The Future of Digital Humanism – Towards a Critical Post-Post-Humanism

Katja Mayer[1], Erich Prem[2], Philip Birkner[3], Pia-Zoe Hahne[4], Alexander Schmölz[4], Francesco Striano[5], Maria Zanzotto[5]

[1] University of Vienna and Center for Social Innovation ZSI Austria

[2] eutema GmbH and Digital Humanism Association, Vienna, Austria

[3] Independent Expert in Digital Transformation Policy, Vienna, Austria

[4] UAS BFI Vienna, University for Economics, Management and Finance, Austria

[5] University of Turin, Italy

Abstract. This position paper distills key insights from the STS Graz 2025 panel 'The Future of Digital Humanism: Towards a Critical Post-Post-Humanism?'. The session brought together interdisciplinary perspectives to discuss Digital Humanism in light of feminist, ecological, infrastructural, and socio-economic critiques. While the movement draws on humanist ideals like dignity and autonomy, panelists emphasized the need to move beyond Western-centric and techno-solutionist narratives. They proposed a pluralistic and situated approach, framing Digital Humanism as a boundary object - flexible across contexts yet grounded in shared normative orientations. The paper outlines five theses: (1) Digital Humanism should not be equated with classical humanism but understood as a political response to digital dehumanization; (2) critical engagement with humanism helps to resist the powerful narratives of determinism and integrating situated epistemologies and feminist STS helps avoid universalist assumptions and centers marginalized perspectives; (3) more inclusive and accountable digital futures require sustained political engagement and the development of public digital infrastructures; (4) trust in generative AI needs to be reframed as a critical and reflective practice; (5) ecological responsibility can be strengthened through relational ethics that tie human well-being to environmental sustainability. In conclusion, translating theory into practice calls for institutional support and collaborative communities of action across disciplines and sectors. Together, these contributions reimagine Digital Humanism as an evolving, practice-oriented framework - capable of engaging diverse knowledge traditions while promoting democratic, just, and ecologically sound responses to digital transformation.

1 Introduction

This position paper presents core insights from the panel session with the provocative title 'The Future of Digital Humanism: Towards a Critical Post-Post-Humanism?', held at STS Graz Conference in May 2025.

This session convened a range of critical perspectives that examined the evolving contours of Digital Humanism through feminist, ecological, economic, educational, and infrastructural lenses. The panel's provocation - whether Digital Humanism requires a 'post-post-humanist' turn - was addressed through a productive tension: rather than abandoning humanism as outdated, contributors explored how its core values might be re-situated, expanded, and politicized to meet contemporary socio-technical challenges.

Despite differences in philosophical orientation, the contributors shared a deep concern for the prevailing limitations of both techno-utopianism and Western-centric narratives that often masquerade as universal human-centrism. Instead, they called for a re-articulation of human-technology relations - one that is attentive to plural epistemologies, situated knowledge, and the material and institutional conditions shaping digital life-worlds. The discussion illuminated the generative momentum of the Digital Humanism movement and emphasized the imperative to transform this momentum into tangible inter- and transdisciplinary collaboration. Such an approach is essential not only for anchoring shared normative commitments across diverse fields, but also for shaping the ethical, political, and infrastructural frameworks through which Digital Humanism might intervene in the digital condition (Stalder, 2018) of our time.

Digital Humanism as defined in the 'Vienna Manifesto on Digital Humanism' is a movement and philosophical approach that emphasizes placing human values, rights, and dignity at the center of technological development, particularly in the age of digital transformation and Artificial Intelligence (Werthner, 2025). It calls for critically examining how digital technologies shape society and aims to ensure that these tools serve democratic principles, individual freedoms, and social cohesion rather than undermining them.

According to its advocates, Digital Humanism must actively guide technological innovation to align with societal goals. In this view, the history of Digital Humanism is rooted in European intellectual traditions that champion human agency, reason, and ethics, now confronted with the accelerating impact of algorithms and automation. Digital humanism has argued that digital technologies must be transparent, aligned with societal values including sustainability, diversity, and consideration of non-humans. It needs to be developed with interdisciplinary insight, including from the social sciences and humanities. Digital Humanism is not just a critique of Big Tech's power but a constructive call to redesign systems where technology empowers rather than controls people. Importantly, this call was very much driven by computing professionals, hence it emerged

not as a call to theoretical deliberation, but as a move to a changing practice of IT design and education.

The five theses presented here emerged through collaborative post-panel synthesis. Following the session, contributors identified points of convergence across their presentations, focusing on recurring themes, productive tensions, and shared normative commitments. Selection criteria prioritised arguments that addressed limitations in existing Digital Humanism discourse, drew on distinct disciplinary perspectives whilst remaining in dialogue with one another, and offered both critical and constructive orientations. The resulting theses represent neither a simple aggregation of individual views nor a consensus document, but a distillation of what the contributors jointly recognised as essential coordinates for a critically grounded Digital Humanism. Our contribution is thus integrative rather than paradigm-shifting: we seek to enrich and re-situate Digital Humanism through critical perspectives often underrepresented in its foundational texts, not to replace it with an altogether different framework.

2 Five Theses for Digital Humanism

Thesis 1: Digital Humanism is not to be reduced to humanism.

While Digital Humanism draws from Renaissance and Enlightenment ideals - such as human dignity, autonomy, and rationality - it cannot be equated with classical humanism, nor should it be caricatured as merely a Western, anthropocentric project. Rather, Digital Humanism should be understood as a political and ethical response to contemporary forms of digital anti-humanism: the socio-technical processes through which algorithmic systems, data-driven infrastructures, and platform economies erode human agency, reduce persons to data points, and perpetuate systemic exclusion and control.

Digital Humanism, in this light, is a pragmatic and pluralist framework for resisting such dehumanization. It insists on re-centering the human - not as a fixed essence, but as a political figure of concern - to confront the loss of meaningful participation, accountability, and justice in the digital condition. This project calls for philosophical responsibility: acknowledging the critiques of humanism from feminist, postcolonial, and posthumanist perspectives without abandoning its historical democratic and emancipatory ambitions. These critiques have exposed how historical humanism often centered a narrow, Eurocentric ideal of the human - one that excluded women, racialized people, non-Western worldviews, and non-human life. Yet rejecting humanism wholesale risks discarding its potential as a framework for solidarity and normative orientation.

What is needed is a dialectical re-engagement with humanism: one that does not universalize from the particular, but instead understands the universality - e.g. of our fundamental rights - as an ongoing negotiation across differences. Humanity, in this view,

is not a fixed endpoint but an open, evolving condition shaped through the interplay of diverse perspectives, histories, and experiences. What we call 'the human' emerges in the space of communication and mutual recognition - not as a static identity, but as continually formed and reformed through relational encounters. In this sense, humanity is not a preordained endpoint, but a shared, unfolding condition (Collège des Bernardins, 2024), or a common ground (Arendt, 2010).

This has profound implications for the digital environment. The interconnectedness and ubiquity of digital infrastructures produce new forms of technological universalism - whether through globally shared platforms, interoperable standards, or more generally the planetary reach of computation and its power concentrations. While some digital phenomena can be localized, others exert effects that are necessarily transnational and transcultural and must be addressed through context-sensitive common grounds. Digital Humanism, then, requires tools to distinguish between harmful universalism and a pluralist, communicative universality grounded in situated yet interrelated experiences. Rather than opposing universality outright, the task is to shape it ethically: not as abstraction, but as a practice of relational inclusion - capable of guiding political agency, institutional design, and collective responsibility in the digital age (Prem, 2024). As a term, digital humanism is misleading as it never originated from an essentialist conception. It aims at a praxis and societal movement that recognizes humans and societies in their diversity, fosters regeneration and environmental views.

Thesis 2: Digital Humanism resists determinism and requires situated epistemologies.

Digital Humanism offers a critical alternative to two dominant yet problematic narratives of digital transformation: techno-determinism and techno-solutionism. Against the former, it challenges the belief that technological development unfolds according to its own inevitable logic - driven solely by efficiency, scalability, or market rationality - rendering societies passive and reactive (Winner, 1985; Wyatt, 2008). Such a view erases human agency, forecloses democratic deliberation, and normalizes the idea that 'there is no alternative' to technological trajectories set by corporate or state actors. In contrast, Digital Humanism re-centers society as a political and epistemic agent in the co-creation of technology. It emphasizes that digital futures are not predetermined but open to contestation, redirection, and collective shaping. This orientation is essential for those seeking not only to critique existing systems but to engage in transformative practice.

At the same time, Digital Humanism resists techno-solutionism - the belief that complex social problems can be solved primarily through technological innovation. This perspective treats technologies as neutral tools and obscures the political, economic, and cultural dimensions of both the problems and their supposed solutions (Eubanks, 2018; Morozov, 2013). Digital Humanism rejects the notion that technological artifacts are neutral; they embody and reinforce specific values, biases, and institutional agendas.

Rather than placing blind faith in innovation, it advocates a politics of bounded optimism - supporting technological advancement while foregrounding the need for deliberation, contextual sensitivity, and political imagination. By resisting both the fatalism of technological determinism and the oversimplifications of techno-solutionism, Digital Humanism thus seeks to build upon and support those already engaged in practices such as participatory design, ethical reflection, and inclusive governance, working toward technologies that serve democratic and socially just aims.

A key strategy in this effort is to foster transdisciplinary collaboration - bringing together expertise from the humanities, social sciences, technical disciplines, and civil society (Mayer and Strassnig, 2020; Werthner et al., 2022). Countering determinism requires more than critique: it demands spaces where engineers, designers, policymakers, and affected communities can co-develop frameworks that situate technical decisions within their broader societal contexts. Such collaboration makes it possible to reframe questions not only around what can be built, but what should be built, for whom, and under what conditions. Digital Humanism, in aligning with these efforts, strengthens its role as a mediating practice, connecting critical reflection with real-world interventions.

For Digital Humanism to realize its democratic and inclusive ambitions in practice, it must critically examine its own epistemic foundations by engaging more deeply with insights from feminist epistemology and Science and Technology Studies (STS). Without this reflection, Digital Humanism would risk reproducing Enlightenment-derived ideals, such as autonomy, rationality, and dignity, as if they were ahistorical and apolitical. These values, although normatively important, have also functioned as mechanisms of exclusion, legitimizing the marginalization of those deemed 'less human' or 'less rational' within sociotechnical systems. Feminist and STS perspectives offer tools to interrogate such assumptions through concepts like situated knowledge, relational autonomy, and systemic responsibility. They challenge the binary of 'humans vs. technology' and expose the embedded power dynamics within digital infrastructures (Benjamin, 2019; Haraway, 1988; Harding, 1991). The concept of knowledge as situated further challenges the pretence of a disembodied, universal 'view from nowhere,' arguing that all knowledge is produced from particular locations and that acknowledging this partiality enables more accountable and responsible knowledge claims (Haraway 1988).

Situated epistemologies thus deepen this vision by grounding universality in the material, historical, and relational conditions of knowledge production. They emphasize that what is commonly called 'the human' is not a static essence, but an evolving horizon shaped through interdependent experiences and positionalities. To move beyond ethical abstraction, Digital Humanism must also adopt a context-sensitive, practice-based ethics - one that asks: Whose values are encoded in digital systems? Who defines dignity, autonomy, or justice in specific technological contexts? Which systemic inequalities are embedded? (Barocas and Boyd, 2017; Birhane et al., 2022; Crawford, 2021). Engaging with critical technoscience provides conceptual and operational tools, such as

participatory design, algorithmic accountability, and plural epistemologies that can transform normative commitments into grounded interventions (D'Ignazio and Klein, 2019; Green, 2021; Schäfer et al., 2024). This re-situation allows Digital Humanism to shift from declarative ideals to institutional imagination, where values are tested, negotiated, and enacted in real-world settings.

Such an orientation also broadens the capacity for inter- and transdisciplinary collaboration by creating shared vocabularies and practices across fields. It fosters participatory engagements with diverse stakeholders - including technical experts, social scientists, activists, policy makers and affected communities - to co-create more just and contextually attuned technologies. In doing so, Digital Humanism shifts from a normative stance to a situated mode of sociotechnical world-making - a generative practice grounded in democratic engagement, epistemic plurality, and collaborative reconfigurations of technology and society.

Thesis 3: Digital Humanism contributes to the development of robust politics.

Digital Humanism aims at overcoming the false binary of innovation versus regulation. It aims to foster a more dynamic dialogue between regulators, public institutions, and industry to reimagine the governance of digital technologies. One important pillar for this is regulation, which is currently under attack, as highlighted in the Digital Humanism's 'Open Letter on the Urgent Need to Regulate Digital Technologies' (Digital Humanism, 2024). However, the challenges we face cannot be met by regulatory instruments alone. While frameworks like the European General Data Protection Regulation GDPR provide necessary baselines, they are insufficient to address the structural inequities and extractive dynamics embedded in the digital economy. Regulation should be regarded as a foundation, not a ceiling, for more ambitious political and institutional transformations. This requires moving from defensive measures to constructive alternatives: not only regulating against harm, but building public infrastructures, inventing new institutions, and articulating digital rights as positive liberties.

To build robust digital politics, Digital Humanism must advocate for public digital infrastructures and commons-based alternatives that resist the dominance of market-driven logics. Rather than accepting the primacy of hyperscalers and extractive platform capitalism, we need coordinated public investment in ethical, accountable, and socially beneficial technological systems. Diverse public voices, such as Mariana Mazzucato and Evgeny Morozov, alongside the Draghi Report's call for strategic state intervention, point to the urgency of reasserting public agency in digital development (Draghi, 2024; Mazzucato et al., 2022; Morozov, 2013). Federated infrastructures, such as those envisioned by initiatives like the Open Future Foundation or the Next Generation Internet (NGI) Digital Commons, offer concrete models for how this could be realized, alongside already existing initiatives such as the Barcelona Decidim platform for participatory governance or public library consortia providing open-access digital services

(Barandiaran et al. 2024; Bosman et al. 2021; EC 2025; OF 2024). In the future, large language models (LLMs), for example, could be hosted as public infrastructures by public libraries or universities, serving society as knowledge commons and supporting linguistic minorities rather than as proprietary tools governed by opaque corporate interests (Samdub, 2025; Sieker et al., 2025).

This shift may require not just better tools, but also new institutions. This may require the invention of new and potentially digital participatory governance models and infrastructure designed around public interest values. These include community-based platforms, transparent AI oversight mechanisms, and state-led stewardship of data and computation as public goods. The environmental and social costs of extractive digital infrastructures, such as data centers and cloud computing, must be properly accounted for and no longer externalized. A fact-based understanding of these costs is essential to designing policies that can redistribute power and resources more equitably.

Fundamentally, Digital Humanism should promote a vision of digital positive liberties: not only the right to be protected from harm online, but the right to access, shape, and co-govern the digital tools and infrastructures that affect our lives. The call for 'basic digital services' to be recognized and treated as public infrastructure is gaining traction - and should be amplified by the Digital Humanism movement. The current trajectory of digital governance continues to marginalize civil society voices, even as the influence of large technology corporations expands. This imbalance poses a real threat to democratic legitimacy. Digital Humanism must thus serve as a normative and practical force to help correct it by advancing institutional innovations that center justice, participation, and the common good.

At the same time, Digital Humanism needs to also move beyond regulation. The dominance of parasitic, asset-intensive platform models and the entanglement with deregulated capital markets have created a form of techno-feudalism that regulatory competition policies alone cannot dismantle (Morozov, 2022). Besides digital services for the public good, we may need other concepts from a renewed entrepreneurial digital virtue to communities of ethical practices. Digital Humanism should therefore advocate for new institutions, federated digital public infrastructures and their governance models, and the better recognition of digital civil rights based on the fundamental rights to ensure equitable access and participation in the digital sphere.

Thesis 4: Trust in generative AI must be critically redefined.

The challenge of trust in generative AI exemplifies the epistemic and political stakes outlined in the preceding theses: here, the need for situated knowledge, critical literacy, and democratic accountability converges in a concrete domain of human-technology relations. Probabilistic systems like large language models challenge both traditional and emerging conceptions of epistemic trust. Drawing from a non-standard account by

Francesco Striano (Striano, 2024), trust is not simply a matter of belief or reliance but an evaluative act - a judgment about the trustworthiness of a system based on its perceived reliability. Under this model, it is conceivable to extend trust to technologies if they meet such evaluative criteria. However, with LLMs, trust is often granted without this reflective process. These systems produce outputs that appear coherent, authoritative, and reliable, even though they are generated through probabilistic mechanisms rather than deterministic reasoning. Their fluency and speed simulate reliability, fostering a misplaced trust that is more about user perception than about actual trustworthiness.

This misplaced trust is amplified by the interactive, human-like design of LLM-based chatbots, which encourages users to relate to them as if they were rational agents. Rather than cultivating critical scrutiny, the design of these systems often promotes uncritical engagement. Digital Humanism must counter this tendency by promoting epistemic agency and critical digital literacy. Users should be equipped to interrogate and contextualize AI-generated content, recognizing the narrative and probabilistic nature of these outputs rather than accepting them at face value. Critical digital literacy can be fostered at multiple stages of education and life - as exemplified by Finland's national media literacy curriculum (Salomaa & Palsa 2019) or emerging university programmes on algorithmic accountability - but it should not be relegated to individual responsibility, in contrast, design choices should promote a more critical interaction. For example, some researchers have experimented with different interfaces of a chatbot, primarily proving more than one answer to a single user's request; this revealed the stochastic nature of LLM and led users to engage critically with the chatbot and its outputs, counteracting blind trust (Swoopes, Holloway and Glassman, 2025). In this context, trust should not be understood as passive acceptance, but as a reflexive and evaluative stance that allows for dissent, doubt, and revision.

What we face today is a trust paradox: many users engage with AI systems not because they trust them in an epistemic or moral sense, but because of convenience, fear of missing out, or the belief that these technologies will improve over time. This habituated reliance is often mistaken for trust but lacks the core ingredients of moral evaluation and freely given consent. In the absence of viable alternatives or adequate transparency, users develop a form of pseudo-trust - confidence without critique - which ultimately erodes their epistemic autonomy and reinforces the illusion of AI's infallibility.

Traditional and feminist theories of trust - such as those advanced by Baier (1986) and Govier (1992) - emphasize trust as a relationship between moral agents, grounded in goodwill, mutual vulnerability, and normative commitment. Extending such conceptions of trust to AI systems risks conferring moral agency upon machines, thereby distorting the very idea of trust. Moreover, the harms introduced by AI are often systemic and collective, disproportionately affecting marginalized communities. As Smuha (2021) notes, these harms do not stem from individual betrayal but from the structural vulnerabilities perpetuated by the systems themselves. Digital Humanism, therefore,

must resist anthropomorphizing AI and instead build frameworks that support critical engagement, protect vulnerable populations, and uphold human freedom in the digital age.

Thesis 5: Critical and ecological notions substantiate existing understandings of Digital Humanism.

While Thesis 2 addressed the epistemological foundations of Digital Humanism, the question of our ethical relations to the non-human world requires a distinct treatment: not only how we know, but how we ought to relate. The intensifying discourse on digitalisation and its environmental footprint has led to a renewed interest in ethical frameworks guiding technological development. Digital Humanism (Doueihi, 2011; Nida-Rümelin and Weidenfeld, 2022; Werthner et al., 2022) offers a perspective by placing human beings - along with their capacity for ethical judgement, boundary-setting, co-creative engagement and multi-modal literacy (Schmoelz, 2020) - at the center of technology use and development. However, in the light of the critique it faces for its western- and male-centrism in the shape of human-centrism, we suggest that Digital Humanism can evolve into a more relational and ecologically aware ethics that responds to the ambivalent legacy of Enlightenment thought and aligns human well-being with responsible environmental stewardship. This does not require abandoning its human-centered focus but demands a rethinking of human-nature relations in relational rather than hierarchical terms. Relational ethics recognizes that human well-being is foundationally intertwined with the protection of the natural world. Relational ethics allow us to take into account different life worlds where not only human actors are recognised as active moral subjects, but instead also take non-human actors such as plants and nature as deserving of moral consideration (Coeckelbergh, 2018; Metz & Miller, 2013). Relational ethics allows us to inform our relationship with other entities, such as nature, meaning that in the end, it focuses on 'how we humans, as relational beings, relate and are related to in general' (Coeckelbergh, 2018, p. 106). We forward a critical and ecological Digital Humanism that critically emphasizes the rooting of exploiting nature and humans alike in the capitalist and progressive neoliberal project (Fuchs, 2022; Schmoelz, 2023).

The care for nature is rooted in the necessity of maintaining environmental conditions that enable human well-being as end-in-itself. Digital Humanism does not propose a purely eco-centric stance - an approach that might prioritize nature even at the expense of human well-being - but rather emphasizes a critical human-centered environmental ethic. As critics point out (Brevini, 2022; Lucivero, 2020; Saenko, 2023), the massive ecological costs of digital infrastructures, particularly AI technologies, pose urgent ethical questions. Digital Humanism addresses the vast energy demands of AI as well as the broader spectrum of environmental exploitation: the extraction of rare minerals, the consumption of water resources, and the global supply chains that support data-centers and device production. To advance a meaningful ecological engagement, Digital

Humanism critically reflects on its historical roots. Digital Humanism today consciously distances itself from this aspect of Enlightenment thinking, which partially overwrote the emancipatory notion of humanist philosophy (Horkheimer and Adorno, 1969).

Digital Humanism actively integrates principles of care ethics and ecological responsibility into its normative framework. Inspired by recent critiques of hierarchical and exclusive anthropocentrism (Braidotti, 2013; Coeckelbergh, 2024; Goodley et al., 2020; Prem, 2024), Digital Humanism can contribute an alternative vision to both anti-humanist hierarchical relation between humans and with nature as well as a post-humanist depersonalisation of agency. Digital Humanism calls for an ethics of responsibility: developing technologies and infrastructures that respect ecological limits while fostering human wellbeing. This perspective encourages rethinking digital technologies as embedded within social and ecological systems. It promotes human traits such as setting values and boundaries, multimodal literacy and co-creativity (Schmoelz, 2020) for fostering a more reflexive understanding of our impacts on the environment. The Vienna Manifesto on Digital Humanism has already highlighted the need for democratic control and humane values in digital development; the next step is to explicitly extend this to ecological considerations. This proposed critical and ecological Digital Humanism seeks a synthesis: upholding human dignity and agency while acknowledging the material conditions that sustain human well-being. We advocate for policies and design principles that minimize resource consumption, avoid unnecessary extraction, and promote circular economies within digital production chains.

Synthesis: Digital Humanism becomes effective when enacted as an embedded, collective practice.

To be clear, these theses do not exhaust the critical perspectives needed - questions of labour, global inequalities in AI development, and disability remain vital and underexplored - but represent the convergences that emerged from our particular interdisciplinary encounter. However, our theses trace a coherent arc: from reframing Digital Humanism as a political rather than essentialist project, through the epistemological and institutional conditions for its realisation - resisting determinism, centring situated knowledge, building public infrastructures, cultivating critical trust, and extending ethical concern to ecological relations. Together, they articulate Digital Humanism not as a fixed doctrine but as a reflexive framework shaped by feminist, ecological, and democratic commitments.

Taken together, all our theses argue that realizing the transformative potential of Digital Humanism requires its enactment as an embedded practice. It must evolve beyond a theoretical or philosophical orientation and take shape as a lived, situated practice - one that is actively embedded in academic, civic, business and political institutions. This requires the cultivation of long-term communities of practice in which scholars, technologists, policymakers, activists, and citizens work collaboratively to co-develop

ethical, inclusive, and context-sensitive responses to digital transformation. These communities cannot be engineered top-down or imported wholesale; rather, they must grow dialogically, rooted in existing initiatives, local conditions, and diverse knowledge traditions.

Such an approach foregrounds sustained collaboration and mutual learning over isolated expertise. Session discussants have stressed that the future of Digital Humanism hinges not only on interdisciplinarity, but on the co-creation of shared infrastructures, vocabularies, and political imaginaries. Institutionalizing Digital Humanism through these practices enables a shift from normative ideals to operational frameworks that support ethical reasoning, democratic engagement, and social justice in technological development. It also helps bridge the structural divide between critique and implementation, ensuring that ethical reflection is not confined to the margins of design but integrated into its everyday operations. Ultimately, it is through these embedded and participatory modes of engagement that Digital Humanism can move from aspiration to action. Rather than remaining an abstract call for better technology, it becomes a platform for collective world-making.

3 Conclusion: Digital Humanism must grow as a pluralistic movement

Our initial provocation of 'post-post-humanism' does not claim a new paradigm but signals a double movement: taking seriously the critiques of classical humanism whilst refusing to abandon some of its normative and political resources. What emerges is not a resolution of these tensions but a Digital Humanism that remains attentive to its own exclusions. So, in closing, we argue that Digital Humanism can only fulfill its ethical and political promise if it evolves as a pluralistic movement and a dynamic 'boundary object' (Star and Griesemer, 1989). Adaptable across diverse contexts while grounded in shared commitments, boundary objects enable coordination without requiring full consensus. However, to translate Digital Humanism's current momentum into transformative practice, it needs to both broaden and deepen: broaden by engaging with diverse epistemic traditions, worldviews, and local contexts beyond Anglo-European paradigms; deepen by articulating normative principles that are ethically robust without reverting to essentialist or universalist abstractions. Rather than acting as a vessel for fixed normative meanings, Digital Humanism should operate as a flexible framework that enables meaningful collaboration across disciplinary, institutional, and geopolitical divides, while maintaining enough coherence to sustain a shared orientation toward democratic, just, and humane digital futures. This requires resonance without rigidity. As humanist values are taken up in different settings, they must be rearticulated in ways that reflect situated knowledge, lived experience, and plural visions of the good life. Remaining true to its humanistic aspirations entails centering global plurality and fostering genuinely transnational dialogues. Resisting epistemic hegemonies - especially those rooted in

dominant intellectual traditions - is not a rejection but an act of inclusion, necessary for co-creating ethical digital worlds in which multiple futures can be imagined and realized. The five theses presented in this paper aim to chart a path toward such a re-situated Digital Humanism - one that is critically grounded, politically engaged, and capable of shaping inclusive and sustainable digital futures.

References

Arendt, H., 2010. The human condition, 2. ed., [Nachdr.]. ed. Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Baier, A., 1986. Trust and antitrust. Ethics 96, 231-260.

Barandiaran, X.E., Calleja-López, A., Monterde, A., Aragón, P., Linares, J., Romero, C., Pereira, A., 2024. Decidim: Political and Technopolitical Networks for Participatory Democracy. Decidim Association, Barcelona. https://docs.decidim.org/en/develop/whitepaper/what-is-decidim.html Accessed 1.12.2025

Barocas, S., Boyd, D., 2017. Engaging the ethics of data science in practice. Commun. ACM 60, 23-25. https://doi.org/10.1145/3144172

Benjamin, R., 2019. Race after technology: abolitionist tools for the new Jim code. Polity, Medford, MA.

Birhane, A., Kalluri, P., Card, D., Agnew, W., Dotan, R., Bao, M., 2022. The Values Encoded in Machine Learning Research. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2106.15590

Bosman, J., Frantsvåg, J.E., Kramer, B., Langlais, P.-C., Proudman, V., 2021. The OA Diamond Journals Study: Exploring collaborative community-driven publishing models for Open Access. Part 1: Findings. Science Europe / cOAlition S. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4558704

Braidotti, R., 2013. The Posthuman. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Brevini, B., 2022. Is AI Good for the Planet? Polity Press.

Coeckelbergh, M. (2018). What do we mean by a relational ethics? In *Plant Ethics: Concepts and Applications* (1st edn, pp. 98-109). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315114392

Coeckelbergh, M., 2024. What is digital humanism? A conceptual analysis and an argument for a more critical and political digital (post)humanism. Journal of Responsible Technology 17, 100073. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrt.2023.100073

Collège des Bernardins, 2024. For a Critical Digital Humanism. Département Humanisme Numérique.

Crawford, K., 2021. The atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence. Yale University Press.

Digital Humanism, 2024. An Open Letter on the Urgent Need to Regulate Digital Technologies [WWW Document]. DIGHUM. URL https://caiml.org/dighum/open-letter-on-the-urgent-need-to-regulate-digital-technologies/ (accessed 6.4.25).

D'Ignazio, C., Klein, L., 2019. Data feminism. MIT Press.

Doueihi, M., 2011. Pour un humanisme numérique, La librairie du XXIe siècle. Éditions du Seuil, Paris.

Draghi, M., 2024. The future of European competitiveness. EU Commission.

EC European Commission, 2025. Next Generation Internet Initiative. Shaping Europe's Digital Future. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/next-generation-internet-initiative Accessed 1.12.2025

Eubanks, V., 2018. Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor. St. Martin's Press.

Fuchs, C., 2022. Digital Humanism: A Philosophy for 21st Century Digital Society, SocietyNow. Emerald Publishing Limited, Bingley, UK.

Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., Liddiard, K., Runswick-Cole, K., 2020. The Desire for New Humanisms. Journal of Disability Studies in Education 1, 125-144. https://doi.org/10.1163/25888803-00101003

Govier, T., 1992. Trust, distrust, and feminist theory. Hypatia 7, 16-33.

Green, B., 2021. Data science as political action: Grounding data science in a politics of justice. Journal of Social Computing 2, 249-265.

Haraway, D., 1988. Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. Feminist Studies 14, 575-599.

Harding, S., 1991. Whose science? Whose knowledge?: Thinking from women's lives. Cornell University Press.

Horkheimer, M., Adorno, T.W., 1969. Dialektik der Aufklärung. Philosophische Fragmente. S. Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt a. Main.

Lucivero, F., 2020. Big Data, Big Waste? A Reflection on the Environmental Sustainability of Big Data Initiatives. Science and Engineering Ethics 26, 1009-1030. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-019-00171-7

Mayer, K., Strassnig, M., 2020. The Digital Humanism Initiative in Vienna: A Report based on our Exploratory Study Commissioned by the City of Vienna, in: Fritz, J., Tomaschek, N. (Eds.), Digitaler Humanismus. Waxmann Verlag. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4250144

Mazzucato, M., Schaake, M., Krier, S., Entsminger, J., 2022. Governing artificial intelligence in the public interest. UCL Institute for Innovation and Public Purpose, Working Paper Series (IIPP WP 2022-12). Retrieved April 2, 2023.

Metz, T., & Miller, S. C. (2013). Relational Ethics. In *International Encyclopedia of Ethics* (1st edn). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444367072

Morozov, E., 2022. Critique of Techno-Feudal Reason. New Left Rev 89-126.

Morozov, E., 2013. To save everything, click here: The folly of technological solutionism. PublicAffairs, New York.

Nida-Rümelin, J., Weidenfeld, N., 2022. Digital Humanism: For a Humane Transformation of Democracy, Economy and Culture in the Digital Age. Springer International Publishing, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-12482-2

OF, Open Future Foundation, 2024. Digital Commons as Providers of Public Digital Infrastructures. Open Future, Amsterdam. https://openfuture.eu/publication/digital-commons-as-providers-of-public-digital-infrastructures/ Accessed 1.12.2025

Prem, E., 2024. Principles of digital humanism: A critical post-humanist view. Journal of Responsible Technology 17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrt.2024.100075

Salomaa, S., Palsa, L., 2019. Media Literacy in Finland: National Media Education Policy. Ministry of Education and Culture, Helsinki. https://medialukutaitosuomessa.fi/mediaeducationpolicy.pdf Accessed 1.12.2025

Saenko, K., 2023. Is generative AI bad for the environment? A computer scientist explains the carbon footprint of ChatGPT and its cousins.

Samdub, M., 2025. Digital Public Infrastructure at a Turning Point.

Schäfer, M.T., Es, K., Lauriault, T., 2024. Collaborative Research in the Datafied Society. Collaborative Research in the Datafied Society.

Schmoelz, A., 2023. Digital Humanism, Progressive Neoliberalism and the European Digital Governance System for Vocational and Adult Education. Journal of Adult and Continuing Education. https://doi.org/10.1177/14779714231161449

Schmoelz, A., 2020. Die Conditio Humana Im Digitalen Zeitalter. Zur Grundlegung Des Digitalen Humanismus Und Des Wiener Manifests. MedienPädagogik. Zeitschrift Für Theorie Und Praxis Der Medienbildung 208-234. https://doi.org/10.21240/mpaed/00/2020.11.13.X

Sieker, F., Tarkowski, A., Gimpel, L., Osborne, C., 2025. Public AI - White Paper 73 S. https://doi.org/10.11586/2025040

Smuha, N.A., 2021. Beyond individual harm: Conceptualising AI's broader societal impacts, in: Dubber, M.D., Pasquale, F., Das, S. (Eds.), The Oxford Handbook of AI Ethics. Oxford University Press.

Stalder, F., 2018. The digital condition, English edition. ed. Polity Press, Cambridge Medford, [Massachusetts].

Star, S.L., Griesemer, J.R., 1989. Institutional Ecology, `Translations' and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907-39. Social Studies of Science 19, 387-420.

Striano, F., 2024. The Vice of Transparency. A Virtue Ethics Account of Trust in Technology.

Swoopes, C., Holloway, T., Glassman, E.L., 2025. The Impact of Revealing Large Language Model Stochasticity on Trust, Reliability, and Anthropomorphization, in arXiv.org, URL https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.16114 (accessed 10.10.25).

Werthner, H., 2025. Digital Humanism and the Vienna Manifesto, in: Digital Humanism. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, pp. 83-87. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-86905-1_7

Werthner, H., Prem, E., Lee, E.A., Ghezzi, C. (Eds.), 2022. Perspectives on Digital Humanism. Springer International Publishing, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-86144-5

Winner, L., 1985. Do Artefacts Have Politics? In The Social Shaping of Technology: How the Refrigerator Got Its Hum, Donald MacKenzie and Judy Wacjman (eds.), 26-38.

Wyatt, S., 2008. Technological Determinism is Dead; Long Live Technological Determinism, in: Hackett, E., Amsterdamska, O., Lynch, M., Wajcman, J. (Eds.), The Handbook of Science and Technology Studies. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 165-180.