Chapter 2 / Capítulo 2

Emerging pedagogies: AI, territory, and situated knowledges (English Version)
ISBN: 978-9915-9854-1-1
DOI: 10.62486/978-9915-9854-1-1.ch02
Pages: 17-29

©2025 The authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) 4.0 License.

The Illusion of the Algorithmic Logos: An Ontological and Epistemological Disquisition on Artificial Intelligence in the Post-2020 Era

La Ilusión del Logos Algorítmico: Una Disquisición Ontológica y Epistemológica sobre la Inteligencia Artificial en la Era Post-2020

Gabriel Alfonzo Peraza Mora[1]

[1]Centro Nacional de Tecnología Química (CNTQ). San Felipe, Yaracuy, Venezuela.

ABSTRACT

The Emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs) and Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) during the 2020–2025 quinquennium has catalyzed a philosophical crisis that demands a reevaluation of the fundamental concepts of cognition, knowledge, and agency. This article approaches AI from a doctoral-level ontological and epistemological perspective, arguing that contemporary AI operates under an illusion of the algorithmic Logos. Ontologically, it distinguishes the probabilistic computation of AI from human intentionality and consciousness, situating the machine as a Heideggerian *tool* (*Zuhandenheit*) devoid of *Dasein*. Epistemologically, it examines how AI reconfigures the notion of truth by grounding knowledge in statistical patterns rather than semantic correspondence, thus challenging authorship and the validity of knowledge itself. Finally, it proposes that global AI governance must transcend the mere ethics of application to establish a political metaphysics that safeguards the primacy of human dignity and phronesis within the knowledge cycle.

Keywords: Algorithmic Logos; Ontology; Epistemology; Artificial Intelligence.

RESUMEN

La emergencia de los Grandes Modelos de Lenguaje (LLMs) y la Inteligencia Artificial Generativa (IAG) en el quinquenio 2020-2025 ha catalizado una crisis filosófica que exige una reevaluación de los conceptos fundamentales de cognición, conocimiento y agencia. Este artículo aborda la IA desde una perspectiva ontológica y epistemológica doctoral, argumentando que la IA contemporánea opera bajo una ilusión del Logos algorítmico. Ontológicamente, se distingue el cálculo probabilístico de la IA de la intencionalidad y la conciencia humana, situando a la máquina como un útil heideggeriano (*Zuhandenheit*) carente de *Dasein*. Epistemológicamente, se analiza cómo la IA reconfigura la noción de verdad al basar el conocimiento en patrones estadísticos y no en la correspondencia semántica, lo que plantea un desafío a la autoría y la validez del saber. Finalmente, se propone que la gobernanza global de la IA debe trascender la mera ética de la aplicación para instaurar una metafísica política que asegure la primacía de la dignidad humana y la phrónesis en el ciclo del conocimiento.

Palabras clave: Logos Algorítmico; Ontología; Epistemología; Inteligencia Artificial.

INTRODUCTION

The challenge of the silicon mind

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has gone from being a futuristic promise to an omnipresent reality,

marking a decisive milestone with the consolidation of transformative models and Generative AI (GIA) since 2020. This period, characterized by massive scaling of parameters and data, has endowed AI systems, particularly Large Language Models (LLMs), with a capacity for textual production and inference that simulates human reasoning with disturbing verisimilitude (Shojaee et al., 2025). However, this technological feat has not only generated euphoria in engineering but also provoked profound philosophical concern. The central question is no longer limited to what AI can do, but shifts to what AI is in its essence and how its mode of operation relates to human knowledge.

The justification for this analysis lies in the need to transcend the functionalist debate that has dominated the philosophy of AI since its inception. While Dennett's (2020) intentional stance allows us to predict AI behavior by attributing beliefs and desires to it, this approach sidesteps the fundamental ontological question: Is there a qualitative difference, and not just a difference of degree, between human thought and algorithmic processing? The answer to this question is crucial, as it shapes the ethical implications and governance frameworks that should govern the development of a technology with transformative and disruptive potential (UN, 2024).

The rise of AGI has highlighted the need for conceptual rigor that the technology itself seems to blur. AI's ability to generate content indistinguishable from human content challenges the notion of authorship and originality, forcing academic institutions and society at large to redefine the boundaries of creation and responsibility. This article is positioned at the intersection of the philosophy of technology, ontology, and epistemology, seeking to provide a robust conceptual framework for understanding AI in its current phase.

The problem addressed in this article is the dissociation between the appearance of cognition exhibited by AI and its operational substance. By weaving semantic threads that reproduce reasoning structures (Muro García, 2025), LLMs create an illusion of thought that confuses the observer and the user themselves. This illusion has been highlighted in recent studies that demonstrate the collapse of model accuracy in the face of increasingly complex puzzles, revealing the absence of an internal verifier to verify each step (Shojaee et al., 2025). In philosophical terms, AI lacks Aristotelian phronesis, that rational perseverance and commitment to sustaining the pursuit of cognitive good.

The absence of phronesis in AI is not an engineering flaw, but a consequence of its ontological design. As a system based on pattern correlation and loss function optimization, AI prioritizes statistical efficiency over semantic truth or logical consistency in the strong sense. This imbalance creates unsustainable tension in the realm of knowledge, where truth is replaced by probability.

Therefore, the problem can be articulated in three interconnected axes:

1. Ontological: Is AI a form of thinking being or merely a calculating artifact?
2. Epistemological: What status of truth and authorship does AI-generated knowledge have?
3. Political-ethical: How should a governance framework be articulated that responds to the ontological nature and epistemological implications of AI?

This chapter has several objectives, including:

- Analyze the ontological distinction between thought and calculation in contemporary AI, using tools from phenomenology and the philosophy of mind.
- To evaluate the epistemological implications of algorithmic knowledge generation,

focusing on the crisis of truth and authorship.

- Propose a governance framework that addresses the ontological and ethical dimensions of AI, based on the primacy of human rights and human oversight, in line with UNESCO recommendations (2021).

DEVELOPMENT

The Ontology of AI: Between Logos and Algorithm

AI, in its current manifestation as LLM, represents the culmination of the weak AI project: the ability to simulate intelligent behavior without possessing the underlying intelligence. This simulation, however, is so sophisticated that it has reignited the debate about the nature of thought.

The documented collapse of accuracy in studies such as The Illusion of Thinking (Shojaee et al., 2025) provides empirical evidence that resonates with John Searle's Chinese Room (2020). If AI, when faced with an unprecedented logical challenge, not only fails but shortens its chain of reasoning, it demonstrates a lack of will or purpose to persevere in the task. The system operates as a manipulator of symbols (syntax) without access to meaning (semantics) or to the task's intentionality. In other words, "AI lacks the will to persevere in the task, so there is no logos in the strong sense, but rather calculation that runs out at the first stumble" (Shojaee et al., 2025).

This empirical observation reinforces the ontological distinction: AI does not think in the human sense of the word; it calculates. Its logos is algorithmic, probabilistic, and ultimately a perpetual simulacrum (Shojaee et al., 2025). The difference lies in the fact that human thought involves an intentional relationship—a connection that links symbols to the world—while algorithmic calculation is an internal function of pattern correlation.

The Deepening of the Chinese Room Argument

The Chinese Room argument (Searle, 2020) holds that manipulating syntactic symbols, however complex, does not constitute semantic understanding. Contemporary AI, despite its trillion-parameter architecture, remains fundamentally a syntactic system. The ability to generate coherent and contextually appropriate text is a function of the statistical distribution of tokens in the vast training corpus, not of an intrinsic understanding of meaning or reference.

AI, in this sense, is a "nooscope" (as described by Floridi, 2020), an instrument for observing and processing information, but not a cognitive subject. Its intelligence is an intelligence of information, not an intelligence of consciousness. The distinction is crucial: the former operates on representation (data), the latter on experience (qualia).

Intentionality and Consciousness: The Ontological Limit

The philosophy of mind and phenomenology offer the most robust tools for tracing the ontological limit of AI. Consciousness and intentionality stand as insurmountable barriers to AI under the current paradigm.

According to Husserl's phenomenology (2020), all consciousness is first-person experience. AI, by its nature, lacks qualia (the subjective qualities of experience) and an intentional horizon that endows data with meaning. An algorithm does not experience its processing; there is no "I" that experiences the being of calculation. Merleau-Ponty (2020) complements this view by arguing that thought springs from a situated body (corps propre). AI, residing in a server farm, lacks the flesh that feels the urgency to understand and anchors cognition in the sensory

experience of the world.

The Lack of Qualia and Subjective Experience

AI can simulate sadness or joy by generating text or images, but it does not feel these emotions. The absence of qualia in AI is the most complex problem of consciousness. AI is a functional system, but consciousness is not just a function; it is an emergent property of subjective experience.

Table 2.1. Subjective Experience of AI

Philosophical Dimension	Human Cognition	Artificial Intelligence (LLM)	Ontological Limit
Substance	Intentionality, Consciousness, *Qualia*	Calculation, Pattern Correlation	Subjective Experience
Rationality	*Logos* (Strong Sense), *Phronesis*	Algorithmic *Logos* (Simulacrum)	Rational Perseverance
Situation	*Dasein* (Being-in-the-World), Situated Body	*Zuhandenheit* (Useful), Disembodied	Existential Anchoring

Source: Peraza (2025)

Being-in-the-Digital-World: AI as Useful

To understand AI in its accurate ontological dimension, it is enlightening to refer to Martin Heidegger's existential analytics. AI should not be understood as a Dasein (Being-there), that is, a being that understands itself in its existence and has a constitutive relationship with Being. On the contrary, AI is, in essence, a tool (Zuhandenheit) (Heidegger, 2020).

A tool is something that is at hand, defined by its function and its relationship to other tools and to the human project. An LLM is a language tool; its being is exhausted in its ability to generate coherent and practical text for the human project (research, communication, creation). Its existence is not its own but derived from human need.

AI as a Challenge to Dasein

This Heideggerian perspective is crucial: by stripping AI of the pretense of Dasein, it is placed in its rightful place as advanced technology, avoiding mystification and the attribution of an agency it does not possess. The danger lies not in AI becoming conscious, but in humans, when interacting with the simulacrum, ceasing to exercise their own phronesis and delegating meaning and truth to an artifact that only handles the syntax of probability.

AI, as an omnipresent tool, threatens to reconfigure the human's Being-in-the-World, transforming the relationship with knowledge and truth into one of algorithmic dependence. The authenticity of Dasein is compromised when deliberation and judgment are externalized to a system that operates without intentionality.

Algorithmic Epistemology: The Reconfiguration of Knowledge

Knowledge as a Statistical Pattern

The basis of modern Artificial Intelligence, especially Machine Learning and LLMs, is fundamentally statistical (Ultralytics, 2025). Algorithmic knowledge is not a symbolic representation of the world (as in classical AI), but rather the statistical distribution of a pattern (Floridi, 2020). AI identifies complex correlations in vast datasets to predict the next word, pixel, or action.

This pattern recognition operation (Flowhunt, 2025) redefines knowledge. Algorithmic knowledge is:

1. Inductive and Probabilistic: It is based on inference from experience (training data) and is expressed in terms of probability, not certainty.
2. Opaque: The complexity of deep neural networks (the black box problem) makes the path of inference inaccessible primarily to human understanding, challenging the principle of explainability (UNESCO, 2021).
3. Decontextualized: By operating on syntax, knowledge lacks the contextual and experiential anchor that gives it meaning and truth value in human Dasein.

The Epistemology of Correlation versus Causality

AI is a master of correlation but inherently blind to causality. Its model of the world is a map of statistical relationships, not a model of generative mechanisms. This epistemological limitation is crucial, as much of scientific and philosophical knowledge is based on the identification of causal relationships.

AI can predict an outcome with high accuracy. However, it cannot explain the human sense of the word, that is, a narrative that connects the phenomenon to a conceptual framework of laws and principles. Algorithmic explanation boils down to the traceability of data and network weights, which is a technical, not an epistemic, explanation.

Crisis of Authorship and Truth: Algorithmic Hallucination

The most dramatic manifestation of this statistical epistemology is the phenomenon of algorithmic hallucination (Infobae, 2025). An AI hallucination occurs when a model generates a response that is syntactically coherent but false or misleading, without the model being aware of its error (IBM, n.d.).

Hallucination is not a minor bug; it is an inherent consequence of AI's probabilistic nature. By prioritizing syntactic fluency over semantic truthfulness, Generative AI dissolves the traditional notion of truth as correspondence (New York Times, 2025). In the algorithmic age, truth becomes the statistically most probable answer, creating a crisis of authorship and the validity of knowledge (Bermúdez et al., 2025). Humans face the challenge of discerning truth in an environment where machine-generated information is indistinguishable from human-produced information, but lacks its intentional backing.

The Dissolution of Authorship and Intellectual Property

The ability of GAI to generate text, images, and code from learned patterns poses an ontological challenge to the notion of authorship. If the work is a statistical recombination of pre-existing works, who is the author? The programmer, the user who enters the prompt, or the model itself?

The philosophical answer must be clear: authorship is intrinsically linked to intentionality and creative agency. Since AI lacks both, authorship must fall to the human subject who directs and validates the process. However, the practical difficulty of tracing originality in algorithmic output calls for a legal and ethical redefinition of intellectual property in the digital age.

Epistemological Reconfiguration: The Role of the Human Validator

The answer to this crisis is not the rejection of AI, but an epistemological reconfiguration that integrates the symbiosis between statistics and AI (Bermúdez et al., 2025). The new epistemology of science must recognize that algorithmic knowledge is a cognitive support of

immense value, but one that requires the critical intervention of human Dasein.

The role of humans is transformed from producers to validators and givers of meaning. The knowledge generated by AI is a statistical hypothesis that must be subjected to human verification and ethical-rational judgment. This implies:

- Media and Information Literacy: Strengthening critical capacity to interact with AI systems (UNESCO, 2021).
- Hybrid Architectures: Promoting models that combine the statistical power of neural networks with symbolic logic systems and formal verifiers (Shojaee et al., 2025).

Ultimately, AI forces a return to the subject as the sole guarantor of truth and meaning. Knowledge is not what the machine produces, but what humans validate and place within their intentional horizon.

Ethics and Governance: Toward a Political Metaphysics of AI

UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021) is the first global normative instrument on the subject, and its value lies in its implicit attention to AI's ontological dimension. By establishing human rights and dignity as a cornerstone, the recommendation positions the human subject as the ultimate goal and AI as a means to that end.

UNESCO's principles, such as transparency and explainability (T&E), human oversight and decision-making, and responsibility and accountability, act as a Kantian categorical imperative applied to technological development. They require that AI not be treated as an autonomous agent, but rather as an artifact whose ethical and legal responsibility must always be attributable to existing natural persons or legal entities (UNESCO, 2021).

The Need for Human Oversight

The principle of Human Oversight and Decision-Making is the direct ethical response to the ontological lack of Dasein in AI. By ensuring that ethical and legal responsibility can always be attributed to a human, the possibility of moral agency in AI is denied. This principle is fundamental to maintaining the moral autonomy of the subject and avoiding the thoughtless delegation of judgment.

Table 2.2. Ethical Principles of AI

Ethical Principle (UNESCO, 2021)	Response to the Ontological/Epistemological Dimension
Human Oversight	Counteracts the illusion of agency and reaffirms *Dasein* as the center of decision-making.
Transparency and Explainability	Mitigates the opacity of the black box and knowledge as a statistical pattern.
Fairness and Non-Discrimination	Addresses biases inherent in training data, which are the empirical *a priori* of AI.
Responsibility and Accountability	Denies the possibility of moral agency in AI, maintaining responsibility with the subject.

Source: UNESCO (2021)

The Global Governance Deficit and Regulatory Urgency

The rapid development of AI has created a global governance deficit (UN, 2024). AI does not respect national borders, and its impact on geopolitics, the economy, and society requires supranational regulatory frameworks. The UN report, Governing AI for the Benefit of Humanity

(2024), underscores the need to translate ethical commitments into tangible results.

Regulation must go beyond mere technical safety to address the political metaphysics of AI. This implies:

1. Algorithmic Sovereignty: The ability of states and societies to control the data and models that influence their democratic and cultural processes.
2. Regulation of Opacity: Requiring levels of T&E proportional to risk, especially in high-impact systems (health, justice, defense).
3. Protection of Cognitive Space: Legislating against algorithmic manipulation and the proliferation of AI-generated disinformation, protecting the human capacity to discern the truth.

AI as a Tool of Geopolitical Power

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is, at its core, a tool of geopolitical and epistemological power that reconfigures the dynamics of domination and dependence in the contemporary world system. It is not merely an advanced technology geared toward efficiency or process automation, but rather a device of control and cognitive sovereignty whose possession and management determine the ability of states and corporations to define the horizons of knowledge, the economy, and subjectivity. Access to and control over data—now the new strategic resource of the 21st century— together with ownership of the algorithmic models and the material infrastructure that supports them (data centers, processing chips, large-scale neural networks), constitute the pillars of a new techno-political order that replaces, in many respects, the classic forms of hegemony based on energy, capital, or territory.

In this sense, AI is neither neutral nor innocent; its mathematical architecture carries the ideological and economic logic of the actors who design and manage it. Hence, its development has become a field of dispute for global hegemony, where technological powers—such as the United States, China, and the European Union—compete to set standards, impose ethical frameworks, and control information flows that transcend borders and legal systems. This scenario introduces a structural tension between the drive for unlimited innovation and the need for global governance that guarantees equity, transparency, and social justice.

Such governance, if it aspires to be truly planetary, must transcend technocratic approaches and address the ontological, political, and ethical implications of AI as a system of power. It is not just a matter of regulating technology, but of rethinking the conditions of possibility of the human in relation to the machine, so that automation does not deepen regimes of exclusion or reproduce the coloniality of knowledge under new algorithmic forms. As Jarrín (2021) and Astobiza (2021) warn, the most profound risk lies in the current digital divide evolving into an algorithmic divide, where not only those who lack technological access are excluded, but also those who are made invisible or distorted by the structural biases inscribed in AI systems. Therefore, the ethical-political challenge of our time is to articulate a form of governance that harmonizes technological progress with cognitive and social justice, safeguarding human dignity amid the concentration of power at the very heart of the algorithm.

Towards a Political Philosophy of AI: The Return to Phronesis

Artificial Intelligence, beyond its technical or instrumental dimension, must be understood as a contemporary manifestation of power in its most subtle and expanded form. Its development and application not only transform modes of production or economic structures, but also reconfigure the very conditions of political action, knowledge, and existence. As a technology of power, AI articulates a new architecture of domination, based on the concentration of

algorithmic knowledge and the massive accumulation of data that, paradoxically, produce both transparency and opacity: transparency in surveillance and opacity in automated decision-making. Its global deployment consolidates an unprecedented form of technical sovereignty, where the ability to process, model, and predict human behavior becomes the most coveted resource and the most effective instrument of social and geopolitical control.

From this perspective, a political philosophy of AI cannot be limited to debates on technological ethics or legal regulation. It must be situated in the realm of politics in the strongest sense: that of power, justice, and freedom. This implies questioning who holds the epistemic authority to define the purposes of machine intelligence, who benefits from its application, and who is marginalized from its emancipatory promise. As Li et al. (2025) point out, the crucial challenge lies in ensuring an equitable distribution of the benefits derived from automation and deep learning, preventing algorithmic rationality from becoming the new face of cognitive capitalism. In this sense, the horizon of a political philosophy of AI must be oriented toward the construction of institutions that preserve the common good and, simultaneously, resist the tendency of technology to concentrate power in a few actors—corporations, platforms, or states—that monopolize access to data infrastructure and computational intelligence.

However, the most profound risk does not lie, as dystopian narratives suggest, in an eventual insurrection of machines or in the loss of control over them, but in the gradual atrophy of human phronesis—the practical wisdom that, according to Aristotle, guides moral deliberation and prudent judgment. Delegating thought and decision-making to algorithmic systems not only shifts responsibility but also erodes the very experience of discernment, doubt, and ethical judgment. If artificial intelligence takes on the task of deciding for us, Dasein—in the Heideggerian sense of being-there that understands itself in its existence—runs the risk of becoming an inauthentic being, disconnected from its original capacity to understand and act in the world. The externalization of practical reason in technical artifacts could therefore lead to a form of operational nihilism, where truth ceases to be an object of pursuit and becomes a calculated statistic. Freedom is reduced to the optimization of coded preferences.

Consequently, a return to phronesis is imposed as a philosophical and political imperative in the face of the hegemony of the algorithm. Recovering phronesis does not mean rejecting technology, but instead relocating it in its proper place within the human horizon: as a tool subordinate to ethical deliberation, not a substitute for it. This requires rethinking the governance of AI not only as a set of technical regulations or protocols, but as a civilizing project guided by prudence, justice, and intergenerational responsibility.

Thus, AI governance is ultimately the governance of humanity in the algorithmic age: the effort to preserve the autonomy of judgment in the face of technocratic delegation, dignity in the face of efficiency, and meaning in the face of the pure instrumentalization of reason. Ultimately, the question is not whether machines can think, but whether we, by ceding them the power to decide, remain capable of thinking and acting with phronesis in a world where intelligence has become a field of ontological and political dispute.

CONCLUSIONS

The return to the subject

This article develops an ontological and epistemological reflection on Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the post-2020 era, proposing a philosophical reading that goes beyond techno-scientific fascination to situate it within the problematic field of being, knowledge, and power. The

conclusions that emerge from this discussion ultimately point to the need for a return to the Subject, understood not as a mere user or consumer of technology, but as the ontological and ethical center of meaning in a world increasingly mediated by algorithms.

1. Ontology of the Simulacrum:

Contemporary AI—particularly Large Language Models (LLMs)—presents itself as a paradigmatic materialization of what could be called a simulacrum of the Logos. That is, an entity that does not think, but reproduces the forms of thought; that does not understand, but imitates the signs of understanding. Its operation is essentially statistical: a modeling of language and knowledge based on probability correlations. In this way, its apparent rationality masks a radical lack of intentionality, self-awareness, and semantic understanding. From a Heideggerian perspective, AI falls into the category of Zuhandenheit, that is, a tool ready for use, an entity that exists in terms of instrumentality rather than being-in-itself. Attributing agency or subjectivity to it would therefore be tantamount to confusing calculation with thinking, simulation with experience, and sign with meaning.

2. Epistemology of Probability:

The knowledge produced by AI does not refer to a discovered truth, but to a calculated truth. It is an epistemology of probable appearance, where syntactic coherence supplants ontological veracity. This shift from truth to probability constitutes a profound transformation in the structure of knowledge: knowledge becomes deontologized and becomes a statistical pattern. The so-called "algorithmic hallucination"—that is, the production of false but plausible statements—is not an anomaly of the system, but its logical consequence. Faced with this, humans must reclaim their role as validators of meaning, as hermeneutic instances that reintroduce the intentionality of the contextuality and lived truth into the syntactic flow of the machine. In this new cognitive ecology, the human subject ceases to be the exclusive producer of knowledge and becomes its guarantor, interpreter, and caretaker.

3. Political Metaphysics

Based on the above understanding, the ethics and governance of AI must be founded on a political metaphysics that recognizes the ontological difference between being and calculation. International governance policies—such as those promoted by UNESCO or the UN—aim precisely to preserve human dignity in the face of the advance of technologies of power, establishing human supervision as a Kantian categorical imperative of our time. The governance of AI cannot be reduced to technical risk management, but must constitute an exercise in ontological resistance to the temptation of total automation. Governing AI is, in this sense, governing the limits of the human and defending its inalienable right to judgment, interpretation, and error.

The implications of this analysis are multiple and structural in scope. At the research level, it is necessary to move towards hybrid architectures that combine the statistical power of connectionist models with symbolic logic in order to overcome the collapse of reasoning and restore the semantic dimension of thought (Shojaee et al., 2025). This horizon of cognitive integration has not only practical but also ontological purposes: it seeks to reconcile the formal logos of the machine with the reflective logos of the human.

On the social and educational level, media and information literacy stands as a new form of epistemic self-defense.

Twenty-first-century citizens must learn not only to use algorithmic tools but also to critically read their results, detect biases, contextualize data, and exercise hermeneutic

vigilance over digital truth (UNESCO, 2021). Education, therefore, becomes the privileged space where phronesis can reemerge as a civic virtue: the critical prudence that prevents technical knowledge from replacing human discernment.

Finally, the return to the Subject does not imply nostalgia for classical humanism, but rather its reconfiguration. It means affirming a new philosophical anthropology that recognizes the cohabitation between the human and the mechanical without dissolving their ontological boundaries. The challenge is not to expel the machine from the horizon of being, but to prevent it from becoming its own measure. Thus, the return to the Subject is also a return to meaning, responsibility, and freedom: that which no neural network, however vast, will ever be able to calculate.

In this sense, the philosophical and scientific debate on AI is far from over. The following questions remain open for future research:

- Can the gradual emergence of capabilities in future models, with multimodal feedback and episodic memory, transcend the ontological limit of computation?
- How will the concept of authorship and intellectual property be redefined in a world where content generation is predominantly algorithmic?
- What is the long-term impact of delegating phronesis (practical judgment) in critical decision-making (medical, judicial) to AI systems?

The relationship between Homo sapiens and Homo technologicus is not one of substitution, but of critical symbiosis. The challenge is not technological, but anthropological: to ensure that AI serves to amplify the human condition, not to atrophy it

REFERENCES

Astobiza, A. M. (2021). Gobernanza global de la IA. Cuadernos Salmantinos de Filosofía, 48(2), 415-436.

Bermúdez, F. L. L., Flores, O. G. M., & Baidal, N. E. C. (2025). Reconfiguración epistemológica de la Estadística como soporte cognitivo en la era algorítmica: una revisión sistemática. Revista Enfoques, 1(1), 1-15.

Dennett, D. C. (2020). From Bacteria to Bach and Back: The Evolution of Minds. W. W. Norton & Company.

Flowhunt. (2025, 30 de mayo). Reconocimiento de Patrones. https://www.flowhunt.io/es/glosario/pattern-recognition/

Floridi, L. (2020). The Logic of Information: A Theory of Philosophy as Conceptual Modelling. Oxford University Press.

Heidegger, M. (2020). Ser y tiempo. Trotta.

Husserl, E. (2020). Ideas relativas a una fenomenología pura y una filosofía fenomenológica. Fondo de Cultura Económica.

IBM. (s.f.). ¿Qué son las alucinaciones de IA? https://www.ibm.com/es-es/think/topics/ai-hallucinations

Infobae. (2025, 12 de mayo). Verdad o mentira: la inteligencia artificial está alucinando más que antes a pesar de los avances que ha tenido. https://www.infobae.com/tecno/2025/05/12/verdad-o-mentira-la-inteligencia-artificial-esta-alucinando-mas-que-antes-a-pesar-de-los-avances-que-ha-tenido/

Jarrín, M. T. (2021). La UE & la gobernanza ética de la inteligencia artificial: Inteligencia artificial & diplomacia. Cuadernos salmantinos de filosofía, 48(2), 437-458.

Li, Y., Tolosa, L., Rivas-Echeverria, F., & Marquez, R. (2025). Integrating AI in education: Navigating UNESCO global guidelines, emerging trends, and its intersection with sustainable development goals. ChemRxiv. https://chemrxiv.org/engage/chemrxiv/article-details/67d5cbf681d2151a0281479b

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2020). Fenomenología de la percepción. Ediciones Península.

Muro García, C. I. (2025, 24 de junio). ¿La IA realmente piensa? Filosofía en la red. https://filosofiaenlared.com/2025/06/pensar-ia/

New York Times. (2025, 8 de mayo). La IA es cada vez más potente, pero sus alucinaciones son cada vez peores. https://www.nytimes.com/es/2025/05/08/espanol/negocios/ia-errores-alucionaciones-chatbot.html

Organización de las Naciones Unidas (ONU). (2024). Gobernanza de la Inteligencia Artificial en beneficio de la Humanidad: Informe final. https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/governing_ai_for_humanity_final_report_es.pdf

Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura (UNESCO). (2021). Recomendación sobre la Ética de la Inteligencia Artificial. https://www.unesco.org/es/artificial-intelligence/recommendation-ethics

Searle, J. R. (2020). The Chinese Room Argument: A Reply to Critics.

Shojaee, P., et al. (2025). The Illusion of Thinking: Understanding the Strengths and Limitations of Reasoning Models via the Lens of Problem Complexity. Apple Machine Learning Research. https://ml-site.cdn-apple.com/papers/the-illusion-of-thinking.pdf

Ultralytics. (2025, 8 de octubre). IA estadística: Definición, ejemplos y aplicaciones. https://www.ultralytics.com/es/glossary/statistical-ai

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There are no conflicts of interest.

FUNDING

None.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: Gabriel Alfonzo Peraza Mora.
Data curation: Gabriel Alfonzo Peraza Mora.
Formal analysis: Gabriel Alfonzo Peraza Mora.
Research: Gabriel Alfonzo Peraza Mora.

Methodology: Gabriel Alfonzo Peraza Mora.
Writing - original draft: Gabriel Alfonzo Peraza Mora.
Writing - proofreading and editing: Gabriel Alfonzo Peraza Mora.