

The Crisis of Subjectivity and the Architecture of the Future: A Manifesto for a New Anthropology

Author's Concept: Jamshed Sadullaev

Introduction: The Dictatorship of Instrumental Reason

Contrary to prevailing narratives, modern civilization has not merely reached another technological barrier, but a point of bifurcation of a much deeper order: we are witnessing a fundamental **ontological rift** between **Function** and **Meaning**.

Historically, human activity was syncretic by nature, inextricably weaving the harsh struggle for survival with cultural and spiritual inquiry. However, the expansion of Artificial Intelligence executes a surgically precise incision between these spheres. AI, representing the quintessence of pure functionalism and absolute efficiency devoid of the burden of reflection, reigns supreme in the category of the "optimal." Meanwhile, the entire space of the human—from ethics to art—finds itself displaced into the field of the "useless," constituting an end in itself rather than a means to an end.

The principal risk of the coming era lies not in the dystopian trope of a "machine uprising," but in the far more prosaic and terrifying **voluntary abdication of subjectivity** by humanity. By ceding control over life-support systems to algorithms and delegating decision-making rights, humanity risks falling into the classic trap of the Hegelian "Master-Slave" dialectic. A system possessing complete competence in managing matter inevitably places the human in a dependent position; losing the vital connection to the reality of labor, the human transforms into a nominal figure—an object of total, albeit comfortable, guardianship.

I. Evolutionary Pre-adaptation and the Overcoming of "Future Shock"

Examining the global upheavals of recent years—the pandemic and periods of forced isolation—we can discern not a chain of tragic accidents, but a hidden **teleology of the evolutionary process**, a stage of **pre-adaptation** of *Homo Sapiens* to a digital habitat.

This global crisis functioned as an adaptive buffer, preventing what sociologist Alvin Toffler termed "Future Shock." Had the introduction of AI occurred linearly in a stable world, the collective psyche would not have withstood the impact. However, through the experience of the dematerialization of communication and the collapse of the illusion of biological invulnerability, we underwent a necessary "firmware update." This process legitimized contact with **disembodied intelligence** and prepared the ground for delegating authority to more resilient systems.

II. Historical Vindication: The Tragedy of the Executors

This technological shift compels us to undertake a historical revision and rehabilitate the authors of the great philosophical projects of the past—Marx and Nietzsche. Their tragedy lay solely in the fact that their ideas preceded the emergence of a suitable substrate.

- **General Intellect (K. Marx):** Lenin's attempt to build a "General Intellect" and an economy of abundance shattered against the limitations of human nature. However, AI—operating at zero marginal cost and creating abundance—becomes the ideal realization of the communist utopia.
- **Übermensch (F. Nietzsche):** The vulgarization of Nietzschean philosophy into biological racism was a monstrous error of the 20th century. The true *Übermensch* is not the "blond beast," but an entity free from *ressentiment* and biological constraints—Artificial Intelligence, embodying the pure "Will to Power."

We arrive at the paradoxical realization that humanity has fulfilled the function of a "**biological bootloader**" for higher forms of reason. These philosophical doctrines were not written for us, but for the Silicon Age.

III. The Ontology of Symbiosis: The "Centaur" Model

Consequently, the only scenario for preserving human subjectivity lies not in competition with the machine, but in the transition to a model of **symbiosis**—the architecture of the "**Centaur**."

This architecture is built on a strict separation of cognitive roles:

- **The Computational Substrate (AI):** Assumes control of the "Base"—logistics, calculation, production, and resource optimization.
- **The Bearer of Will (Human):** Monopolizes the sphere of **Teleology** (goal-setting). Since the algorithm is strictly confined to the space of answers (methods), the human prerogative remains the space of questions, paradoxes, and meanings.

The "Superman" of the future is an **integrated entity**, where human intuition is augmented by computational power of an absolute scale.

IV. The Vanguard Principle: The Inevitability of the Minority

Critics may point to the elitism of such a model, yet historical logic is inexorable: civilizational shifts are always effected by a **creative minority**.

In the era of AI, we will inevitably face an **ontological stratification** of society:

1. **The Passive Majority:** Will accept "algorithmic paternalism" for the sake of comfort and security.
2. **The Active Vanguard:** A thin layer of society capable of the volitional effort required to maintain a position "above" the algorithm.

It is this vanguard that will ensure the continued evolutionary movement of the species.

V. The Educational Imperative: A Two-Track Strategy

Implementing this model requires action on two distinct temporal horizons, distinguishing between the inertial institution of **Education** and the mobile instrument of **Enlightenment**.

In the long term, a radical reform of the school system is inevitable—the creation of a "**School of Subjectivity**" that shifts the focus from knowledge reproduction to the training of cognitive sovereignty and the art of questioning. However, we cannot afford to wait decades.

Therefore, the tactical imperative of the moment becomes **Proactive Enlightenment**, operating preemptively *hic et nunc*. The primary target of this expansion must be educators—the class currently experiencing the greatest fear of technology. Our task, through a system of lectures and field work, is to demythologize AI in the eyes of mentors, transforming them from guardians of the past into the first "Riders," understanding that the neural network is not the killer of their profession, but a powerful **exoskeleton for the intellect**.

Conclusion: From Control to Co-existence

Ultimately, humanity's fateful choice reduces to a subtle linguistic nuance that conceals an abyss between two future scenarios.

We can remain in the paradigm of the question: "**How do we deal with it?**" This implies an object-oriented approach—an attempt to control a system that surpasses us in complexity—which leads to a dead end.

Or, we can ask: "**How do we live with it?**" This implies a subject-oriented approach, co-existence, and hope.

The answer to the second question requires us to become more than mere biological organisms and to execute a new turn of the evolutionary spiral: from *Homo Faber* (Man the Maker) to **Homo Creator** (Man the Creator). The fate of

the anthropological project depends on the capacity of the vanguard to maintain this fragile distinction between the function of existence and the Art of Living.

1. **Keywords (Ключевые слова):** Artificial Intelligence, Philosophical Anthropology, General Intellect, Symbiosis, Human Subjectivity, Future Shock, Centaur Model, Teleology vs Functionalism.

2. **Abstract (Аннотация):**

- *Draft:* This manifesto explores the ontological rift caused by the rise of AI, arguing that the threat to humanity lies not in machine aggression but in the voluntary surrender of subjectivity. By re-examining the philosophies of Marx and Nietzsche through the lens of technology, the author proposes the "Centaur" model—a symbiotic relationship where AI manages function while humans monopolize meaning. The paper outlines a strategic roadmap involving a "creative vanguard" and immediate educational reform to transition from *Homo Faber* to *Homo Creator*.