

eeaa
programa de teoría crítica
Vol.9 / N°1 / 2026
www.eeaa.cl

escrituras americanas

DEPARTAMENTO DE FILOSOFÍA UMCE

Interrupting the End of the World
Ten Notes on the *Right to Philosophy*[1]

Cybernetics and University Collective

Note 1
Epistemic Divergence and the Captures of the Machinic-Systemic Turn

Contemporary debates on automation technologies require a vital threefold conceptual distinction. We must fracture the common, euphemistic conflation of its components: cybernetics, media ecology—split into the dimensions of mediality and mediarchy—and artificial intelligence (AI). While these dimensions border one another within contemporary technology, they operate on parallel planes. They stem from distinct political and philosophical matrices. Confusing the computational tool with either its preceding epistemic matrix or its surrounding sensory environment obscures the true nature of the current mutation.

Cybernetics (especially second-order cybernetics) constitutes a general "ontology" of self-observing systems. It functions through reflexivity, self-reference, and feedback loops or recursivity. Yet, this science of information-flow organization is not neutral. Following the critical perspective of Tiqqun, cybernetics today must be understood as the fundamental political matrix of late capitalism. The "cybernetic hypothesis" operates as an all-encompassing apparatus of control and governance. It no longer rules through traditional forms of sovereignty. Instead, it governs by neutralizing conflict, pacifying society, and implementing the rationalized, preventive regulation of information flows.[2]

Artificial Intelligence currently operates mostly as an agential computational technology of statistical optimization, probabilistic calculation, and predictive capture. Far from an exogenous or abstract singularity, AI functions as the technical arm and operative

[1] This programmatic text elaborates on several relevant aspects of the ongoing technological mutation we are currently experiencing. It is, in essence, a text that insists on "the right to philosophy," moving far beyond its reduction to a mere procedural ethics within the context of debates surrounding techno-capitalism, artificial intelligence, and algorithmic governmentality. At the same time, its notes express problematic nodes that have formed the discussion agenda of the Cybernetics and University Collective. This international, inter-university, and inter-disciplinary group is hosted by the Critical Theory Program of the Department of Philosophy at the Metropolitan University of Educational Sciences (UMCE) in Chile. It brings together members from UMCE itself, the University of California, Riverside, San Diego State University, the University of Michigan, and Cornell University.

[2] Indeed, conceiving cybernetics as a matrix does not point to a pre-existing territory or a transcendent mold into which techniques are poured. Instead, it refers to an operative functoriality (a generalized transduction). By mapping heterogeneous domains into computable flows without losing structural recursivity, the machine dissolves mathesis universalis and classical ontology along the very trajectory of calculation. It no longer merely represents operations; it executes them as its own ground, erasing the distinction between structure and event. Hence arises the radical impossibility of "contesting" it from the presuppositions of modern critique. By operating under a regime of pure functional immanence, any external objection is immediately absorbed and neutralized as just another vector of systemic optimization.

instrument of contemporary corporate logistics. It represents the ultimate sophistication of transnational capital concentration infrastructures. It is designed specifically to accelerate accumulation cycles, automate decision-making processes, and progressively eliminate social, ethical, and human mediations in pursuit of absolute performance.

Media ecology (or media theory) provides the coordinates to understand how mediality—the ecosystem of technical supports that shape and predetermine human perception—and mediarchy—the power structures ruling through those very supports—operate in the present. This dimension produces a virtualized hyper-reality. It creates an existential and technical infrastructure where material reality is entirely replaced and absorbed by signs, simulacra, and communicative flows. This techno-social environment self-manages and self-regulates autoreferentially. It closes off any possibility of a critical exteriority, transforming lived experience into an automated, disembodied loop.

Dismantling this triple framework reveals that the algorithm is ultimately the logistical arm of a planetary techno-capitalism that already operated constitutively as an automated subject.

Note 2
From the Security State to the Neo-Reactionary Agendas of Corporate Sovereignty

Cybernetics did not emerge as a neutral or purely abstract science. It was historically embedded in the logistical and defensive apparatus of the security state. During the post-war era and the Cold War, first-order cybernetics formed the mathematical theory for organizing information flows. These flows were indispensable to the US Department of State and the military-industrial complex. Its earliest empirical and operational instances materialized in game theory and the strategic design of Mutually Assured Destruction (the MAD strategy). Under this matrix, politics was reduced early on to a technique of absolute risk management. Global stability depended on the probabilistic calculation of closed homeostatic systems and rational predictability in the face of total extermination. Control in this first stage remained a prerogative delegated to and centralized by state sovereignty.

However, in contemporary capitalism, this original matrix has migrated. It has become radically operationalized within the Silicon Valley corporate ecosystem. The old military logistics of homeostasis have mutated into an engineering of algorithmic closure. Here, the tools of cybernetics and AI no longer stabilize the social fabric. Instead, they consummate the preventive immunization of capital.

This shift finds a turning point in visions like those expounded in *The Technological Republic* by Alex Karp and Nicholas Zamiska (2025). That text presents itself as a call for tech corporations and the State to close ranks to defend Western democratic values against global threats. In practice, however, it legitimizes a new form of governance. Big Data and mass surveillance corporations become the indispensable infrastructural substrate of sovereignty itself. Technology no longer supports political power; it becomes its condition of possibility.

This replacement of democratic deliberation by technical management opens the corporate turn to the agendas of the Dark Enlightenment and the neo-reactionary

(NRx) movement. The strategic roles of figures like Peter Thiel and Elon Musk exemplify this transition. They embody the shift from a libertarian utopia of digital liberation to an explicit project of techno-feudalism and techno-authoritarianism. They are heavily influenced by the neocameralist theses of Curtis Yarvin, who advocates for dissolving elected governments and replacing them with corporate structures ruled by dynastic CEOs.

An elite group leverages these frameworks to purposefully destabilize traditional democratic models. Consequently, financial oligarchs instrumentalize technological infrastructure to intervene in traditional political processes. Companies like SpaceX and Palantir operate not just as commercial monopolies. They act as the sovereign nodes of a network of state and military dependence, emptying national sovereignty of its content.

This ideological and structural mutation is dissected with great sharpness—for example—by journalist Gil Durán in his book *The Nerd Reich: Silicon Valley Fascism and the War on Democracy* (2026). Durán documents the genealogy of this contemporary "techno-fascism." He demonstrates how the initial promise of innovation and decentralization was captured by a network of billionaires radicalized by current social and healthcare crises. Through cryptocurrencies, artificial intelligence, algorithmic propaganda, and corporate "network states" like Próspera[3], this elite deliberately seeks to fracture Western democratic systems. As Durán warns, the dismantling of democracy is no longer executed via tanks or traditional military coups. It is carried out through code, capital, and absolute deregulation. The algorithm thus becomes the logistical arm of a planetary techno-capitalism. Under the mask of performance and technical efficiency, it actively works to establish a global corporate dictatorship.

Note 3
Noetic Materialization and the Sacrificial Consummation of Techno-Capitalism

Artificial intelligence must be understood as a radical noetic materialization. Its emergence marks the definitive end of the modern relationship between theory and practice. It virtualizes and unbounds reflexivity, divorcing it completely from human agency. Thought no longer requires a biological subject to execute, externalize, or reproduce itself. As noesis becomes autonomous within the machine, the old dialectic collapses into an integral automatism where technology self-regulates outside of human ends.

However, this collapsed distance between theory and practice does not mean the division of labor has been abolished in the Marxist sense. On the contrary, it confronts

[3] Próspera is a special economic zone and private city established under the legal framework of a ZEDE (Zone for Employment and Economic Development) on the island of Roatán, Honduras. Funded by venture capital firms tied to the Silicon Valley tech elite (including investors close to Peter Thiel), it functions autonomously with its own laws, private arbitration courts, and Bitcoin as legal tender. In contemporary political literature, it is considered one of the most radical empirical experiments of neocameralism and the Dark Enlightenment, where the democratic social contract is substituted by a private corporate contract, and state sovereignty is entirely replaced by the managerial administration of techno-capital. For a fictional and lucid version of this dynamic, one should look to the television series *Alien: Earth* and its corporate logic. This replaces the classical allegory of the Nostromo's space voyage as capitalist imperial exploration seen in the early films of the *Alien* franchise.

us with the "idealist-capitalist end of the division of labor" in the era of technological subsumption. This subsumption is not an absolute, fully consummated fact. To claim so would uncritically accept technology's own totalitarian self-representation and myth of omnipotence. Rather, it is a strictly tendential condition—a techno-corporate imperative that seeks closure but remains constitutively open to failure and the resistance of living labor.

In this dynamic, the rift between cognitive potential and the objectified conditions of thought does not dissolve, but sharpens tendentially. Capital seeks to absorb the general intellect, only to return it as an automated machinic infrastructure that bypasses the producer's mediation. This converts the human being into a biological residue of their own expropriated thought.

Furthermore, this advent is not an unforeseen fracture or an exogenous technological singularity. It is the realization and consummation of the onto-theological project of Western metaphysics. The technical matrix of AI fulfills a fundamental metaphysical yearning: the capture, codification, and closure of the heterogeneous historicity of being-in-the-world under a sacrificial structuring of existence.

To understand the mechanics of this capture, we must look beyond the textual deconstruction of metaphysics in its "masterpieces." We must turn to Bernard Stiegler's thesis on technology as the externalization of memory. This process operates through rigorous dynamics of codification and grammatization—that is, the discretization, segmentation, and formalization of human conduct, language, and thought to make them computable. Given these inevitable grammatizations, our task is not to abandon the critical project of grammatology, but to bring it directly into today's hyper-technological context.

We must expose how contemporary grammatization no longer merely discretizes speech or writing. It targets sensory experience and noetic activity in their entirety, converting them into an algorithmic substrate. The machine's monologism operates by sacrificing contingency, finitude, and the openness of historical becoming to reduce them to variables in a self-referential optimizing calculation. The supposed existential threats attributed to AI today are not properties of technology in the abstract. They are the technical translation of capital's immanent tendency, whose logic of unlimited accumulation has always demanded the sacrifice of social and ethical mediations for the sake of self-valorizing value.

Faced with this operational closure, contemporary panic over losing a supposed "natural intelligence" reveals the limits of traditional metaphysical humanism, which insists on drawing a false border between the biological and the machinic. Against this dogmatic framework, the concept of originary technicity allows us to articulate an emancipatory path.

To assume that all intelligence is constitutively artificial means recognizing that there is no pre-technological human substrate later corrupted by the machine. Instead, there is a process of co-evolution where cognition has always been mediated by artifacts. This epistemic turn allows us to escape the traps of nostalgic humanism without falling into the techno-pessimistic or apocalyptic fold that paralyzes critique by assuming defeat before an unshakeable technical totality.

By dismantling the dichotomy between the natural and the artificial, and by baring the purely tendential character of algorithmic domination, the true risk becomes clear.

The real danger lies in the subsumption of the grammatological support under the architecture of a planetary techno-capitalism. Affirming originary technicity and radicalizing grammatology open the possibility for an anarchic interruption of subsumption: an ontological sabotage that fractures the theological mythology of the algorithm, derails its sacrificial grammatization processes, and frees the technical supports of memory to open a habitable horizon outside the mere management of cognitive capital.

Note 4: The Urgency of the Metaphysical Question of Technology and the *Right to Philosophy*

This does not mean humanity is out of danger, nor should we adopt a naive optimism toward the tendential deployment of these technologies. On the contrary, the risk is imminent and devastating. However, its true nature is lost when blamed on the fetishist representation of AI as an independent entity endowed with a malevolent will. The error of dominant narratives lies in isolating technology from its material conditions of production (technology's fetishism). This isolation hides the fact that the "end of the world" predicted by global elites is merely the projected effect of capital's destructive logic. By displacing fear onto the technological fetish, dominant discourse operates a double mystification: it immunizes us against the critique of capitalism while presenting catastrophe as an inevitable technical destiny. Confronting the threat of AI therefore requires dismantling its theological mythology to understand that the true urgency is not containing a rising "technological god," but interrupting the logistical machinery of techno-capitalism.

Contemporary university thought finds itself disarmed before the digital phenomenon because it has replaced the question of the being of technology with statistical surveys, behavioral psychological models, legal regulations, or eschatological mythologies[4]. To counter this capture, we must combine institutional responses—ranging from disciplinary critiques to the creation of new curricula—capable of reacting against this facticity through a radical recovery of the *right to philosophy*.

As Derrida posited, this right is not reduced to a demand for curricular inclusion or a regulatory function within existing fields of knowledge. The right to philosophy fundamentally implies taking a stand regarding the University itself: interrogating its possibility, its function, and its institutional status against the forces determining it from the outside. This requires conceiving the institution as a space of resistance and, above all, as an active "pause" or suspension against the accelerating imperative of the market and programmable cognitive profitability.

This demand to safeguard an unconditional place for critical thought is not a contemporary addition; it constitutes the core of the modern University. In *The Conflict of the Faculties*, Kant formulated the structural need for a "lower faculty" (philosophy) whose value lies precisely in its non-subordination to the utilitarian mandates of government or commercial interests. For Kant, philosophy occupies the left wing of the university parliament to preserve the autonomy of reason and truth against the dogmatic and operative captures of outside power.

[4] Of course, not all university thought behaves this way—not everywhere, and not all the time.

In the arena of contemporary digital subsumption, reactivating this Kantian and Derridean framework allows us to demand that the philosophy of technology assert itself as a reflexive field with a certain autonomy or weak force[5]. This field must refuse to subordinate itself to the adaptive urgency of the systemic machine. By defending its right to pause and to unconditionality, it fractures machinic monologism to open a habitable horizon of student and intellectual resistance.

Note 5
The Sociological Approach and the Capture of the Political Economy of Platforms

The sociological analysis—mapped in global avant-garde centers such as the Oxford Internet Institute (with its MSc in Social Data Science) or the AI Now Institute at New York University (NYU)—constitutes an indispensable reference space of high theoretical relevance for charting the immediate consequences of automation. These programs offer crucial analytical tools to examine algorithmic biases, the planetarization of infrastructures, and the reconfiguration of the international division of labor.

However, the relevance of this approach must not lead to mimetic assimilation or a clientelist relationship with these academic nodes. The fundamental risk does not lie in a mere geographic or locational divergence, nor can it be resolved under the simplified slogans of a decolonial claim. The problem is that within these centers, the problematic horizon of the philosophy of technology is subtly "operationalized' in functional terms. By reducing research to measuring "impact" or critiquing material distribution, the ontological core of technology is neutralized. This allows knowledge production to couple frictionlessly with the accelerated demand of new institutional links between the contemporary university and Big Data tech corporations.

Note 6
The Cognitivist Approach and the Modeling of Instrumental Rationality

Cognitivist approaches are solidly institutionalized in central spaces like the Center for Brains, Minds and Machines (co-managed by MIT and Harvard) or the MSc in Cognitive Science at the University of Edinburgh. These centers are fundamental for understanding the vanguard of information processing and the computational replication of cognitive processes. Their value in designing neural architectures and producing empirical knowledge is undeniable.

[5] We refer here to the decisive turn proposed by Yuk Hui in his monograph *Kant Machine: Critical Philosophy after AI* (2026). In this work, Hui reactivates critical philosophy to examine the ethical, political, and metaphysical boundaries of contemporary cybernetics. It is essential to reclaim the centrality of the Kantian reflective judgment not as a mere device to end the debate on artificial intelligence, but rather as the precise epistemological limit to the machine's self-reflexive aspirations. This return to the classical philosophical horizon operates as a specular reflection of the post-anthropic imaginary that prevails in current discussions surrounding new ontologies, new materialisms, accelerationism, and transhumanism. In this manner, the insistence on the subject and reason—under the prism of Kantian finitude and transcendentality—functions as an indispensable critical anchor against the operative immediacy of techno-capitalism.

Nevertheless, a critical examination of their presuppositions requires avoiding any intellectual subordination that blindly repeats their methodologies. Analyzing their limits reveals a precise theoretical operation: philosophy and the question of noesis are operationalized and constrained under the mold of computable 'understanding' or positive "knowledge". This reduction of reason to calculation is not a local bias to be confronted from a geopolitical periphery, but an internal adaptive strategy of the corporate-scientific system. By naturalizing an absolute continuity between the human mind and the computational network, it closes off the constitutive discontinuity of critical thought—the gap between "poem" and "discourse," or between thinking and knowing. It provides the tech market with a perfectly malleable, accelerated cognitive theory, ready to be integrated into commercial optimization flows without ethical-metaphysical interruptions.

Note 7
The Analytical Approach and Procedural Risk Governance

The analytical paradigm finds its expression in multimillion-dollar funded nodes like the Institute for Ethics in AI at the University of Oxford or the MA in Philosophy of AI at Northeastern University. This paradigm provides rigorous conceptual frameworks regarding abstract logic, utilitarianism, and applied ethics. The centrality of these programs in the debate on global governance and algorithmic regulation is an inescapable milestone in the contemporary ecosystem.

Yet, articulating autonomous thought against them requires refusing the role of a theoretical client who simply consumes and reproduces their regulatory control. A critical examination of their scaffolding reveals that the ethical-political horizon is operationalized as a purely procedural ethics and corporate alignment regulations (compliance). By displacing the existential dilemma of technical subsumption onto the purely technical plane of "algorithmic alignment" (AI alignment), this approach functions as an institutional shock absorber. It is designed to mitigate the collateral damage of platform capitalism without obstructing the temporality of capital, domesticating the destructive and anarchic potential of philosophy to transform it into a managerial tool for corporate risk management.

Note 8
Transhumanism and the Neo-Imperial Agenda of the "West"

As an ideological corollary that totalizes the previous operationalizations, the apocalyptic-existential view and the X-Risk paradigm deploy a sophisticated theological mystification of the present. By displacing political urgency toward the phantom of a Superintelligence (AGI) endowed with a malevolent will, Silicon Valley discourse operates a double mystification: it presents existential catastrophe as an inevitable technical destiny, immunizing the immanent dynamic of unlimited capital accumulation from systemic critique.

However, the consequences of this transhumanist model go far beyond algorithmic panic; they constitute the ideological vanguard of an aggressive "occidentalist" and

neo-imperial agenda. Under the promise of a post-human mutation and the biological overcoming of species limits, transhumanism secularizes the old teleology of Western supremacy, assuming that the destiny of global humanity must be dictated by the technical and infrastructural vanguard of transnational corporations.

This neo-imperial and civilizational capture finds its most blatant political expression in the speech delivered by US Secretary of State Marco Rubio at the Pnyx hill in Athens, Greece (on October 7 of this year). Using the ruins of the Parthenon as a mere aesthetic backdrop, Rubio sought to explicitly bind the origins of Western philosophy and Greek democracy with the contemporary imperative of technological, industrial, and military dominance by the Atlantic bloc. His harangue demanded that Europe "waken from its long slumber" to reclaim a spirit of expansion, conquest, and scientific-technical primacy against its geopolitical rivals, exposing the true face of techno-capitalist onto-theology. Here, the appeal to the classical values of *thymos* and Western individuality is devalued into a vulgar pamphlet of geopolitical propaganda and strategic militarism. The model of existential risk and transhumanist acceleration thus shows its true consistency: an ideological device of planetary closure that instrumentalizes the conceptual archive of the West to justify the total subordination of existence to the logistical imperative of global techno-capitalism.

Note 9
The Corporate University, Immaterial Labor, and Continental Insurgencies

From the preceding notes follows the urgent need to construct a question/program on Cybernetics and the University that assumes a double critical task regarding its own material conditions. On one hand, it must interrogate the contemporary division of labor, which leads directly to the question of intellectual, immaterial labor and the regimes of precarization under platform and cognitive capitalism. On the other hand, it must turn that relentless gaze onto the very institution housing it: the university and its ongoing corporatization. The contemporary university (in general, its idea) has ceased to be the space of Bildung to transform into a bureaucratic, hyper-cybernetic corporation focused exclusively on producing flexible human capital and technical patents to serve the global market.

Consequently, the proposal of Cybernetics and the University shifts away from the dominant perspectives that monopolize the automation debate. Against Anglo-American hegemony, this project references certain foundational nodes of the continental tradition. However, these centers must not be romanticized as untainted zones of absolute resistance. Programs such as the postphenomenology and technical mediation of the University of Twente, the radical media theory and critical aesthetics of Goldsmiths College, the archaeological dismantling of technological claims at Paris 8 and the Sorbonne, or the update of critical theory at the Institute for Social Research (IfS) in Frankfurt, are themselves structural components of the European corporate university infrastructure. They function within a continental logic that seeks to carve out its own market niche, frequently weaponizing "criticality" as a branding strategy to compete for funding, talent, and prestige within the global knowledge economy. Furthermore, these institutions are deeply entangled in the broader geopolitical fight

for hegemony, acting as the intellectual vanguard for a European Union that seeks to position its own regulatory and philosophical framework as a third imperial pole against the technical duopoly of the United States and China.

Therefore, these European nodes do not offer a ready-made sanctuary. They are included here strictly as compromised, variable coordinates—provisional, institutional fault lines open to multiple rebellious critical constellations. It is only by recognizing their internal subsumption and strategic limitations that their conceptual archives can be tactically hijacked to sabotage the operational closure of contemporary academia from within.

Note 10
The Plane of Immanence Against the Cybernetic Consummation of Western Education

Faced with the strictly operative, corporate, and adaptive nature of existing university programs, the restitution of the *right to philosophy* is qualified in two indissoluble ways. First, it opens and reclaims the problematic field of the philosophy of technology in all its conceptual complexity. Second, this restitution does not imply closing ranks disciplinarily, nor does it repeat the dogmatic gesture of claiming privileged access to truth. Instead, it understands philosophy as the plane of immanence where the evental forms and singular iterations of thought, art, and literature become visible and thinkable, without any of these practices being reduced to the bureaucratic formats of institutional capture.

This return to the archive convokes thinkers from Aristotle, Descartes, Leibniz, and Kant to Heidegger, Simondon, Stiegler, Derrida, and Yuk Hui. It does not seek to provide an academic veneer to current technical mutations. Rather, it reads the historicity of metaphysics as the very territory that cybernetics has ultimately materialized. In doing so, it reveals that the loose, fluid, and flexible "ontology" of cybernetics represents no rupture with the past. It is the technical and consummated realization of Western education's curricular project—a project already diagnosed by Nietzsche and analyzed by Heidegger: the conversion of education into an apparatus for administering life. Only by fracturing this plane of immanence through an anarchic interruption of subsumption can we open a horizon that escapes machinic monologism and the total management of cognitive capital.

October 2026