



Netopraxis: A hermeneutics of digital language

La Netopraxis: Una hermenéutica del lenguaje digital

Jaime José Salcedo Díaz

Master in Education and PhD candidate in Philosophy Universidad Pontificia Bolivariana,
Corporación Universitaria Minuto de Dios UNIMINUTO Colombia.
Jaime.salcedod@uniminuto.edu.co
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3056-7222>

ABSTRACT

The research conducted addresses the concept of Netopraxis as a hermeneutics of language that seeks to understand, in the phenomenon of the digital, a particular and singular praxis called Net. The Netopraxis not only belongs to the field of a practical philosophy, but also to that of ontology, since it unveils an existential structure through digital language, which, as a clarifying action, un.masks apparent problems and helps to solve real problems in the digital framework. Netopraxis is a functional unit of digitalization, which represents a linguistic act of human praxis and builds a dialogical and relational action between human action and digital action that occurs in the update.

RESUMEN

La investigación realizada abordo el concepto de la Netopraxis como una hermenéutica del lenguaje que pretende comprender, en el fenómeno de lo digital, una praxis particular y singular llamada Net. La Netopraxis no sólo pertenece al ámbito de una filosofía práctica,

sino también al de la ontología, ya que devela una estructura existencial a través del lenguaje digital, que, como acción clarificadora, desenmascara problemas aparentes y ayuda a resolver problemas reales en el marco digital. La Netopraxis es una unidad funcional de la digitalización, que representa un acto lingüístico de la praxis humana y que construye una acción dialógica y relacional entre la acción humana y la acción digital que se da en la actualización.

Keywords/ Palabras clave

Net praxis, ontology, language, technology

Neto praxis, ontología, lenguaje, tecnología

Introduction

Netopraxis is not a genealogy of the ubiquity of the informative process of the digital, nor is it an analytic of codified data; it is a way of understanding the *modus vivendi* of the digital being that is made and perfected in that relational *praxis*, whose linguistic exchange opens a dimension of possibility that, as Jean Grondin (2002, p. 12) says, "constitutes the practice of life itself". Since the experiential is implied in this form of understanding, *Netopraxis* as hermeneutics focuses on the *event*, not as historical data, but as active action, not of the event but of language, that is, of the *verstehen* (understanding) of the linguistic event that occurs in the experiential exchange of the *Net*.

To understand the linguistic *event* that intuitively rests in *Netopraxis* is to delve into the subjective interrelations that arise in the digital present, and which in turn elaborates forms of existential consensus that from the perspective of practical philosophy legitimize meaningful modes of thought and action that are transmitted and communicated through the screen. The task of *Netopraxis* as hermeneutics of language is to reflect on the practical conditions that occur in the linguistic event of the *Net*, to find its knowledge, conceptualize it, understand it, interpret it and translate it into life; only in this way, the digital existence (ontology) of the *Net* will not be "strange", rather, it is incorporated to be hermeneutically signified and understood, as Gadamer (1992) says "in it (*hermeneutics*), the strange becomes its own" (p. 363).

The linguistic *event* expressed in the *Net*, implies the understanding, not only of the structures of access that people have to the digital world through the empowerment they have based on information and communication technology, but also of the process of construction of meaning governed by structures, whose intersection elements occur through a series of practices, be it reproduction, consumption, production, experiences, knowledge and power (Castell, 2011, p. 27). These practices are called *nodes*, which are in permanent function of the *Net*, and make possible the unity of a particular type of thought, which from the hermeneutic perspective presents a totality of elements, where the whole comprises the particular and the particular comprises the whole, that is, the *node* as a practice will never be the unity, the unity of meaning is in the *Net* (for being *praxis*), the *node* is simply the possibility of intersection, understanding intersection as that point that builds a path of existential interconnection through lived practices.

This movement of understanding that takes place between the *Net* and its *nodes*, shows an ontologically positive sense, since independently that it refers from the whole to the part, and from the part to the whole, what is latent is an elaboration of the being that permanently discovers and redefines new senses of existence, what we call *actualization*, which redesigns ways of being and knowing in the world, inquiring for that effective phenomenon that intuitively perfects that digital being, and whose path of understanding is in the linguistic nature of these nodal practices. The practice itself already contains a communicative act, a language, a logos that carries a sense of philosophical-living understanding and that constitutes a starting point, as Hans George Gadamer (1992) said "there is a path to which philosophy points more and more clearly and that testifies to this correspondence. The path is language" (p. 76).

The *Net* has its own language that reveals an aesthetic, ethical and political rationality in the digital world and which is accessed through the analysis of cultural experiences that argue a series of logical modes of thought and action. Language is inserted in the effectuality of the digital worldliness, it is not a language that speaks about technical terminologies of the artifact, but the language of facts; and as the world is fact, language speaks of everything that happens, and happens, no longer in the factuality of the experiential world, but in the virtual world (Wittgenstein, 1975, p. 35). This language corresponds to the fact, to the digital *doing* that increasingly shapes human life.

Therefore, to discover this language is to delve into the *factum* of *digitalization*.

But what is it that happens there so that we can refer to a specific language? What is the importance of the language of the nodal practice that accompanies the objectives of the *Net*? If we manage to understand the type of digital practice and its *raison d'être*, then we will be faced with the demonstration of a particular language that will detail its system of understanding and validity.

The *Net* as a universal practice is possible through nodal practices. The word *node* comes from the Latin *nudus* (Collazos, 2001), and refers to a kind of starting point that joins with other starting points. Here the starting points are experiences of action, which are possible when other actions are present. It is not a single nodal action, but many nodal actions that integrate a systemic structure that is understood not in a fragmentary or differential way, but as a unit that has an existential function as *modus vivendi*. That is why the *Net* is a set of interconnected nodes; all these nodal actions give rise to a particular practice as the *Net*, and this practice in its social structure forms a kind of "device" in the Foucaultian perspective, which is constituted as a heterogeneous set of elements, involving discourses, statements, architectures, practices, and institutions. But this heterogeneity is concentrated in only one thing: the "dispositif" and this, according to Giorgio Agamben (2016), "is the network that is established between these elements" (p. 9).

As the *Net* is a device composed of a heterogeneous set of nodal practices, it means that it is not only a practice, but that this practice keeps a discourse, a knowledge, a language that needs to be understood. Its technique reveals a strategic function of linguistic government over other practices and over people, however, its relationship is based on the rational intervention that it has with the nodal, as Manuel Castell says

Nodes can have greater or lesser relevance for the network as a whole: they increase their importance when they absorb more relevant information and process it more efficiently. The relative importance of a node does not come from its special characteristics, but from its ability to contribute to the objectives of the network (2011, p- 27).

In other words, it is a relationship of forces that intervene to develop in one direction; the nodal practices in the digital world are important, but their greater importance is that they all contribute to the

performance of the *Net*, and to its purpose in shaping the ontologies of the present in the digital age.

Net and *nodes* are closely linked, both fulfill a practical functionality in the world of *digitization*, what differentiates them is that the *Net* as a particular and singular practical unit is updated, and by updating it reconfigures new ontologies where new beings adapt to the new digital ecosystems and try to survive in it. The *Net* is an existential *oikos* composed of experiences derived from practices, a dwelling place that is defined by the human practice installed there, which gives rise to meanings and senses and whose *réseau* (*network*) promotes a positivity in the Hyppolitan sense in the structural understanding of the language of the experiences given by the nodal practices. Nodal practices are unconscious, performed spontaneously and without intentionality, while the *Net* as a functional unit has a character of rationality that gives it pertinence in its *praxis* and validity in its argumentation.

The *Net* as a functional device of *digitalization*, and as digital rationality, acquires greater meaning in the transition from the *Net* to the *Neto*, it is a morphological *Sprache* (language) that carries a sense of "result" consequence of the structure of nodal practices, a kind of existential pragma (πραγμα) that presupposes a reflexive movement where the *ontodigitizer* settles in a linguistic consciousness after an exercise of distancing from himself and from his unconscious digital practice, and acts from a *Neto*-linguistic thinking, making of this act not a tool, but a sphere of his own that he learns to incorporate, to signify, to make sense of in order to understand the world of the digital, not as a tool of use that he can abandon once he uses it, but as a way of life that provides him with a series of experiences that are assumed by the *ontodigitizer* "as an attitude of openness towards the world he wishes to interpret" (Piastra, 2019, p. 40).

The *Net* is not *poiesis*, but a *praxical* device, and being *praxical* it has an intentionality of government through language, which starts from a serious reflection of the *nodal* practice of *digitalization*, and which only occurs in the consciousness of the linguistic-social structure that thematizes a new disciplinary field. That is why the *Net*, is *Netopraxis* whose rational character is established by an intellectual act of a particular practice and, whose intellectual act yields a rationality that in this case is not attitude (Foucault, 2017), but knowledge, which, from the Foucauldian perspective is constituted in the open space of knowledge not in the sense of apprehension, but as Jürgen Habermas

(2003) says "as a way in which subjects capable of language and action make use of it" (p. 24).

Netopraxis is constituted -from the ontology of the present in the digital era- a hermeneutic that designates an overcoming of subjectivity and intends to unite an intersubjectivity that rationally makes explicit a knowledge that broadens its horizon and spectrum through the different ways of communicating in the digital world. For example, each Link, web or application has an endless amount of knowledge because its nodal practices, although it refers to the digital is different, their respective points of view is different, that is why it is important to inquire into that knowledge that is not installed in the subjectivity of individuals, but in the objectivity of the digital world, which configures a common rationality, which is consensual and not subversive. But what is this knowledge? Which is not constituted here as a tool of use but as a rational practice that ensures a common context of lives, what Habermas calls in his communicative action "the world of life" (Habermas, 2003, p. 30).

Netopraxis, being a hermeneutics of language, anchors its philosophical understanding in reflexive consciousness. It is the *point of view* of the present rationality of *praxis*, which aims to interpret that set of nodal practices that are established and related forming a device of digital government, which from the linguistic perspective acts strategically in digital culture; understanding digital culture as the system of latent and manifest vital ideas, which form that worldliness of *co-net-tivity*, and which is transversed by a human character of experiences, what Habermas (2003) calls the *Lebensführung*, i.e., a way of life.

The intentionality of *Netopraxis* as hermeneutics of language is to understand the rationality of the *Net* as a practice of government, which assumes language as a mechanism for understanding the ontologies of the present in *digitalization*. In *Netopraxis*, language is not representation, Gadamer (1992, p. 76) will say, in the manner of Cassirer, but rather efficacious reality that constitutes beings in itself, which is exposed in the objectivity of the digital world, and that this, in turn, provides the *ontodigitizer with* a relational and consensual language. In this case, language is not a juxtaposed tool, but is constituted in the relational effect that occurs in the digital world, which contributes to a rationality of governance expressed in the *Net* as a praxis of direction and management.

Language in the *Netopraxis* is a rationality, meaning by rationality, a particular type of knowledge, which carries a myriad of knowledge that groups thoughts, modes and behaviors. That is why *Netopraxis* presupposes a high linguistic consciousness, not only because of the rationality that constitutes it, but also because the result of the reflective exercise, in which the *ontodigitizer* meditates starting from the unconscious realization of the nodal practices of language, takes distance from himself after the dialogizing act, reflects on it, thinks about it, constructs it again in language and returns it to the digital world (Gadamer, 1992).

In *Netopraxis* language is not an aggregate, an added element, it is a practice that manifests the structure of the digital being relating in the world of *co-net-ivity*. To navigate in the digital world is to immerse oneself in the world of technological language that is assumed and incorporated into daily life. *Netopraxis*, being intentionality, not only makes conscious of a presence in the digital world from its reflexive character, but by inserting itself in that world it inserts itself in its language, suggests Gadamer (1922, p. 148).

The particularity of the language of *Netopraxis* is its *domain*, which in this case does not express an expertise, but a belonging over something. *Domain* comes from *domus* (house), not a house of bricks and concrete, but a dwelling that is represented by the digital existential structure. It is not language that inhabits the house as a guest, but being is language, and language determines its practices, emotions, affections and its ways of being both in the digital world and in the circumstantial world of relationships. As Hans-Georg Gadamer (1992) has already said

Materials and Methods

Language is thus the true center of the human being if it is contemplated in the sphere that it alone fills: the sphere of human coexistence, the sphere of understanding, of consensus, always greater, which is as indispensable for human life as the air we breathe. Man is really, as Aristotle said, a being endowed with language. All human beings must pass through language (p. 52).

The domain manifests a characteristic of government from language, not as a subjugating force that bursts into the freedom of the other, but as Byung-Chul Han (2019) says "a power of kindness that engenders a continuum of self in the other" (p. 45). It is not a government that

starts from the negativity of the digital being, it is a government that directs digital behaviors in a practical way, respecting the freedom of the intersubjective coexistence of digital beings. *Netopraxis* is philosophy of language and way of life, it determines a structural possibility of an existential *ethos* that creates - as Castro-Gómez (2015) says, interpreting Foucault, "conditions of acceptability where subjects experience themselves as free, even if the objectives of their behavior are set by others" (p. 14).

In *Netopraxis* the concept of *mastery* is implied in a form of digital governance practice, which is anchored in the ontological and non-instrumental language of technology, and which in turn speaks about the world of individuals. To govern from the digital is to construct a rationality from nodal practices that an individual or institution pre-writes from the idea of necessity that a virtual ecosystem requires. Digital governance creates a virtual rationale through platforms that recreate a context, when this context is externalized, a variety of nodal practices appear that are shared by a network of individuals building stories. A clear example is Facebook or Instagram, who build scenarios, contexts, or ecosystems and users freely obey a structure of experiences that are shared through a "you accept the terms".

In *Netopraxis* the *domain* is exercised by digital individuals that as Quintanilla (2017) says "are intentional products of human agents and are characterized because they are oriented to obtain certain objectives in a predetermined efficient way" (p. 21). In other words, governance in *Netopraxis* is still interdependently linked to the human and it is he who has the possibility to guide, lead, manage behaviors through language, unlike *Bionetopraxis* where it is automation and Machine Learning that builds modalities of governance over life (IBM, 2020).

The *domain* in the governance structure of *Netopraxis* is a type of affective disposition, a virtual presence, which reveals its emotions, passions, feelings in the construction of its being in the digital world. This affective disposition (*Befindlichkeit*), as expressed by Escudero (2016) manifests an ontological determination of the *inter-es*, whose existence is not only established by its character of factual subjectivity, but by the intersubjective recognition of a world that captures it through the "like" of the "share" of the "like" of the "like".

The *domain* as an affective disposition, does not build thrown beings, but "connected" beings, beings in communication, who need to say something (*Rede*), as Escudero (2016) says "the affective disposition

conveys the idea of being in a situation where things, others and ourselves already matter" (264). In short, the *domain* is an affective disposition of the digital individual, which through *Netopraxis* grants him a certain form of possibility of ontological openness from language, and whose language manifests a "state of mind" of rationality of governance, which aims to guide, influence, manage and direct behaviors and practices in the network.

Results

As a result of the research carried out, the definitions are provided in accordance with the specific work model, which made it possible to discern and bring the concepts and definitions proposed closer together.

The government rationality of *Netopraxis*: the language of algorithmic programming.

Rationality as knowledge is constituted in an epistemology proper to the present, which arises from the serious reflection of nodal practices, which in their singularity manifest a series of lived experiences that are brought to visibility through a rational conceptualization, which can be enunciated, argued and incorporated into the everyday language of human beings. This knowledge enunciates a discursive relationship between the *ontodigitalizer* and the artifact, and whose relationship is established from the practical agency of the *Netopraxis* device, which keeps a plexus of existential possibilities, and which makes visible a co-originary presence in the digital world.

This knowledge is not something static, it always leads to another knowledge (the click), that is why behind each digital nodal practice, there is an enunciation and a visibilization of a phenomenon that reveals from the linguistic perspective, an affective disposition, an apprehending, which in its colloquial sense is a way of understanding that "knowing how to do something" (Escudero, 2016. 269), that is to say that knowing and doing compose the same reality, as Deleuze says "knowing is a practical agency that enunciates and makes visible an epistemological threshold" (p. 79). This threshold is not unique, but varied, however, although it is varied, the important thing is to focus on the unity of knowledge (*Neto*) and not on the panoply of nodal practices, since it is not of interest in this work to make an archeology of these practices to discover knowledge, but rather, that unitary

knowledge with the constitutive possibility of "expression", that is, an ontological structure of saying something: an act of the language of *Netopraxis* (Foucault 1968).

This act of language develops in the being-in-a-digital-context, and exerts an influence on thoughts and behaviors, a kind of governability whose character of rationality builds technologies of signification, whose meaning is anchored in the established aims and objectives of instrumental "program" strategies, which give meaning to a conversational virtuality, thus causing "existential modes", where human beings acquire an experience of intersubjectivation coinciding-as Castro- Gómez (2015) says "in desires, hopes, decisions, needs, and lifestyles" (p. 15) with governmental goals set by faceless bureaucratic institutions such as Google, Facebook, Apple among others (Noah Harari, 2019, p. 373).

In the functional unit of *Netopraxis*, knowledge lies in governmentality from language, which is not violent, which does not subjugate, which does not force, which does not attempt against the particular will of individuals, but which itself is presented as a need to feel present in the digital world, delivering its being in the hands of others (applications) that make of itself an information for others, a delivery of identity that gives power and knowledge to the other to give an opinion and say something (Noah Harari, 2018, p. 11), a kind of relation of forces that in the Foucauldian perspective translates into power, not the disentangled power between dominators and dominated, but in the "know-do-something" (Escudero, 2016, p. 270) of skill, whose skill lies in the act of the language of algorithmic programming.

The language of programming is constituted in the new sovereigns that govern and direct the human existential structures, which from the algorithmic perspective, this one (the human) indicates to the artifact what it must perform through the programmatic codification. Although the framework of the digital corporeality (*Hardware*) is important, there is no doubt that in the *Netopraxis* the understanding rationality is possible from the factual structure of the installed information (*Software*), there is where the *pro-gramma* arises, a kind of nodal practice that denotes a space of linguistic game that describes existential structures previously installed, and, that project a virtuality of possibility in the "being-digital". In other words, programmatic language implies a structure of projection (*pro- Gramma*), a launching forward, a description of the "doing" that is executed from the

subjective need of the *ontodigitalizer*, and which in turn reveals on his part an affective disposition, a type of presence in the world of the digital.

The fundamental characteristic of the language of programming is to constitute the linguistics of the digital world, a description-effectual that structures *a priori*, all conversational possibilities that digital individuals will have in their social interactions in the network. This effectual-description is conceived *in* and *from* the algorithmic language, which is not changing, but updated, which is not dynamic, but static and whose staticity responds to what Gadamer (1992) calls "the articulation of the world" (p. 221), (*Ge - stell*), which, in this case, is to transfer the teleological phenomenon of the affective disposition of the factual individual to the objectives of the program that is intended to be executed.

However, the linguistics of programming, before executing any type of governance, must construct a field of experiential "processor" that constitutes the starting point of any digital subjectivity, and that, in turn, responds to a set of linguistic actions that are not perceptible to the eyes of the common, but its ontological structure always refers to rationally digital acts. This field of experiential "processor" is constituted in a digital language technology that speaks of integral nodal practices (sequence, instruction, objectives), and which in turn build a strategic rationality of governance from the *Neto*. However, these rational practices are apparently usually conceived as a mere instrument of technical means that calculate a series of orders to the artifact, but their result ends up being rationally applied so that digital users respond through behaviors and affections, thus generating an *ethos* of life, a kind of onto-technologies that produce an accumulation of practices that, in a Heideggerian way, are shown, preached and communicated.

This governability from the digital language is established in a practical way in the linguistic sign of the algorithm that pretends to be a logically perfect language for its precision and execution in the world of the *pro-gramma*. The significance of the existential structure of the algorithm is fundamental, since its description keeps a projective sense of an order, which when executed determines behaviors of digital individuals, and creates dependencies of affections submitting in a free and spontaneous way to a diversity of aims and objectives proposed by intentionally established programs. The algorithm is the device, that set of nodal practices of the language of programming, and

its essential function is to build from the existential perspective a logical-syntactic codification that enables a comprehensibility of the relationship of words and signs found in an application, on a website, etc., building a familiarity, not with the algorithm, because this is not seen, but with what appears to us in the digital encounter.

Therefore, the algorithm is the symbolic condition of writing and of the opening to the communicational world that is established in the *Net*, and it is the *Netopraxis* that in its rational reflection signifies its existential modes from the constructed and executed nodal practices. The algorithm in itself keeps a meaning of *operation*, an action, a type of practice that is put into operation in order to solve a situation or an existential need. The algorithm, being an operation, is already a practice, but a practice that is executed in the language of the symbolic of the number that through the sequence of binary numbers pretends to build an existential syntax, whose syntax is determined by the meaning given to the binary composition. In other words, the algorithm constructs a linguistically propositional order, which in turn ends up translating into a fact; in the words of Wittgenstein (1975) - the "shown", the *Tatsache*, which, in the case of the digital, is the correspondence of the projective of the algorithm with what is expected in the visualization of the *Net*.

The algorithm as the programmatic language of *Netopraxis*, builds technical conditions of governance, which are constituted in the new authorities of human management and direction, as Noah Harari (2018) already says

authority may soon shift again: from humans to algorithms. Just as divine authority was legitimized by religious mythologies and human authority was justified by the liberal narrative, so the coming technological revolution may establish the authority of big data algorithms, while undermining the very idea of individual freedom (p. 11).

Therefore, the algorithm is not only understood as sequential writing of binary numbers, but as an *entity* that possesses logics and modalities of government, which, when programmed, manage, direct and affect human behaviors from symbolically established linguistic structures. All government action is exercised on people through technological devices that constitute the new spaces of sovereignty, where humans cease to be living beings, to be digital beings, "organisms composed of algorithms" as Noah Harari (2019, p. 360),

where territoriality, are zones of applications of de-local encounters, and where production systems are not generated by the sovereigns of digital territoriality, but by algorithmic organisms that build neoliberal production systems through "statuses", "stories", "#TBT", "comments", "comments", "reproductions", "like", "follow" "share", among others, thus generating sovereignties of technical production.

The algorithm as numerical expression projects in its programmatic structure, a linguistic expression, common to all, where digital individuals can converge in the territoriality of the *Net*. The conversational act is not in the algorithm, but in the projection of the meaning of the algorithm when it is translated into letters, words or image. However, there is a close relationship between the two, since the word represents the algorithm, it is in the latter where the governing technique is configured, which will be understood and obeyed by digital users when it appears to them in the everyday life of their language, there, what was a figure becomes a fact (*facere*), a doing, that is, a practice.

This practice has a governmental intentionality, that is, this programmatic and algorithmic *facere* regulates the existential structure from the language, in the words of Foucault (2008) "regulates life" (p. 23), which is exposed in the digital window, whose identity is rationalized not by ideological systems but by systems of affections, that is, digital individuals accept to be governed by digital structures (applications) that measure their desires, their emotions, their beliefs through the "acceptability of terms", which is subjected to a series of unread and understood policies and yet are incorporated into the everyday life itself.

The governance of algorithmic programming is projective, it is not presented as it is, its logical figure lies in language, and it is this that influences thought (Gadamer, 1992), giving a vital orientation between the artifact, the algorithm translated into content and the life of the individual. This orientation makes the individual familiar with the constructed and conventionally accepted world. Behind the digital world lies a series of linguistic conventions, a rationality that overflows all human reality, and routes it in a direction of thought that allows it to produce a praxis of *political power*, of *aesthetic production*, and of *ethical signification*. These three rationalized practices, complete the structure of the governmental rationality of *Netopraxis*, from the programmatic and algorithmic language. Let us see:

The *political power* of algorithmic programming language.

The political concept that keeps the *Netopraxis* is configured through the relationship between the *technical language* and the *adaptive language of digitization*, that is, that the language being one, responds to internal logics of the *ontodigitizer*, and external logics that involve the modes and behaviors of any digital individual. The *technical language* is the one that refers to the algorithmic system that from the perspective of the *pro-gramma*, is an activity of thought that aims to build a technical rationality whose objectives and purposes is to assemble a behavioral structure that makes digital individuals respond from the *adaptive language*. While the *adaptive language* is the rationality that the digital individual finds, appears to him, and whose route is established to generate through this language, some logics of intersubjective relationship.

The algorithm as a *technical language* is constituted for a digital political philosophy, in an activity of thought that is not visible to individuals in their experience of the digital world, they already find a world built through images, audios, letters and words, but what is behind it is a projective construction that aims to generate not only an ecosystem of services and content, but an intentionality to generate a *data* that shows identities, patterns and behavior. In the *data* and its analysis is expressed the political power of algorithmic language, it traces a route from a univocal logic that expects to have results; each link is encoded in such a way that it expects to have the correct answer. It is a language that seeks to avoid error and to access more and more to the affections of the human being, understanding him in such a way that it gives him what he wants, before he wants it (Moreno, 2019).

With the algorithm as a *technical language*, access is gained to the world of digital experiences, where the field is opened to the *adaptive language* of the Web, the navigator navigates in the language of adaptation, which is the world constructed and known in his images and words; this world provides him with a series of experiences that reflect his human activity, no longer in the facticity of his concrete existence, but in the objectification of his being on the screen. This is no longer a virtualization or appearance of reality, it is an effectual reality of power, in which a network of intersubjective thoughts is activated, which, through the logical symbolism of the algorithm, communicates concrete events and living experiences. The technical language of the algorithm is in constant tension with the adaptive language, both imply a sphere of power, both internal and external,

however, it is in the exteriority where the algorithm expresses its intentionality of government, exerting a force of *circuit* that influences thoughts, behaviors and languages.

Power from the political perspective of the algorithm is a *circuit*, which is composed of plural structures of micropowers of tensions and forces that construct spaces of relation, understanding space as an existential *ubi* that implies in the words of Michel Certeau - quoted by Marc Augé in his book *Non-places* (2000) - a practice, a traveled path, "a practiced place" (p.85). This power in first measure is established in micropowers (speaking of nodal practices) in the numerical composition that each computer demands to respond to billions of operations per second, these operations respond to an activity of thought of the human being that pretends to transfer his experiences through the translation to binary numbers (composed of 0 and 1), then the information is quantified, codified, and in turn become a minimum unit of information called *bit* (Latorre, 2019), each *bit* represents not only a value in the information but a *praxis* of thought, which when entering the language of programming enters the logical language of the explicit and the detailed, the information is compiled and appears in the *adaptive language* of the internet that can be read, translated and understood by any digital individual. Each of these micropowers represents a linguistic layer that manifests the political power in *digitization* as a functional and total unit in the understanding of *Netopraxis*.

Power, being a *circuit*, implies a relational *dynamis*, whose subjectivity, when inserted in the world of the digital, initiates, in Arendt's words "to appear, to become visible, for the first time, before the eyes of the other, to become part of a common world" (1997, p. 18), the world of digital information. Therefore, power becomes political in this world only when there is a *praxis* of common language, that is to say, each word, each photograph, each image, each character is experienced in itself and by the other in the act of communicating something, of speaking something and how this speaking generates a series of affections in the other, who responds with a like, a comment, a share, a reproduce, among others.

This common language externalizes subjectivity; it is no longer the world of interiority and privacy of the algorithm as a *technical language*, but the world of the public that becomes more and more published (Conill, 2018). Individuals publish their intimacy, enter into the relational game of belonging to that *circuit* of power through the

like; they open the field to "belong" which in its double meaning means extension and relationship, that is, to extend their subjectivity through the *digitus* in others, and establish a common relationship with other digital subjectivities. This extension and political relationship is called *digital community*.

In the *digital community*, the *adaptive language* reaffirms and argues what is intuitively present in the *technical language*, there, in the adaptive language of the digital is where a "someone" is recognized, it is no longer a simple thing that is visualized through a screen; it is a someone who belongs to a world in relation (Pigem, 2018). This is the hard battle that ontodigitalization must live every day, to tear away from the pessimistic culture of digital dehumanization, and to understand that the status of political power in the digital language, is legitimized in the plurality of the community- in a relational world, what in Bauman's words (2019) is called the *common condition*, which is nothing more than the desired and imagined space.

When there is digital plurality, there is a *digital community*, and when there is a *digital community*, this relational *circuit* that builds common consensus is legitimized and validated, starting first of all when the individual is part of a *digital community*, by belonging to a social network. There they "accept" certain "terms" that are nothing more than policies that define belonging to that community. In this communitarian act, the world as experiences, the world as praxis, the world as presence, the world as language are re-signified. In the latter not only resides, but also validates the political, since its importance is not for subjectivity, but for the space of appearance as Arendt (1997) would say. That is why the political power of the digital, although it is established from the *technical language* of the algorithm, is validated in the *adaptive language* of the *Net*, there the human being is language where reality and virtuality merge into one thing.

In the *digital community*, the political *circuit* establishes linguistic practices that establish a comprehensive relationship between the individual and the technical and adaptive processes of digital language. This relationship, being pushed by a political *circuit*, implies a movement not of the body, but of thought, performing operations that co-create the contexts of the *Net*, making possible from an ontological perspective an *actualization* not only of the individual who dwells in the digital world, but also of the ecosystem of that world.

These movements are co-governed by hierarchical structures of the political *circuit* of the digital, presented in layers that respond to: ecosystems, platforms, services, content, and uses. This movement represents a unity and cannot be understood in a fragmentary way, for example: the ecosystem of an "application" requires platforms, offers a service and includes the user to create content for them, all have different spheres of power, and all have a different movement, from the most primitive (digital users) to more complex movements such as *ontodigitalizers* that not only have an understanding of the *adaptive language* of the *net*, but its *technical language* such as algorithmic language.

The most important thing about political power as a *circuit* is its operation (*praxis*) both linguistic and rational, it is the intersubjectivization of the ontological understanding that is configured there, a kind of hermeneutic frame of thought that elucidates the human-digital behavior that allows the "conditions of acceptability" (Castro-Gómez, 2015) not to be pejorated, but on the contrary, achieves that digital individuals not only accept the conditions of some terms to be able to live in the digital world, but that they autonomously cement a series of affective and concrete practices by setting in motion some production games that end up being part of their daily life, thus becoming a *psychopolitics* as Byung-Chul Han will mention, which is that neoliberal policy that pretends to be positive, and that seeks to please instead of subjugating and subduing. Chul Han himself (2019) will say.

Psychopolitics (...) instead of operating with threats, operates with positive stimuli. It does not use bitter medicine, but I like it. It flatters the soul instead of shaking and paralyzing it through shocks. It seduces instead of opposing it. It takes the lead. It attentively takes note of longings, needs and desires, instead of unlearning them. With the help of forecasts, it anticipates actions, even acts before it instead of hindering it (p. 57).

The concept of government that is kept in the political *circuit* of algorithmic language takes shape in the field of a "relation-we", the *circuit* as political power legitimizes some modes of relationship and understanding, where the *digital community* has its ways of life, builds its own beliefs, defines minimums of relationship and validates itself from its linguistic experiences; it is here, Habermas (2003) will say, where the "claim of validity carries implicitly the affirmation that something is worthy of being recognized" (p. 189). Therefore, political

power is the power of language, and since language is a concept, then through it, the concept of relationship, security, freedom, democracy, civil society, and economy is reconfigured.

Conclusions

Netopraxis as hermeneutics of language expresses a symbolic world of the new emerging logics of governance. It is through language that digitalization imprints a practice of control and management of human life. In it, a rationality is established between the adaptive and the technical, the latter being a logical form that keeps a will to be that makes human affection coincide with it in the adaptive, turning it into a human need to open up to the world to be captured and recognized from the digital. Netopraxis as a practice of digital government, starts from a linguistic rationality, built from algorithms that pretend to produce modes of existence that from the digitus respects the human being by analyzing his affections, feelings and emotions. The human factum is objectification of the algorithm, he does not matter, what matters are his experiences in relation to technology and what it promotes. Once the experiences are captured to be analyzed, a process of orientation begins, which, under the intention of possibility suggests how the machine should be lived and not used. The human being, under the existential optics of his relationship with the digital, yields his being to the algorithm, allows himself to be led and persuaded by its language, a symbolic load that keeps a technicality that involves his thought, his singularity, a kind of colonization of his being that is a product to configure subjectivities, as Joan will say. Carles Mèlich: "technology has achieved the extreme complicity of its subjects: the enjoyment and love of the system" (2021, p.142).

References

- Adorno, T. (2020). *Teoría estética, Obra completa 7*. Akal.
- Agamben, G. (2016). *What is a device*. Ed. Adriana Hidalgo.
- Aguilar, L. (2019). *Industry 4.0, the fourth industrial revolution*. Alfaomega.
- Arendt, H. (1997), *What is politics?* Paidós.
- Augé, M. (2000). *Non-places, spaces of anonymity*. Gedisa.
- Bauman, Z. (2019). *Community*. VII. 21st century.

- Benjamin, W. (2017). *The work of art in the age of its technical reproducibility*. La Marca.
- Benjamin, W. (2018). *Image aesthetics*. The Brand.
- Byung-Chul, H. (2019). *Hegel and power*. Herder.
- Castell, M. (2011). *Sociedad Red: una visión global*. Ed. Alianza.
- Castro- Gómez, S. (2015). *History of governmentality I*. USTA.
- Chul Han, B. (2014). *On the swarm*. Herder
- Chul Han, B. (2017). *The expulsion of the different*. Herder
- Chul Han, B. (2017). *On power*. Herder
- Chul Han, B. (2018). *Good entertainment*. Herder.
- Chul Han, B. (2018). *The agony of Eros*. Herder.
- Chul Han, B. (2019). *Psychopolitics*. Herder.
- Collazos, J. (2001). Dictionary of informatics, computing and other subjects. McGraw-Hill.
- Conill, J. (2018). Biographical recollections. In: Garcia, D. Marza, Ethics and political philosophy: homage to Adela Cortina. Techno.
- Deleuze, G. (1987). *Foucault*. Paidós.
- Escudero, J. (2016). *A reading guide to Martin Heidegger's Being and Time*. Herder.
- Foucault, M. (1968). *Words and things*. Siglo XXI.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *Birth of Biopolitics*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Foucault, M. (2017). *On the Enlightenment*. Tecnos.
- Gadamer, H. (1992). *Truth and Method. Vol. II*. Sígueme.
- Gómez, F. (March 23, 2015). 8 characteristics of digital imaging that you should know. *Deusto formación*. <https://www.deustoformacion.com/blog/disenio-produccion-audiovisual/8-caracteristicas-imagen-digital-que-debes-conocer>
- Grondin, J. (2002). *Introduction to philosophical hermeneutics*. Herder.
- Habermas, J. (2003). Theory of communicative action. Vol. I. Taurus.

- Harari, Y. (2018). *21 lessons for the 21st century*. Penguin Random House
- Harari, Y. (2019). *Homo Deus*. Debate
- Hegel, G. (2011). *Lessons in aesthetics*. Ed. Coyoacán.
- Heidegger, M. (2009). *Being and time*. Trotta
- Hyppolite, J. (1970). *Introduction to Hegel's philosophy of history*. Calden.
https://www.academia.edu/6090998/Hyppolite_Introduccion_a_La_Filosofia_de_La_Historia_de_Hegel_OCR?auto=download
- IBM. (2020). Machine Learning. <https://shortest.link/z-v>
- Latorre, J. (2019). *Ethics for machines*. Ariel.
- Levy, P. (2007). *Cyberculture, report to the Council of Europe*. Anthropos.
- López, J., & Sánchez, R. (2019). *Alquimia*. Deusto.
- Mèlich, J. (2021) *La fragilidad del mundo*. TusQuets.
- Molina, C. (2019). Looking through digital windows. In *IV Congreso Internacional de investigación en artes visuales*. Editorial Universitat Politècnica de València.
<https://riunet.upv.es/handle/10251/128909>
- Montoya, M. (2011). *Ethics and hermeneutics, a dialogue between Paul Ricoeur and John Rawls*. Universidad del Valle.
- Moreno, R. (2019). *A use of genetic algorithms for pattern search*. Editions of the U.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1982). *Meditaciones de la técnica y otros ensayos sobre la Ciencia y Filosofía*. Alianza Editorial.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (2001). *The Mission of the University*. Guadarrama. <http://www.esi2.us.es/~fabio/mision.pdf>
- Parente, D. (2010). *From organ to artifact, about the biocultural dimension of technique*. Edulp.
- Piastro, J. (2019). *The languages of identity*. Herder.
- Pigem, J. (2018). *Angels or Robots, human interiority in the hypertechnological society*. Fragmenta.
- Quintanilla, M., Parcelis, M., Sandrone, D., and Lawler, Diego. (2017). *Cataract endearing technologies*.

- Rancière, J. (2019). *Disenso, essays on aesthetics and politics*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Ricoeur, P. (1996). *The self as other*. Siglo XXI.
- RTVE, (March 20, 2018). How Cambridge Analytica and Facebook influenced Trump's victory. RTVE. <https://www.rtve.es/noticias/20180320/asi-influyeron-cambridge-analytica-facebook-victoria-trump/1700142.shtml>
- Ruiz, P. (2020). *Ethics of nanotechnologies*. Herder.
- Söderqvist, J., and Bard, A. (2002). *Netocracy, the new power in the network and life after capitalism*. Prentice Hall.
- Turkle, S. (2017). *In defense of conversation, the power of conversation in the digital age*. Attics of books.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1975). *Tractatus lógico-philosophicus*. Alianza Universitaria.
- Zátonyi, M. (2016). *Contributions to aesthetics, from the art and science of the twentieth century*. La marca Editora.