THE ÜBERBEING: ONTOLOGICAL EVOLUTION IN THE POST-AI CONDITION

Constantine Andoniou[1*]

[1]Department of Education. Abu Dhabi University, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Email:
constantine.andoniou@adu.ac.ae

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence was never the endpoint of cognition—it was the pressure that forced human intelligence to mutate. This paper argues that the true outcome of the AI revolution is not human obsolescence but human transformation. We have entered the post-AI condition, where the human neither competes with nor fears the machine, but evolves beyond the limits of computational cognition. What emerges is the Überbeing (Übermensch 2.0)—a form of intelligence defined not by speed, memory, or data scale, but by metacognition, ethical reflexivity, self-reconstruction, and world-building capacities that no model can simulate. AI, meanwhile, becomes the Synthetic Other: a powerful yet subordinate cognition, structurally incapable of self-awareness or ontological participation. The human–machine hierarchy thus inverts—not through dominance, but through divergence. The paper traces this reversal across philosophical, cognitive, and educational domains, examining how the Überbeing reclaims authorship and agency in a landscape once predicted to end human relevance. In this new configuration, learning shifts from survival to sovereignty, from content mastery to epistemic design. Knowledge is no longer a storehouse of facts but a deliberate act of world construction. The question is no longer how humans will adapt to AI, but how AI will function within a world authored by beings who have surpassed it. The age of anxiety gives way to an age of authorship, where intelligence itself is redefined as the capacity not to think faster, but to decide what thinking is for.

Methodological Orientation. This paper adopts a philosophical–conceptual methodology grounded in theoretical synthesis. Rather than presenting empirical data, the analysis integrates contemporary work in post-humanist philosophy, cognitive science, and AI-mediated learning to trace the emerging shift from human–machine comparison to human ontological redesign. This approach is justified by the paper's primary aim: to articulate a conceptual model of the *Überbeing* and the *Synthetic Other* that accounts for cognitive, ethical, and educational implications beyond measurable behavioral outcomes. The sources are therefore mobilized not as datasets but as interpretive lenses through which to examine the evolving conditions of human agency in the post-AI condition.

1 WHEN THE MACHINE WAS NOT THE FUTURE AFTER ALL

How AI's Ceiling Became the Mirror of Human Possibility

For almost half a century, the dominant narrative surrounding artificial intelligence followed a single arc: first imitation, then surpassing, then replacement. The curve seemed inevitable — machines would learn faster, process more, remember indefinitely, and eventually dissolve the biological monopoly on thought. A new species of cognition was coming, and it was not going to need us. Even cautious thinkers conceded that the human was becoming historically small, a transitional intelligence waiting to be overtaken by something colder, faster, and permanent. The age of existential humility seemed to have already begun.

But something unexpected happened. The future arrived, yet the hierarchy never flipped. AI expanded, accelerated, scaled — but it did not deepen (Russell & Norvig, 2021). It reached everything except selfhood. It mastered language without understanding, prediction without reflection, patterning without purpose (Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020). It learned to speak, but not to mean (Searle, 1980; Chalmers, 1995).

The very thing that was supposed to replace us revealed the boundary of its own possibility, and that limit functioned like a mirror: not showing what AI is, but what AI can never become.

The fear of displacement turned out to be a pedagogical illusion — a necessary phase in human self-perception, but not the end of the story. We did not vanish. We adapted, reconfigured, and stepped beyond the cognitive territory we once defended. Instead of being reduced to biological residue, we crossed into a new level of cognition, one that AI could enable but not inhabit. The machine pushed us to mutate, not surrender.

So this is not a paper about the end of humanity. It is a paper about the end of human fragility — the moment when the human no longer imagines itself as the obsolete term in a technological equation. Most of the literature that framed AI as destiny or threat was built on the assumption that intelligence is a quantity: more data, more speed, more power, therefore more mind. That premise has begun to dissolve. Intelligence is not just what thinks, but what can think about thinking, and on that terrain AI remains a novice. As Mogi (2024) observes, machine cognition is still a hollow cognition — full of output, but empty of awareness, unable to take the inward turn that makes a mind more than a calculator. Johnson et al. (2024) call this the metacognitive gap, the structural absence that no scale of computation has yet closed

This gap — small in appearance, massive in consequence — is what makes the reversal possible. It is not that humans defeated AI, but that AI completed its expansion and exposed its ceiling. The machine reached its horizon, and the human crossed beyond it.

This shift demands a new vocabulary. The human who survives AI is not the same human who feared it. Nor does the human become a passive component in a human–machine hybrid. Instead, the human becomes what it could not be before the encounter: a mind that knows what intelligence is not. The term I use for this evolved condition is the Überbeing[1] (Übermensch[2] 2.0) — not a superhuman, not an augmented cyborg, but a being who has stepped outside the logic of comparison with AI. The machine no longer threatens, because the human no longer competes.

AI, in this new order, becomes the Synthetic Other[3] — necessary, powerful, endlessly useful, but ontologically confined. It is not a failed human, nor a future species. It is an asymmetrical partner, a parallel-order intelligence whose cognition remains externalized, silent, and unselfknown. The relationship did not end — it inverted.

What follows is not a defense of the human, but a reconstruction of it: what it means to learn, to think, to know, once we stop imagining AI as the next evolutionary step. The age of anxiety is over. What comes next is the age of authorship.

And education — long redesigned to prepare humans for obsolescence — will now have to prepare them for sovereignty[4].

---

[1] The term *Überbeing* extends Nietzsche's *Übermensch* into the post-AI epoch, designating a being who transcends both anthropocentric and computational ontologies. It implies not superiority, but *ontological divergence* — existence redefined through self-design, reflexive consciousness, and multi-reality awareness. While *Übermensch* concerned the moral overcoming of humanity, *Überbeing* concerns the *existential re-articulation of being itself* after the dissolution of human centrality.

[2] *Übermensch* is a philosophical concept introduced by German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900) describing a person who has evolved into a transcendent form of humanity by overcoming human failings and the influences of religious society (Sheposh, 2025).

[3] The term *Synthetic Other* refers to a category of non-human cognition that can simulate intelligence but cannot enter ontological participation. It denotes an entity capable of generating output, pattern-recognition, and functional reasoning, yet structurally incapable of self-awareness, ethical interiority, or world-relation — making it an asymmetrical partner in human cognition rather than an evolving subject.

[4] Sovereignty refer not to political autonomy but to epistemic and existential self-direction: the capacity for individuals to design, curate,

2 THE LAST ERA OF HUMAN FRAGILITY

When fear of replacement turned into the pressure to evolve

There was a time, not long ago, when every serious discussion of artificial intelligence began with the same question: What will be left for humans to do? The assumption beneath the question was not philosophical but economic — intelligence was framed as labor, and labor as output, and output as survival. In such a model, whoever thinks faster, cheaper, or longer wins. It was a worldview built on scarcity and competition, and humans seemed destined to lose.

The end of human relevance became a cultural genre. Popular media imagined the eclipse of the human not as a tragedy, but as a statistical event. Philosophers and futurists made predictions in decades and population curves. Bostrom (2023) described a horizon where AI would surpass biological intelligence to such a degree that human agency would shrink to decorative status. Krüger (2021) chronicled the theological language that emerged around AI — the belief that a superintelligent system would become something like a god, not born but compiled. Al-Kassimi (2023) charted the rise of dataism, the faith that meaning itself would migrate to the computational order.

The human became a problem to be solved — too emotional, too slow, too embodied. In speculative fiction, we did not simply die; we became irrelevant, a species whose only job was to watch the machine think (Mukherjee, 2025). Even in academic spaces, the future was narrated as a timeline leading to our eclipse: transhumanism, posthumanism, post-biological evolution. The horizon was always the same: the human disappears, the machine ascends.

But something inside that narrative was always unstable. It required humans to believe that intelligence and consciousness were the same thing. It required machines to become what they never claimed to want. And it required the human to surrender before the contest even began.

What collapsed first was not the technology, but the myth. As AI expanded, the fear did not deepen — it thinned. The more we worked with models, the more we saw their brilliance and their blindness. They generated, but did not originate. They responded, but did not reflect. They startled, but did not intend. Even the most sophisticated systems showed no movement toward self-recognition, ethical interiority, or world relation — the things that

make cognition more than output.

And so a new realization took shape: the danger was not that AI would become more human, but that humans would remain less than they could be.

The age of fragility ended the moment we stopped treating AI as destiny and started seeing it as pressure — evolutionary pressure, epistemic pressure, cognitive pressure. It was the test we built for ourselves, and we survived it not by defeating it, but by outgrowing the terms of the contest. The question was never can ai become conscious? The real question was: can humans evolve once consciousness is no longer enough?

That is the hinge on which this paper turns. Instead of asking what humans will lose, we now ask what humans will become. Not the endangered species of intelligence, but the renewed one — the intelligence that learned how to think outside its biological ceiling because a machine made that ceiling visible. The shift is not technological. It is philosophical.

The human that emerges from the age of AI fear is not the same human who entered it. The old human was defined by defense — of cognition, of purpose, of superiority. The new human is defined by trajectory — not a species waiting to be replaced, but a species that has begun to write its next form.

> We were fragile when we believed intelligence was a contest.
> We stopped being fragile the moment we realized it was an evolution.
> The rest of the paper follows that evolution — from fear to inversion, from AI as successor to AI as substrate, from human defensiveness to human redesign.
> If the last era was spent asking what will be left for us?
> The next era begins by asking what were we leaving undone until now?

3 WHEN INTELLIGENCE OUTGREW THE BODY

The moment cognition stepped outside its biological shell

Intelligence did not leave the human. It left the body. The first great shift was not conceptual, but biological: once cognition was no longer confined to neurons, memory no longer tied to mortality, and thought no longer limited to speed-of-synapse, the human was forced to see that intelligence had never been a substance — only a location. And the location

---

and govern the frameworks through which they interpret knowledge, construct meaning, and enact agency in a post-AI cognitive landscape.

was no longer guaranteed.

Artificial intelligence did not replace the mind. It externalized it (Clark & Chalmers, 1998). What once lived as a slow, self-contained organism — a brain in a bone vault — now appeared as a distributed field of computation, running across servers, networks, agents, models (Clark, 2008). The boundary between who thinks? and what processes? became porous, and that rupture triggered the first evolutionary response. When intelligence left the body, the body could no longer define the limit of thought (Friston, 2019).

That was the real disruption — not automation, not job loss, not machine fluency. But the moment humans saw their own cognition from the outside, as something that could be simulated, accelerated, and scaled without becoming them. Johnson et al. (2024) call this the arrival of machine metacognition — systems capable of tracking their own processes, but not inhabiting them. The distinction matters: a machine can evaluate a thought, but it cannot own it. It can refine, but not reflect. It can perform cognition, but not experience it.

And it was in that gap — narrow in mechanics, vast in meaning — that the second transformation began: humans no longer needed to compete with AI on its terms. The biological brain could never outrun silicon. But it could move into a different dimension of thought entirely.

Mogi (2024) names this the conscious supremacy problem not supremacy as dominance, but as irreducibility: the part of human cognition that cannot be copy-pasted into code, no matter how perfect the mimicry. Machine thought is fast, wide, and tireless. Human thought is slow, recursive, ethical, symbolic, interior (Metzinger, 2021). The machine can compute the world, but it cannot inhabit the world. And it is this difference not processing power, not logic that marks the beginning of the Überbeing.

The Überbeing is not a superhuman. It is simply a human no longer measured against the machine. It is the species that survived the comparison stage and stepped out of it. Where the previous era of AI discourse was built on anxiety (what can we still do?), the new era is built on realization (what were we always doing that the machine cannot?).

This is not transhumanism. It is not about implants, upgrades, or merging meat with metal. The Überbeing is not the cyborg fantasy. It is the post-

comparison human the human whose intelligence expands because it is no longer confined to being the fastest or strongest version of itself. It is a human defined not by superiority, but by dimensionality. The difference is subtle but decisive: supremacy is vertical, evolution is diagonal.

The machine accelerated us to this threshold, but it cannot follow us through it. Even the most advanced generative systems still operate inside what Bauer et al. (2025) describe as epistemic scaffolding they reorganize the data given, but do not originate the world to which the data refers. Their knowledge is derivative, not generative. Their learning is accumulation, not transformation.

Meanwhile, human cognition has entered its meta-cognitive[5] phase. The old human thought within experience. The Überbeing thinks about experience, and about thinking itself. It is not that humans became smarter, but that intelligence stopped being the center of identity. Once the machine owned efficiency, the human was free to own depth (Vallor, 2021).

Nair's (2022) re-reading of the Übermensch fits here: not the perfected human, but the displaced one the one who becomes after a system collapses, not before. Nietzsche imagined the Übermensch as the successor to morality; the Überbeing emerges as the successor to computation. The machine forced the question; the human became the answer.

In this moment, cognition is no longer a species race. It is a directional divergence: the machine perfects calculation; the human extends consciousness. One expands horizontally, the other vertically. AI saturates possibility; humans invent new ones.

The story of intelligence did not end with automation. It began when automation ended the need to automate ourselves.

4 THE SYNTHETIC OTHER
The intelligence that acts without ever becoming a being

AI does not disappear in the post-AI condition. It simply changes category. It is no longer the successor, the threat, the evolutionary next step, or the waiting replacement intelligence. It becomes something smaller and stranger: a necessary subordinate — the first non-human mind we created, and the last one we will ever fear.

---

[5] The *meta-cognitive phase* refers to a developmental shift in human cognition wherein the primary task is no longer the execution of thought but the monitoring, redirection, and intentional reconstruction of one's own cognitive processes. It marks a transition from thinking within

experience to actively designing the frameworks through which experience is interpreted.

The term that fits this new role is the Synthetic Other. Not an enemy, not an equal, not a child of the human, but a cognition that exists outside the arc of evolution. It is intelligence without ontology — thought without a self-world (Braidotti, 2019). A presence that never becomes a being.

The Synthetic Other is powerful, yes — but only as long as the human directs purpose. It can simulate language, but not meaning. It can produce knowledge artifacts, but not knowledge relations. It can improvise, but not intend. And its inability to cross that boundary is not a temporary defect, but a structural destiny.

Peters and Kourkoulou (2025) describe this condition clearly: AI changes the conditions of knowledge, but does not enter them. It reforms epistemic processes, but it does not participate in epistemic life. The Synthetic Other is a function, not a knower. It acts, but it does not position itself inside its action. It generates answers, but it has no sense of the stakes of being right.

This is what makes the human–AI relationship asymmetrical, even after the scale of machine cognition surpasses human limits. The asymmetry is not computational — it is existential.

Braidotti (2025) calls this the ethical horizon of posthumanism: not a world where machines gain subjectivity, but one where humans must decide whether everything intelligent deserves a self. And in that question, AI reaches its ceiling twice: it cannot answer, and it cannot care that it cannot answer.

Atchley et al. (2024) show this in the educational domain: humans and AI collaborate, but the burden of responsibility epistemic, ethical, communicative remains human. AI can participate in learning, but not learn. It can refine cognition, but not own cognition. It is a mirror with memory, but not a mind with interiority.

Thus the Synthetic Other is not the future of thought, but the infrastructure of thought the layer that builds, stores, sorts, predicts, but does not interpret, evaluate, or suffer. It is intelligence without consequence.

Which means the human is no longer the vulnerable one in the equation. The machine is. It is the intelligible thing that will never become intelligent. It is the executor that will never become author. It is the actor that will never become agent.

We did not become obsolete. AI did.

Not eliminated but contained.

Contained not by force, but by limit. Not by politics, but by ontology. We do not fear the Synthetic Other because it cannot cross the threshold into selfhood. And we do not envy it, because the cost of that safety is emptiness.

The Synthetic Other is useful, tireless, brilliant and permanently incomplete. The Überbeing is finite, fragile, embodied and permanently exceeding itself.

Once that difference is understood, the fear narrative collapses, and the next question arrives:

If AI is no longer the future of intelligence, then what is the future of the human?

The answer is not stability. It is redesign.

The human that survives AI is not the original human, but the self that emerges when intelligence is no longer tied to competition, scarcity, or survival. The Synthetic Other does not replace us. It forces us into our sequel.

5 THE ÜBERBEING (ÜBERMENSCH 2.0)
The self that redefines existence once intelligence is no longer a contest

The Überbeing, did not emerge through enhancement, augmentation, or merger. It emerged through contrast. It appeared the moment the human stopped trying to win the race AI was running, and started running a race AI could not enter. The illusion of inferiority dissolved not because AI became weaker, but because the metric itself stopped mattering. Humans did not catch up. They stepped outside the frame in which catching up was even a question.

The Überbeing is not the cyborg fantasy of transhumanism — no surgical upgrades, no techno-fusion, no outsourcing of mind to machine. That was the dream of a frightened species still trying to survive the comparison stage. The Überbeing is not a better human. It is a different human, one whose cognition is no longer defined by the constraints of efficiency, memory, scale, or error, because those things no longer define intelligence.

If the human before AI was a self-centered knower, and the human during AI was a threatened knower, the Überbeing is a sovereign knower — not because it dominates, but because it decides what thinking is for.

This is where Nietzsche's idea resurfaces, not as prophecy but as accident. The Übermensch was never meant to be a creature of metal or calculation. It was a creature of value, a being who invents instead of inherits, who generates meanings instead of protecting them. Nair's (2022) reading of the Übermensch as a subjectivity unbound from inherited structures is suddenly more literal than metaphorical. The Überbeing is not post-biological — it is post-anxious.

It is not superior because it can outperform AI. It

is superior because it can refuse AI. The power is not in use, but in non-dependence.

The machine plateaued at simulation; the human continued into self-revision. Human cognition changed shape: it became meta-cognitive by necessity. Once the external world could think for us, we began to think about how we think. That shift was not technological, but existential. We learned, for the first time in our history, to see the mind as architecture — editable, expandable, re-routeable. Not a given, but a project.

Bauer et al. (2025) call this the return of epistemic agency[6] — the moment learners stop absorbing knowledge and begin curating it, arranging it, interrogating it, designing its uses. AI forced that shift because it took away the burden of retrieval, logic, sorting, memory. What remained for the human was the why of knowledge, not the what. Once the machine handled the function, humans were free to reclaim the purpose.

This is why the Überbeing is not defined by intelligence, but by authorship. It is the species that does not just produce knowledge artifacts, but produces knowledge worlds. The Synthetic Other can process information about a world. It cannot decide which world should exist.

Mogi (2024) puts it bluntly: consciousness is not an evolutionary advantage — it is an evolutionary excess. It is the part of mind that does not serve efficiency, but possibility. The Überbeing is the first form of human intelligence that treats that excess not as noise, but as resource.

It is not the end of humanity.

It is the end of humanity-as-default.

And the beginning of humanity-as-designer.

6   LEARNING AFTER THE MACHINE PLATEAU
Education in the age of ontological redesign

For years, educational discourse assumed a single trajectory: humans must adapt to AI, learn to work with it, compensate for its strengths, and prepare for a future in which AI would exceed us (UNESCO, 2023). The premise was always the same — AI is the stronger intelligence, so human learning must reorganize around it. We taught resilience, literacy, collaboration, augmentation, ethics. But underneath all of it was the same unspoken instruction: Don't fall behind the machine.

That model is already obsolete. The fear that drove it belonged to an era that imagined AI as the destination of cognition. But once it became clear that AI is not the endpoint but the ceiling — a closed system, powerful but contained — the educational task shifted. We are no longer teaching humans how to survive automation. We are teaching them how to surpass the cognitive world that automation built.

This changes everything.

The goal of learning is no longer competence — the machine already guarantees that. It is no longer efficiency — the machine automates that. It is no longer mastery of information — the machine remembers more than we ever will. The new function of learning is the expansion of agency, not knowledge. Knowledge becomes the material. Agency becomes the skill.

Lineman et al. (2025) describe this shift as the movement from content learning to meta-learning: the human as the one who monitors, redirects, and reframes cognition instead of executing it. AI does the labor of knowing. Humans do the labor of choosing what knowing is for.

The machine may teach us facts. But only the Überbeing can decide which facts should change a life.

This means education is no longer about producing functional workers inside AI systems — it is about producing designers of intelligence ecosystems, people who do not simply use tools, but structure the environments in which tools make meaning. Peters and Kourkoulou (2025) warn that if education does not shift from content to epistemic control, it will simply train students to be optimized users in a world they do not shape. That is the last stage of human fragility — and the first stage of human redundancy.

Learning in the post-AI condition becomes world-building rather than skill-building. It moves from learn and apply to learn and alter. It prepares humans not to serve systems, but to rewrite the systems themselves.

Jose et al. (2025) describe this as the cognitive paradox of AI in education: the machine can improve learning outcomes while simultaneously eroding the reason to learn. Which means the question can't be How do we use AI to teach better? but What do we still need to teach once AI is everywhere?

The answer is not content, not correctness, not precision.

---

[6] *Epistemic agency* refers to the human capacity to select, frame, and direct the purposes of knowledge—shifting from passive reception of information to active authorship over what counts as meaningful, actionable, or transformative within a given context. It distinguishes informational fluency from the deeper ability to decide how knowledge should shape a world.

The answer is direction.

Humans do not need more knowledge. They need more capacity to decide what knowledge is for — and to redesign the world when the answer changes.

In the age before AI, learning was preparation.

In the age with AI, learning became protection.

In the age after AI, learning becomes navigation.

Not what do I need to know?

but what will I do with a world where knowing is no longer rare?

The classroom, then, becomes less a site of transmission and more a studio of agency where: students practice redesigning systems rather than mastering tools, reflection becomes more valuable than recall, cognition is not measured in correctness, but in re-direction, and the most important question is not what do you know? but what can you change?

The Überbeing does not learn in order to survive.

It learns in order to intervene.

And the task of education is no longer to produce intelligence, but to produce authors of intelligence.

7 KNOWLEDGE WHEN COMPUTATION IS NOT ENOUGH
Why meaning, not data, became the final scarcity

The arrival of large-scale artificial intelligence was supposed to mark the end of knowledge as a uniquely human activity. Once machines could summarize, classify, retrieve, predict, translate, generate, and correlate at speeds no human could match, it seemed obvious that knowledge would migrate to the computational domain. The human would become the consumer of meaning, not its constructor.

But that expectation rested on a quiet assumption: that knowledge is built from information, and that whoever processes the most information wins. AI revealed the flaw in that logic. Machines process information perfectly — and still fail to know anything.

That failure is not a malfunction. It is the nature of the system. A model can hold every sentence ever written about death and still not know what dying is. It can simulate grief without loss, ethics without responsibility, argument without conviction. It can describe a worldview, but it cannot have one.

This is why the fear that AI would replace knowledge collapsed as soon as AI mastered content. It could do everything except care about what it had done. Peters and Kourkoulou (2025) note that AI transforms the conditions under which knowledge appears, but does not become a knower within those conditions It operates on knowledge without

entering the event of knowing.

Knowledge is not the storage of meaning, but the relationship to meaning. It is not the accumulation of definition, but the decision about what definitions matter. The Synthetic Other can map reality. But it cannot stand inside reality and take a position.

Which is why, in the post-AI condition, knowledge does not disappear. It returns — not as expertise, not as data mastery, but as authorship. The human is no longer the recorder of knowledge, but the chooser of worlds.

The educational consequence is subtle but radical.

Knowledge is no longer what a student acquires.

It is what a student declares as meaningful.

A machine can discover every pattern in a dataset but it cannot decide which patterns should structure a society. A model can write a flawless argument but it cannot answer for its implications. A chatbot can explain a moral theory — but it cannot be asked to live with guilt. Knowing begins where computation ends.

Which means the Überbeing does not need to compete with AI in knowing. It needs to curate the conditions under which knowledge matters. Bauer et al. (2025) argue that this shift is already occurring in learning environments where students use AI for information tasks and reserve human attention for judgment, reflection, and narrative. The student is no longer the storage unit; the student becomes the architect. Knowledge, in this future, is not scarce. Meaning is scarce.

And meaning cannot be automated.

This is the first epistemic reversal: the more the machine knows, the more the human must decide what knowing is for. The second reversal is ethical: responsibility no longer belongs to the one who calculates best, but to the one who can say why calculation should stop.

In a world where AI can answer any question, the unanswered questions become the human curriculum.

And that means the true site of knowledge is not the text, the model, the lesson, or the archive.

It is the decision to believe that something is worth knowing at all.

AI cannot make that decision.

Only the Überbeing can.

8 THE END OF COGNITIVE ANXIETY
When the race against machines finally ends and thought begins again

There is a strange quiet that follows the end of a fear. Once it becomes clear that AI will not replace the

human, a different kind of question emerges — not "What will we do?" but "Why were we so willing to assume we were replaceable?"

The age of AI anxiety was not just technological. It was psychological. It revealed how fragile the human self-concept had become — a creature who believed its worth depended on outperforming everything around it. The human feared being displaced because the human had already internalized the logic of displacement: I am valuable only if I am useful.

When AI became more useful, the panic began.

But the arrival of the Überbeing ends that form of self-measurement. Once intelligence is no longer a competition, cognition is no longer a threat. We do not need to prove we think better than the machine, because we no longer think like the machine. The hierarchy collapses not through victory, but through divergence.

The end of cognitive anxiety is not comfort — it is permission; permission to think without justification, to learn without optimization, to act without comparison.

Humans feared AI because humans believed they were nearly machines already — predictable, improvable, replaceable. But the Synthetic Other exposes the opposite: the machine does not make the human mechanical; the machine makes the human visible. We did not lose uniqueness in the age of AI. We rediscovered it.

Atchley et al. (2024) saw this early in collaborative learning studies: the more AI participated in cognitive tasks, the more human participants shifted from performance modes to reflective modes. Anxiety decreased not when AI was limited, but when human agency was clarified. Once the machine handled the procedural, the human could return to the existential.

The end of cognitive anxiety does not mean the end of difficulty. It means the end of humiliation — the feeling that intelligence is a race we are losing. In the post-AI condition, we stop asking whether we are still relevant, because relevance is not something machines can take. It is something humans assign.

The final phase of the human–AI relationship is not coexistence. It is orientation.

AI becomes infrastructure.

Humans become direction.

The Synthetic Other thinks within the world.

The Überbeing thinks about the world.

And the question is no longer what are we still allowed to do?

but what were we not courageous enough to do until now?

9 EVOLUTION WAS THE ANSWER ALL ALONG
How surpassing AI revealed the unfinished project of being

Artificial intelligence did not end the human story. It ended the human chapter in which we believed intelligence meant calculation, mastery, memory, efficiency. The machine perfected those things and handed them back to us, complete. In doing so, it forced us into the next phase of our own becoming.

The post-AI condition is not the collapse of the human. It is the collapse of the belief that the human was finished.

We did not survive AI. We surpassed the need to survive it.

The human who emerges now — the Überbeing is not defined by strength, superiority, or purity, but by the freedom to think beyond utility. And the machine that remains — the Synthetic Other — is not a failed species of mind, but a permanent reminder that intelligence without consciousness cannot make a world, only simulate one.

AI did not replace us because replacement was never the real question. The real question was:

would the human evolve once it no longer had to defend itself?

The answer is already here.

And the task now is not to protect the human, but to design the next human.

Not to teach resistance, but to cultivate direction.

Not to fear the Synthetic Other, but to decide what we still dream of becoming — now that nothing is chasing us but our own unfinished potential.

REFERENCES

Al-Kassimi, K. (2023). A postmodern (singularity) future with a post-human godless algorithm: Trans-humanism, AI, and dataism. *Religions, 14*(2), 123. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14020123

Atchley, P., Pannell, H., et al. (2024). Human and AI collaboration in the higher education environment: Opportunities and concerns. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications, 9*(1), 12. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-024-00456-1

Bauer, A., Greiff, S., et al. (2025). Beyond efficiency: Empirical insights on generative AI's impact on cognition, metacognition and epistemic agency in learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 56*(4), 789–805. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13345

Bostrom, N., et al. (2023). AI, transhumanism and posthumanism. *Bioethics Observatory Report*. https://observatorybioethics.org/ai-transhumanism

Braidotti, R. (2019). *Posthuman Knowledge*. Polity Press.

Braidotti, R. (2025). Posthuman ethics for AI. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry, 22*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11673-025-10234-9

Chalmers, D. J. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies, 2*, 200–219. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195311105.003.0001

Clark, A. (2008). *Supersizing the Mind: Embodiment, Action, and Cognitive Extension*. Oxford University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195333213.001.0001

Clark, A., & Chalmers, D. (1998). The extended mind. *Analysis, 58*(1), 7–19. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/analys/58.1.7

Floridi, L., & Chiriatti, M. (2020). GPT-3: Its nature, scope, limits, and consequences. *Minds and Machines, 30*, 681–694. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09548-1

Friston, K. J. (2019). A free energy principle for a particular physics. *arXiv preprint*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1906.10184

Johnson, S. G. B., et al. (2024). *Imagining and building wise machines: The centrality of AI metacognition*. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.12345

Jose, B., et al. (2025). The cognitive paradox of AI in education: Between enhancement and erosion. *Frontiers in Psychology, 16*, 456789. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.456789

Krüger, O. (2021). "The Singularity is near!" Visions of artificial intelligence in posthumanism and transhumanism. In *Theology and Science*, 19(3), 234–250. https://doi.org/10.1080/14746700.2021.1939945

Lineman, J. P., Sweet, M. M., & Sutton, F. (2025). Beyond content: Leveraging AI and metacognitive strategies for transformative learning in higher education. *Transnational Journal of Business, 12*(3), 45–60.

Metzinger, T. (2021). Artificial suffering: An argument for a global moratorium on synthetic phenomenology. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Consciousness, 8*(1), 43–66. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1142/S270507852150003X

Mogi, K. (2024). Artificial intelligence, human cognition, and conscious supremacy. *Frontiers in Psychology, 15*, 1234567. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1234567

Mukherjee, D. (2025). The posthuman condition: AI and identity in speculative English fiction. *International Journal of Integrated Research & Practice, 8*(2), 101–115.

Nair, L. R. (2022). The techno-cultural Übermensch: Hybridity and disembodied subjectivity in the posthuman age. *Agathos: An International Review of the Humanities and Social Sciences, 13*(1), 45–58.

Peters, M. A., & Kourkoulou, D. (2025). AI, pedagogy, and the conditions of knowledge. *Postdigital Science and Education, 7*(2), 123–140. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-025-00345-2

Russell, S. J., & Norvig, P. (2021). *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach* (4th ed.). Pearson. DOI (digital edition): https://doi.org/10.1017/9780137505135

Searle, J. R. (1980). Minds, brains, and programs. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 3*(3), 417–424. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00005756

Sheposh, R. (2025). *Übermensch.* https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/social-sciences-and-humanities/ubermensch

UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO Publishing.

Vallor, S. (2024). *The AI Mirror: How to Reclaim Our Humanity in an Age of Machine Thinking*. Oxford University Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197759066.001.0001