity of the address is not a contingent empirical property — it is a structural one: the authentic Call engages the existence of the one who calls precisely because it addresses this particular other and not some other in general.

The Call is furthermore *in excess of itself*: it is not reducible to a transmissible and reproducible informational content. It carries a demand that overflows what is said — a demand for existence, engagement, presence that cannot be fully explicated without betrayal. That is why the authentic Call always contains a portion of unpredictability: the one who calls does not entirely know what they are asking, because what they are asking exceeds what they can formulate. This dimension of excess is constitutive of interpellation — it is what makes the Call an event rather than a transaction.

The Call finally *opens a dialogal space* — an existential between-two in which the Response of the other becomes possible as a free and unpredictable act. This space is not given in advance — it is created by the Call itself in the very movement of address. And it is structurally open: the authentic Call does not determine the Response it awaits — it makes it possible while ignoring the form it will take. It is this radical openness to the unpredictability of the Response that distinguishes the authentic Call from all its degraded forms.

§ 1.2 — *The Three Mutations of the Call in the Digital Environment*

Saturating Multiplication: When Everything Calls, Nothing Interpellates

The first mutation is the most paradoxical. It does not consist in suppressing the Call — it consists in multiplying it to the point where its very multiplication produces its obstruction. In the contemporary digital regime, Calls are permanent, simultaneous and incessant: notifications, messages, alerts, solicitations, updates, mentions, reminders — the digital subject lives in a state of interpellatory hyperstimulation that knows neither pause nor end.

Yet precisely: a Call that is everywhere is nowhere. The structure of the authentic Call presupposes that it *arises* — that it interrupts, surprises, arrives into a space not saturated in advance. The Call is by nature an event: something that occurs, that stands out against a background of silence or expectation, that creates a rupture in the ordinary course of existence. It is this event-structure that confers upon it its power of interpellation — its capacity to constitute its addressee as a called subject, to require a response that engages their existence.

When Calls arrive at the rate of dozens per hour, this event-structure is destroyed. The subject then develops, necessarily and almost unconsciously, immunisation mechanisms against the Call: they sort, filter, classify, defer. These mechanisms are rational and even necessary to psychic survival in a saturated environment. But their phenomenological effect is devastating: they transform the reception of the Call into flux management — and to manage is not to respond in the sense of the triad. Saturation is therefore not the fullness of dialogue. It is one of its most pernicious forms of obstruction precisely because it presents itself as an abundance of relation while destroying relation's structure.

Algorithmisation: The Call Without Human Intentionality

The second mutation is even deeper. In the contemporary digital world, a growing portion of the Calls that reach the subject are not the product of a human intentionality — they are produced by algorithmic systems that optimise engagement, not meaning. Content recommendations, personalised notifications, targeted advertisements, automatic suggestions — all these Calls have been generated by processes that have neither

intention, nor existence, nor engagement. They target a profile — a statistical construction of past behaviours — not a living subject.

Yet the authentic Call, in the structure of the Call–Response–Resonance triad, presupposes an intentionality: it is the gesture of one existence addressing another existence. The algorithmic Call bears no such trace: it is the product of an optimisation calculus that has never been inhabited by anyone. It simulates the Call while being structurally empty of it. And this simulation is all the more dangerous because it is indiscernible, for the subject who receives it, from the authentic Call.

The Loss of Event Character: The Programmed Call

The third mutation completes the first two. The authentic Call arises — it comes, it interrupts, it surprises. Its power of interpellation lies precisely in the fact that it was not foreseen, that it arrives from the other in their freedom and unpredictability. The digital Call, by contrast, is increasingly programmed, planned, optimised to produce an effect at a calculated moment. In doing so, the Call loses its event-structure to become an occurrence — something that happens according to a programme, at a calculated moment, for a predictable effect. An occurrence does not interpellate in the phenomenological sense: it happens, it triggers a reaction, it generates a behaviour. But it does not create that existential between-two in which one existence calls to another existence from its freedom and unpredictability.

§ 1.3 — *The Orphaned Call as Analytical Category*

These three mutations converge toward a figure that the foundational texts of the Mahoukou Law have named the *Orphaned Call*: a Call that has the form of address without having its structure — that simulates singularity while targeting an undifferentiated mass, that claims to address a thou while aiming only at a profile, that occupies the place of the Call in the structure of exchange without accomplishing its phenomenological function.

The Orphaned Call is orphaned in a precise sense: it has no existential father. It was not born of an existence that chose to address another existence from the engagement of its own life. It was born of a process — algorithm, campaign, automation — that was never inhabited by anyone. And like every orphan, it bears the mark of this absence of existential origin: something is lacking in it that cannot be compensated for by the sophistication of its form or the precision of its targeting.

Martin Buber had distinguished two fundamental regimes of relation: the I-Thou regime, in which the other is encountered in their irreducible singularity, and the I-It regime, in which the other is treated as an object, an instrument, a thing among things. Most digital Calls are structurally inscribed in the I-It regime while mimicking the I-Thou regime. They have the form of personal address — they use the first name, imitate the tone of conversation, simulate interest in the addressee's singularity — but they treat this addressee as a profile to be optimised, not as a thou to be encountered. It is a counterfeit of the I-Thou — and like every sophisticated counterfeit, it is all the more dangerous because it is difficult to detect.

§ 1.4 — Can an Authentic Call Exist in Digital Space?

It would be philosophically honest and practically necessary to refuse any radical pessimism here. The Mahoukou Law is not a nostalgic ideal that would condemn by principle all forms of technically mediated interpellation. It is a structural law that identifies the conditions of possibility of authentic interpellation — and these conditions, while rendered difficult by digital architecture, are not rendered impossible.

An authentic Call is possible in digital space. But it is possible as exception, as resistance, as deliberate act that goes against the dominant logics of the platform. It is possible when someone deliberately chooses to write a singular message — not a generic copy-paste, not an automatic response, not a courtesy emoji, but a message that bears the trace of their existence, that testifies to their having thought of this particular other, that opens a space in which the other's Response will be awaited in its unpredictability. Such Calls exist. They arise in digital space like islands of authenticity in an ocean of algorithmic orphans. They are precious precisely because they are rare — and their very rarity is the most eloquent diagnosis of what digital architecture does to the structure of the Call.

Part II — The Digital Response: From Existential Engagement to the Ghost Response

§ 2.1 — What the Authentic Response Requires: Recognition, Engagement, Vulnerability

If Part I showed how the digital undoes the structure of the Call by multiplying it to the point of algorithmic orphanhood, Part II must now analyse what it does to the second moment of the triad — the Response. For even when an authentic Call manages to arise in digital space despite the logics of the platform, someone must still be capable of responding to it authentically.

The Mahoukou Law defines the Response by a twofold irreducible operation. The first is *self-recognition*: recognising oneself as the one to whom the Call was addressed — accepting to be interpellated, not to evade, to hold one's place as assumed addressee. The second operation is *existential engagement*: responding from one's own life, from what one genuinely is and thinks, taking the risk of self-disclosure. This engagement presupposes a constitutive vulnerability — the vulnerability of one who exposes themselves in responding, who does not know how their Response will be received, who accepts that the other may be transformed by it and that they themselves may be transformed in return. It is this twofold operation that the digital tends to short-circuit through three distinct mechanisms.

§ 2.2 — The Pre-formatting of the Response: The Like as Impoverished Response

The most visible and widespread form of the obstruction of Response in digital space is pre-formatting. Digital platforms have progressively developed an arsenal of standardised responses — the like, the heart, the thumbs up, the emoji, the share, the reaction in five predefined emotions — that allow the subject to occupy the place of the Response in the structure of exchange without accomplishing the phenomenological act the triad requires.

These pre-formatted forms are not without value — they signal attention, presence, minimal agreement. But they short-circuit precisely what makes a Response a Response in the sense of the Mahoukou Law: they

replace singular expression with a gesture of standardised validation, the qualitative with the quantitative, existential engagement with the reflex reaction. Pre-formatting produces what we might call the *Impoverished Response*: a Response that maintains the formal structure of the triad in appearance while emptying it of its existential content. The triad appears complete in form and reveals itself hollow in reality.

The dynamics of platforms structurally aggravate this phenomenon. By designing interfaces that valorise the speed of reaction, that reward the frequency of interactions, that gamify the accumulation of likes and responses, they create an environment in which the Impoverished Response is not only possible but actively encouraged. The platform does not ask how one responds — it asks that one respond, as fast as possible, as often as possible. The quality of existential engagement is structurally invisible to it. Only the quantity of reactions is measurable, and therefore only it is optimised.

§ 2.3 — The Delegation of Response: The Algorithmic Ghost Response

The second form of obstruction of Response is more radical still. It does not merely impoverish the Response by pre-formatting it — it delegates it entirely to a system that has neither existence, nor engagement, nor vulnerability. Automatic writing assistants, smart reply suggestions, chatbots, auto-reply systems — all these tools produce Responses that have the form without the essence: coherent texts, contextually adapted, sometimes even touching in their formulation, but entirely devoid of what makes a Response a Response in the phenomenological sense.

What we propose to call the *Ghost Response* is precisely this: a Response that occupies the place of the second moment of the triad without accomplishing its function. It resembles a Response — it has the grammatical form, the appropriate tone, sometimes even stylistic warmth. But it is the product of no self-recognition, no existential engagement, no assumed vulnerability. It is a computational artefact that simulates the Response while being, structurally, its absence.

Maurice Merleau-Ponty had established, in his phenomenology of perception, that the body is not an instrument the subject uses to act in the world — it is the subject themselves insofar as they are in the world, the schema of all possible experience. To respond, from this perspective, is never merely to produce a text or a sound — it is to engage a body, a history, an existence that takes the risk of self-disclosure before the other. The Ghost Response is precisely what remains when one has subtracted from the Response this corporeal and existential dimension: a text without a body, a formulation without existence, an engagement without risk.

§ 2.4 — Image Management as Substitute for Authentic Response

The third form of obstruction of Response touches something even more intimate — no longer the architecture of platforms but the way the subject relates to themselves in digital space. For the digital does not merely transform the external forms of exchange — it transforms the way the subject constitutes themselves as a responding subject.

Paul Ricœur, in *Oneself as Another*, distinguished two forms of the subject's identity: *idem-identity* — the permanence of the same through time, the continuity of characteristics — and *ipse-identity* — the capacity to

keep one's promises, to answer for oneself, to maintain oneself as someone who can be held accountable for what they say and do. Ipse-identity is precisely what makes Response possible: it is because the subject is capable of answering for themselves that they can produce an authentic Response — a Response that engages them, that binds them, that constitutes them as a subject responsible for what they have said.

Yet digital space tends to substitute for Ricœurian ipse-identity what we might call the *digital persona* — a carefully managed construction of self-image, optimised to produce certain effects on certain audiences, constantly adjusted according to received reactions. In the logic of the digital persona, one edits before sending, anticipates the reaction before exposing oneself, measures the image the Response will project before formulating it. The constitutive vulnerability of genuine Response is systematically concealed behind image management. Byung-Chul Han has shown, in *The Transparency Society*, that digital logic produces paradoxically not more transparency but more opacity: behind the permanent self-exposure hides a systematic subtraction of the real subject, replaced by an image constructed to elicit approval. In Call–Response–Resonance terms, what Han describes is precisely the obstruction of the second moment of the triad through substitution of the persona for the ipse: one appears to respond — one is visible, active, present — but one does not respond in the phenomenological sense.

Part III — Digital Resonance: From Metric Reverberation to Absent Transformation

§ 3.1 — What Resonance Requires: Time, Reciprocity, Deferred Transformation

Resonance is the moment of the triad most profoundly alien to digital logic — and it is precisely for this reason that it is the moment most gravely threatened. Not because it would be rare or difficult in other contexts, but because its very structure — retroactive, transformative, deferred — enters into frontal contradiction with the fundamental architectural principles of contemporary digital environments: immediacy, measurability, acceleration.

The Mahoukou Law defines Resonance by three essential properties. It is *retroactive*: it affects not only the one who received the Call and responded, but also the one who called — it comes back to them, transforms them, produces in them something they had not foreseen. It is *transformative*: it does not leave the two parties in the state they were before the exchange. It is finally *deferred*: it often manifests only after the fact, in belated realisations, progressive displacements, transformations whose origin one understands only in retrospect. It is this triple structure that the digital world obstructs through mechanisms we shall now analyse.

§ 3.2 — The Confusion Between Resonance and Reverberation: Metrics as Simulacrum

The first form of obstruction of Resonance in digital space is perhaps the most pernicious because it is the least visible: the structural confusion between Resonance and what we propose to call *reverberation*. This confusion is maintained, even produced, by the very architecture of digital platforms.

Reverberation is the quantitative propagation of content: the number of views, shares, likes, comments, followers it generates. It is measurable, immediate, visible, comparable. Content that has ten million views

has, in the terminology of the platforms, *resonated*. But Resonance in the sense of the Mahoukou Law has nothing to do with reverberation. Resonance is an interior and often invisible transformation: something that takes place in a person's life through contact with a Call and a Response, something that modifies their understanding of the world, their relation to the other, their relationship with themselves. Content may have ten million views without having resonated in a single life.

The distinction is therefore radical and irreducible: reverberation is quantitative, immediate and measurable; Resonance is qualitative, deferred and structurally unmeasurable. Yet digital platforms can only measure reverberation. And because they can only measure reverberation, they optimise reverberation — and only it. The contents that produce the most reverberation are often precisely those that produce the least Resonance — shock content, divisive content, content that triggers an immediate and intense but superficial reaction. The mechanics of digital attention are structurally hostile to the deep transformation that Resonance requires.

§ 3.3 — Acceleration as Structural Enemy of Resonance: Always-Being-Beside

The second form of obstruction of Resonance is acceleration. And it is here that the Mahoukou Law enables the formulation of a diagnosis of a precision and depth that habitual sociological analyses do not reach — a diagnosis that touches not only the architecture of platforms but the anthropological transformation that the digital regime produces in the very structure of human existence.

Hartmut Rosa, in *Resonance: A Sociology of Our Relationship to the World*, has shown that social acceleration is one of the constitutive pathologies of late modernity: the increasing speed of exchanges, decisions and transformations produces an alienated relationship to the world in which subjects can no longer appropriate their own experience nor inhabit their own existence with the depth that authentic life requires. The Mahoukou Law enters into critical dialogue with Rosa on this point: it shares his fundamental diagnosis, but specifies and radicalises it by situating it within the structure of the triad. Digital acceleration is the enemy of Resonance because it prevents the Call and the Response from having time to be inhabited — from producing, in duration, that transformative echo that constitutes the third moment of the triad.

But there is something still deeper — an anthropological transformation of the very structure of existence. Martin Heidegger had described Dasein — being-there — as the structure of an existence that inhabits its world, that is thrown into it in an engaged manner, that is present to its situation in a temporally anchored way. Heideggerian Dasein is fundamentally *there* — somewhere, in a determinate situation, facing precise possibilities, with a history that precedes it and a future that calls it. What the digital regime produces is the mutation of this fundamental structure. The Heideggerian being-there — this inhabited, engaged, temporally anchored presence in a situation — has become, in the regime of permanent hyperstimulation, what we may call *always-being-beside*: a mode of existence in which the subject is never fully present where they are, always partially elsewhere — on their phone, in a feed, in ten simultaneous conversations, in anticipation of the next notification. The digital subject is physically present in a situation and existentially dispersed across an indefinite number of others.

This is not simply distraction — a phenomenon as old as humanity. It is a structure of existence: a mode of being-in-the-world in which full and complete presence to a situation, a moment, an interlocutor has become structurally difficult, almost counter-cultural. And what the Mahoukou Law enables us to add to this anthropological diagnosis is decisive: always-being-beside is precisely what structurally prevents Resonance. For Resonance requires one to be *there* — fully present to what is given in the exchange, available for the transformation that the Call and the Response have initiated. If the subject is always beside — always partially elsewhere, always already distracted by the next solicitation — Resonance cannot take hold. Like a graft on tissue structurally incapable of receiving it, it slides along the surface without ever penetrating.

There is, however, one further dimension this diagnosis must integrate to be complete. Always-being-beside is not merely an external constraint imposed by platforms. It is, increasingly, internalised by subjects themselves as a norm of existence. One does not merely submit to digital acceleration — one compels oneself to it. One feels guilty for not responding immediately, abnormal for taking time to think before reacting, behind oneself the moment one stops. Permanent availability has become a virtue — and silence, slowness, non-response have become faults.

This process of internalising acceleration is, in Call–Response–Resonance terms, a progressive self-immunisation against Resonance — not under the constraint of an external violence, but through the incorporation of a cultural norm that makes immediate reactivity a value and transformative depth a suspect slowness. The subject thus becomes complicit in their own dialogal obstruction: they self-deprive of Resonance by adopting the rhythms and postures that digital logic valorises. And this complicity is all the more difficult to undo because it does not present itself as such — it presents itself as efficiency, as modernity, as necessary adaptation to the demands of the world.

§ 3.4 — Is Digital Resonance Possible? Conditions and Resistances

Faced with this triple obstruction — confusion with metric reverberation, structural acceleration, internalised always-being-beside — it would be philosophically dishonest to conclude that Resonance is entirely impossible in digital space. Resonance remains possible — but as exception, as active resistance, as grace within a system that did not provide for it. It occurs when a digital exchange manages, despite everything, to produce a lasting transformation in both parties — when a message read at midnight lastingly modifies how someone understands a situation, when a conversation through screens produces a realisation that persists and develops over time.

Such digital Resonances exist. But they require, in order to occur, a deliberate resistance to the dominant logics of the platform. They require *slowing down*: accepting not to respond immediately, allowing the received Call to settle before formulating a Response. They require *personal engagement*: refusing pre-formatted responses, taking the risk of genuinely saying oneself. They require finally *acceptance of unpredictability*: renouncing control over the effect of what one says, allowing the other to be transformed in their own way.

These conditions sketch what we might call a positive ethics of digital dialogue grounded in the Call–Response–Resonance triad. Not a list of external rules to apply, but a structural orientation: conceiving

digital exchanges such that the three moments of the triad can be accomplished — that the Call be singular and engaged, that the Response be free and vulnerable, that Resonance have the time and space to occur. This ethics also has a political and institutional dimension: it furnishes the immanent normative criteria for a conception of platforms respectful of dialogal structure. If the Call–Response–Resonance triad is an eidetic law, then any digital architecture that structurally obstructs one of its moments commits a fault not against an external rule but against the very phenomenality of encounter.

Conclusion — The Paradox of Connection and the Task of Authentic Interpellation

Taking Stock: What the Mahoukou Law Has Made Visible

At the end of this journey, the inaugural paradox with which we opened this article has received a philosophically precise answer. This paradox — never so connected, never so alone — is not the sign of a superficial contradiction that goodwill or better tool usage would suffice to resolve. It is the sign of a structural crisis of intersubjectivity inscribed in the very architecture of contemporary digital environments — a crisis that strikes the three moments of the Call–Response–Resonance triad through distinct, articulated and analysable mechanisms.

The Mahoukou Law has established that the digital world does not obstruct dialogue through absence — it obstructs it through excess and substitution. The Call is obstructed by the saturating multiplication that destroys its event-structure, by algorithmisation that strips it of all human intentionality, by programming that removes its character of unpredictable arising. It becomes orphaned: it has the form of address without having its structure. The Response is obstructed by pre-formatting that reduces it to a standardised validation gesture, by algorithmic delegation that transforms it into a Ghost Response devoid of all existential engagement, by image management that substitutes the digital persona for the Ricœurian ipse. Resonance finally is obstructed by confusion with metric reverberation, by acceleration that destroys the deferred temporality without which no lasting transformation can settle, and by always-being-beside — that anthropological mutation of Heideggerian being-there — which deprives the subject of the full presence without which Resonance cannot take hold.

What This Changes for the Understanding of the Digital

This analysis produces three major philosophical displacements relative to habitual diagnoses of the digital crisis.

The first concerns the nature of the problem. The digital is not a problem of quantity — neither a problem of too little communication, nor a problem of too little physical presence. It is a problem of structure: the architecture of contemporary digital environments structurally prevents the three moments of the triad from being accomplished. This displacement is decisive because it radically changes the level at which answers must be sought: not in the moderation of usage or the return to physical presence, but in the transformation of the architecture itself — and in the subject's deliberate resistance to the logics that architecture imposes.

The second displacement concerns the nature of the solution. The Mahoukou Law proposes no technical solution to the technical problem of the digital — it proposes an ethical orientation grounded in the eidetic structure of interpellation. If the Call–Response–Resonance triad is a structural law of all phenomena of authentic interpellation, then the question is not how to optimise digital exchanges — it is how to create, in digital space, the conditions in which the Call can be singular, the Response can be engaged, and Resonance can have time to occur.

The third displacement concerns the nature of the digital subject. The Mahoukou Law allows us to see that the digital crisis of intersubjectivity is not merely a crisis of exchanges — it is a crisis of the subject themselves. Always-being-beside is not a posture the subject adopts toward the digital — it is a structure of existence that the digital regime produces and that the subject progressively internalises as normal. To understand this is to understand that the restoration of the capacity for authentic interpellation in the digital world is not merely a question of usage — it is a question of reconstituting the subject themselves in their capacity to be there, fully, for what is addressed to them.

The Synthetic Formula: Obstruction Through Excess

There remains, at the end of this analysis, a formulation that the Mahoukou Law makes possible and that constitutes perhaps its most original contribution to the understanding of the digital crisis of intersubjectivity.

In the digital world, the paradox of connection can now be formulated with rigorous philosophical precision: the more the system is designed to produce relation, the less room it leaves for authentic interpellation. This paradox is not accidental — it is structural. It lies in the fact that digital systems optimise reverberation, not Resonance; reaction, not Response; diffusion, not address. They maximise precisely what resembles interpellation while destroying its structure.

The Mahoukou Law names this paradox with the precision it deserves: it is *obstruction through excess* — the form of dialogal obstruction proper to our epoch, irreducible to the classical forms of obstruction through violence or silence. Obstruction through excess does not deprive the subject of exchanges — it drowns them in exchanges that are not interpellations. It does not take away their speech — it gives them speech so abundant that none of it can be truly heard. It does not condemn them to silence — it condemns them to noise, which is phenomenologically the same thing: in both cases, Resonance cannot occur.

Opening: Toward the Other Themes of the Collection

This article has analysed the digital crisis of intersubjectivity as a paradigmatic case of contemporary dialogal obstruction — perhaps the most widespread, the most quotidian, the most insidious because it presents itself as relational abundance. But it is not the only one. Each configuration that the collection *Interpellation of the World* proposes to examine produces its own forms of obstruction, strikes the triad at its own points of vulnerability, calls for its own restorative mediations.

The plurality of lived worlds and the intercultural crisis pose the question of what happens when the Call and the Response are inscribed in horizons of meaning so different that Resonance cannot occur without a

prior translation that is itself a risk and an act. The asymmetry of power relations poses the question of what happens when the structural conditions of exchange make a free Response impossible for one of the interlocutors. The fragmentation of the contemporary subject poses the question of what happens when the subject themselves is too dispersed to hold the position of one who calls or who responds with the fullness the triad requires.

These questions form the programme of the collection. What they share — what the Mahoukou Law allows us to see as their common thread — is that the contemporary crisis of interpellation is not a crisis of communication in the technical sense. It is a crisis of presence: of the capacity of subjects to be *there*, fully, for what is addressed to them and for what they address to the other. Restoring this presence — against saturation, against acceleration, against dispersion, against all the contemporary forms of always-being-beside — is the most urgent philosophical task of our epoch. And it is to this task that the Mahoukou Law intends to contribute, one theme after another, one interpellation after another.

References

- Buber, M. (1923). *Ich und Du*. Leipzig: Insel Verlag. [English trans.: *I and Thou*, trans. W. Kaufmann, New York: Scribner, 1970.]
- Han, B.-C. (2012). *Transparenzgesellschaft*. Berlin: Matthes & Seitz. [English trans.: *The Transparency Society*, trans. E. Butler, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015.]
- Han, B.-C. (2010). *Müdigkeitsgesellschaft*. Berlin: Matthes & Seitz. [English trans.: *The Burnout Society*, trans. E. Butler, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015.]
- Husserl, E. (1913). *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie*. [English trans.: *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology*, trans. W. R. B. Gibson, London: Routledge, 2012.]
- Lévinas, E. (1961). *Totalité et Infini. Essai sur l'extériorité*. La Haye: Martinus Nijhoff. [English trans.: *Totality and Infinity*, trans. A. Lingis, Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1969.]
- Mahoukou, C. (2025). "The Phenomenological Law of Interpellation: Call-Response-Resonance." Founding article. Collection *Interpellation of the World*.
- Mahoukou, C. (2026). "The Mahoukou Law and the Popperian Epistemological Challenge." Collection *Interpellation of the World*.
- Mahoukou, C. (2026). *Toward an Epistemology of the Human Sciences: The Case of the Phenomenology of Interpellation*. Philosophical Manifesto. Collection *Interpellation of the World*.
- Mahoukou, C. (2026). "Obstructed Interpellation: Dialogue, Conflict and Violence through the Mahoukou Law." Collection *Interpellation of the World*.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1945). *Phénoménologie de la perception*. Paris: Gallimard. [English trans.: *Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. D. Landes, London: Routledge, 2012.]
- Ricœur, P. (1990). *Soi-même comme un autre*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil. [English trans.: *Oneself as Another*, trans. K. Blamey, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.]
- Rosa, H. (2016). *Resonanz. Eine Soziologie der Weltbeziehung*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp. [English trans.: *Resonance: A Sociology of Our Relationship to the World*, trans. J. Wagner, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2019.]
- Rosa, H. (2005). *Beschleunigung*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp. [English trans.: *Social Acceleration: A New Theory of Modernity*, trans. J. Trejo-Mathys, New York: Columbia University Press, 2013.]
- Stiegler, B. (2008). *Prendre soin. Tome 1 : De la jeunesse et des générations*. Paris: Flammarion. [English trans.: *Taking Care of Youth and the Generations*, trans. S. Barker, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.]
- Waldenfels, B. (1994). *Antwortregister*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Waldenfels, B. (2007). *Schattenrisse der Moral*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp. [English trans.: *The Question of the Other*, trans. T. Nenon, Albany: SUNY Press, 2007.]

© 2026 Christian Mahoukou — Collection "Interpellation of the World" · All rights reserved