

Digitalization and mediatization as tools for forming new types of subjectivity

Dr. Vadim Palahuta

National University of Technology

✉ Email: palaguta@ua.fm

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4254-1625>

Abstract

The article explores the latest opportunities for refined control over individuals by power structures within the so-called surveillance capitalism of contemporary society. It highlights the use of advanced tools of digitalization and mediatization, as well as the formation of new types of subjectivity. It identifies the mechanisms through which modern power relations in a control society (domination and coercion of individuals) emerge, differing significantly from traditional forms of governance and control in pre-modern and early modern European societies. The discussion is based on Michel Foucault's concept of socio-historical types of power relations in societies, including sovereign power, disciplinary society, and control society in its current digital form.

The paper analyzes the history of concepts such as biopower, biopolitics, and biomass introduced by Foucault, starting with his studies of disciplinary society. It demonstrates that biopower, aimed at managing masses and controlling individuals, implemented mechanisms during the disciplinary society that have evolved further in today's control society through digitalization and mediatization. Its essence involves transforming people into civilian individuals with formal democratic rights and freedoms while simultaneously maintaining the totalization of the population as biomass.

The state is shown to simultaneously undertake the functions of totalization and individualization in the formation of modern subjectivity, from which individuals attempt to escape through nomadic practices and techniques of freedom that guarantee authentic subjectivation.

It argues that with the extensive use of the socio-philosophical doctrine of neo-behaviorism, the formation of representations and behaviors of individuals is justified at all levels of their life activities. This creates conditions for the emergence of new types of subjectivity that fully satisfy neo-globalists. As a result of this long-term process of modern biopolitics, not only has the role of democratic institutions in contemporary society diminished, but neoliberalism could become the "breeding ground" for digital totalitarian regimes of governance and control.

Keywords

subjectivity, individual, digitalization, mediatization, biopolitics, biopower, biomass

Introduction

It is well known that the modern global process of globalization has chosen neoliberal values as its socio-political foundation. However, these neoliberal values no longer continue the traditional values of classical liberalism from the early and mid-20th century. Classical liberalism was based on the freedom of individual entrepreneurial activity, unregulated markets, guaranteed functioning of various democratic state institutions, and the rule of law in society. In essence, liberalism fostered ideas of state control, comprehensive rational thinking, legislative mandates, and vertical discipline. However, neoliberalism as an ideology, particularly in its modern globalist form, has very little in common with classical liberalism. Today, it has become a primary source of total control over the population as biomass, gradually descending into a new form of totalitarianism.

One of the means for disseminating neoliberal ideology has been global information corporations such as Google, Facebook, Instagram, Amazon, Twitter, and others. This has made it possible to establish constant surveillance and control over the vast majority of the world's population. Indeed, the total digitalization and mediatization of all aspects of modern society – business, education, science, politics, leisure, and cultural preferences – has expanded enormously and quickly permeates even the personal lives of individuals in most civilized countries. Moreover, the intrusion of digital mediatization into individuals' personal lives not only affects their various social or discursive practices but also allows for continuous monitoring of their thoughts, feelings, and desires. This enables the establishment of 24/7 total control over every individual connected to information-computer networks in modern information societies. Digitalization further facilitates constant monitoring of the most intimate aspects of people's daily lives.

Thus, total digitalization and mediatization not only enable offering and advertising what individuals should buy, eat, read, watch, listen to, or how to relax but also closely track their emotional state, fears, phobias, secret desires, dreams, and much more. In other words, digitalization scans individuals from within, allowing external computer-information networks to know more about them than they might know about themselves. Consequently, the calculations of information globalists have a clear objective: by immersing ordinary individuals in the *digital world*, they ensure constant control and management over almost every aspect of their existence.

In this context, a pressing issue of a socio-humanitarian and interdisciplinary nature is studying the influence of powerful digital technologies on the process of subjectivation. This will allow us to trace the emergence of new types of subjectivity in modern society. The emer-

gence of new types of subjectivity was anticipated by French philosopher Gilles Deleuze, who, in the early 1990s, spoke of the so-called «*dividual*», characterized by a fragmented, mutable existence stretched across various information-computer networks – «individuals become ‘dividuals,’ and masses become samples, markets, and data banks» (Deleuze, 1997, p. 216).

Analysis of Recent Research. Analysis of Recent Research

Recent publications indicate global and significant socio-political and socio-economic changes in the modern world, leading to the emergence of unprecedented types of subjectivity. Recent studies directly point to possible directions for the development of modern information society, which has transitioned into its current phase – the digital media society. These societal changes inevitably result in the transformation of individuals. Such transformations, influencing the emergence of new types of subjectivity, are explored in the works of prominent contemporary scholars from various socio-humanitarian disciplines, including Giorgio Agamben (1993, 2021), H. Alemán (2023), and a series of studies by Byung-Chul Han (2011, 2015, 2017, 2023), Judith Butler (1997, 2005), Rosi Braidotti (2013), Manuel DeLanda (2006), Berardi, F. (2007). Works on these topics have also been published by Shoshana Zuboff (2019), Slavoj Žižek (1989, 2020, 2022), Peter Newman (2015), Alex Pentland (2015), Francis Fukuyama (2018, 2022), Steve Fuller (2018), Nico Carpentier (2017), Umberto Eco (1997), Francesca Ferrando (2019), Mark Fisher (2009) and other scientists and researchers.

Methods

The research methodology corresponds to interdisciplinary studies and is inherently complex, combining the method of social constructivism to study the influence of digitalization and mediatization on the formation of new types of subjectivity. This approach is complemented by other socio-humanitarian methods such as comparative analysis, phenomenological interpretation, hermeneutic-interpretive analysis, structural-psychoanalysis, and discourse analysis in addressing the stated research topic.

Purpose

The main theoretical task is to examine the existential state of modern individuals under the dominance of digitalization and mediatization processes in contemporary society. Therefore, the purpose of this article is to study the consequences of implementing digital technologies as tools of neoliberal ideology, significantly affecting the formation of new types of subjectivity.

Results

The analysis of the identified problem revealed that digitalization and mediatization serve as an ideal foundation for forming modern types of subjectivity.

These types of subjectivity have lost the characteristics inherent in individuals of the previous liberal era and earlier times. The concepts of biopower, biopolitics, and biomass introduced by Michel Foucault were examined.

It was demonstrated that contemporary society combines the disciplinary power of previous eras with the control society, coexisting side by side. However, through large-scale

digitalization and mediatization, in which powerful global information giants play a significant role, it has become possible to establish continuous governance and control over the vast majority of the world's population, fully satisfying authorities at all levels.

The implementation of global technologies for managing individual behavior as biomass, along with the process of individual digitization driven by modern neo-globalists using advanced digital technologies and artificial intelligence, was shown not only to significantly transform the subjectivity of contemporary individuals but also to condition the emergence of new types of subjectivity in the near future.

It is hypothesized that at the current stage of civil society development, an urgent search for alternatives to the global digital society is needed, as a real threat of a unique digital concentration camp organized by authorities at all levels has emerged.

Therefore, further examination of the issue should involve in-depth research into new types of subjectivity arising in the digital age, considering the simultaneous weakening and strengthening of dual power coercion, i.e., the individualization and totalization of individuals. A particularly interesting area of study is the exploration of subjectivity types that are not imposed by power structures. These alternatives to neoliberalism in the digital era – characterized by identity politics and the rhetoric of differences – enable the division of individuals, establish strict boundaries for them, and maintain them at a tolerant distance from one another.

Discussion

It is known that modern society is characterized by terms such as informational, post-industrial, consumer, risk, postmodern, late modernity, programmed, advanced capitalism, achievements and others. However, the most defining feature of modern society today is total digitalization and mediatization, making «surveillance capitalism» the most appropriate definition. The genesis of such a society is linked to theatricality, conceptualized as the «society of the spectacle» by the French philosopher and situationist Guy Debord in the late 1960s. At the time, Debord could not have imagined how accurately his characterization of society – as simultaneously digital, media-based, and theatrical – would apply to today. These definitions, to varying degrees, encompass the other aforementioned characteristics, yet total digitalization amplifies the spectacle's theatrical qualities. Spectacles, through expanded digitalization, transform reality into a stream of images, which itself becomes a «living» reality for individuals. According to Debord, what was presented as real life reveals itself simply as life *most genuinely spectacular* (Debord, 1996). This not only enables observation and control of individuals but also manipulation of the perceptions and emotions of large audiences through the extensive use of visually narrative social networks.

Key questions arise: What now defines the primary content of subjectivity in modern individuals? Who, and for what purpose, is interested in controlling and manipulating vast populations worldwide through digital and media technologies?

Indeed, for a long time it was believed that the main socio-philosophical and public idea and value of liberalism was the freedom of will of individuals, which was embodied in dynamic entrepreneurial activity. Each individual possessed certain civil rights and freedoms, aspirations for their realization, sufficient autonomy in views and actions, and the ability to make any free choice in their existence, of course, without violating generally accepted state and international laws. This foundation of human civilizational existence was always grounded in a sense of personal subjectivity, significance, and social value. Therefore, civil rights and freedoms have always been a matter of pride for capitalist business activity, a triumph of the political and social institutions of democracy.

Thus, for capitalist market relations, this is personal interest and competitive relations, in interpersonal relations individualism or collectivism prevails, in consumerism – the right to choose, and the freedom provided by political rights – freedom of speech, freedom of opinion, the right to political associations, the right to privacy, the right to secrecy of correspondence and telephone conversations, etc., that is, freedom was understood as something that ensures human dignity for individuals. It should be added that social practices of freedom, which were legally enshrined in various spheres of society, tended to constantly expand and increase during the era of classical liberalism.

However, modern neoliberalism, particularly in its globalist form, features digital control. Unlike the constant surveillance typical of totalitarian societies in the recent past, this digital control is not perceived by individuals as an external limitation on their rights and freedoms. Instead, a paradox emerges where individual autonomy and sovereignty coincide with an objective control system, where the restriction or partial deprivation of democratic rights and freedoms is felt by individuals as true freedom. The fact is that in the modern consumer society, *permissiveness and free choice* become the highest individual values and needs, so social control and domination can no longer be seen as an alleged encroachment on the civil rights and freedoms of individuals.

This is what the modern ardent ideologist of neoliberalism Francis Fukuyama draws attention to, who writes that the most valuable social aspect of individual rights and freedoms, from the era of the French Revolution onward, is the very act of choice itself, which is considered by itself, separately, and has greater axiological significance than the essence of the thing being chosen, valued more than the substance of the choice (Fukuyama, 2022).

In this view, the essence of social rights and freedoms lies primarily in the ability to choose anything within permissible bounds and the indulgence in desires—regarded as the highest values in civil society. That is, according to the American political scientist, the essence of social rights and freedoms for individuals is, first of all, the right to choose everything that is within the limits of what is permitted and permissible, and permissiveness in one's desires, which is the most valuable for the life of a subject in civil society. In other words, because *permissiveness and freedom of choice* are considered the highest individual values in modern society, then there is no particular need to fear any external restrictions and control, as if they no longer exist at all.

However, this is self-deception – the digital network knows everything about individuals, down to the smallest details, thanks to the latest digital technology Big Data, which calculates, accumulates and stores all quantitative parameters, the entire voluminous database about the individual. However, this is usually not given much attention either – these «features» of civil rights and freedoms push other important civil rights and freedoms into the background at the expense of the self-perception of individuals (as if they were free and capable citizens) in a modern democratic society. But this makes them toys in the arms of not only international information and mass media corporations, but also organs of all levels and directions of state power. But how does this affect social rights and freedoms that define the process of individual subjectification in society?

To address this question, it is necessary to recall the type of power that preceded the society of digital control in which modern individuals now exist. Actually, as noted by Giorgio Agamben, concern for the life and health of subjects began to take an important place in the mechanisms of state functioning and economy as early as the XVII century, leading to the birth of police science. He emphasizes that sovereign power gradually transformed into biopower, according to Michel Foucault's concept. Biopolitics of the Modern Age is characterized by the notion that life prevails over death (Agamben, 2002).

In this form of power, the focus shifts from the sovereign state to the population state, where the state takes control of the security, life, and health of its population as biomass. This

exists within confined disciplinary spaces (schools, hospitals, barracks, factories, psychiatric institutions, prisons, etc.) where the population can be dispersed from disciplinary spaces. This legitimizes biopolitics as a set of control technologies for managing the behavior of large groups of people through biopower.

In his lectures at the Collège de France during 1975-1976 (Foucault, 1997), 1977-1978 (Foucault, 2004a), and 1978-1979 (Foucault, 2004b), Foucault further developed the concept of «biomass» and laid the foundations of modern biopolitics. In his lecture on March 17, 1976 (Foucault, 1997), he expanded on the concept of «biomass», which has become increasingly significant in modern times. In accordance with which, since the late 18th century, a new people management technology has been forming, distinct from disciplinary power.

While disciplinary power focused solely on controlling individual corporeality, namely, – sovereign power to govern the lives of subordinates, – this new technology begins to manage and group mass actions of populations, aiming to control random events, which can occur in a living mass, calculate the probability of some mass events and try to compensate for their adverse consequences (Foucault, 1997).

Thus, this newest power technology, on the one hand, focuses entirely on managing, controlling, and regulating mass biological processes, and allows biopower, with the availability of political, technical, and now the latest Internet technological capabilities, not only to regulate the lives of a large mass of people, but also to allow the population to exist normally and grow quantitatively. However, on the other hand, – the issue of using biopower technologies in the context of individual freedom is approached differently. In his later lectures, Foucault vividly discusses this. For example, in his January 24, 1979, lecture, he defines freedom as something produced hourly, directly linked to biomass security, and should not pose a security threat to it (Foucault, 2004b).

Thus, liberal techniques of governance and control over the population, identified as biomass, inherently involve both the production and destruction of freedom; that is, types of freedom are not guaranteed by the government, but consumed by it, it is itself a consumer of freedom; therefore its «production» of freedom always involves its restriction through strict control procedures, constant suppression, obligations, responsibilities, coercion, or even its abolition under extraordinary circumstances. And here there is no way to talk about freedom in the ontological-ethical dimension that I. Kant relied on in his works. Just at that time manipulation of rights relations, freedom, and security became routine practices in the power-population relationship.

However, biopower of disciplinary society operates in two capacities: as a protector and an overseer. It cares for the well-being and growth of the population while ensuring the health and welfare of individual subjects, doubling control over both the population and over a single individual. According to Agamben, during the disciplinary process by which state power transforms the individual (as a living being) into its specific object, a parallel process emerges, coinciding with the rise of modern democracy. Here, humans (as living beings) are no longer objects but subjects of political power.

Thus, a completely different type of power relationship between biopower and the individual was launched on a long-term basis, defined as mutual submission, which is radically different from the one-sided obedience characteristic of the authoritarian power of the sovereign of traditional society.

The mechanism of this type of bio-government is the exclusion of an individual from the mass, and then his inclusion in the biomass, reintegrating, but in other cases he can be in the form of an included/excluded one, which imposes certain obligations on the biopower itself, which allows declaring the life and freedom of the citizen as the most important strategic goal of all further biopolitics. Therefore, the subordination of biopower through the process of subjectification of individuals means its subordination by one's own consent, representing a kind of social contract with biopower.

However, presenting the concept of biopower in disciplinary societies of closed spaces, M. Foucault perfectly understood its relatively short-lived dominance in society and the «heyday» of which falls on the XIX and first half of the XX centuries. Indeed, the disciplinary power of capitalism, primarily oriented towards the economic exploitation of manual laborers, has been, since the second half of the 20th century, in a state of deep crisis, it does not disappear anywhere, in what, in our opinion, is somewhat mistaken by Byung-Chul Han, who claims that the disciplinary society has been replaced by a society of digital control and that the society of the XXI century is a society of achievements (*Leistungsgesellschaft*), whose inhabitants are called subjects of achievement; this is, according to Byung-Chul Han, not a disciplinary society with its obedient subjects (Byung-Chul, 2015, 2023). But what about the numerous budgetary state institutions, organizations, and enterprises with their social practices of subjectivation, where traditional models of disciplinary power are reproduced? They will not disappear under the conditions of the existence of any type of state, which E. Goffman wrote about in his famous work «Total Institutions». Therefore, disciplinary spaces in a postmodern society – a society of control – will exist, but in the conduct of biopolitics they will no longer have the same significance as in the past times of modernity. Moreover, they will not play a decisive role in the subjectivization of individuals (Goffman, 2007).

For the modern society of control, the implementation of such a principle required and still requires the development of more sophisticated techniques of individualization or its transformation into a subject, but with the simultaneous preservation population totalization as biomass. Thus, a similar excursion into the study of historical types of power by M. Foucault, carried out by him at the end of the seventies of the last century, allows us to more clearly understand how the subjectivity of the recent past was formed and the basis of which for modern societies must simultaneously be performed by the state in the form of its totalizing and individualizing function. Actually, the biopower of the state turns out to be something that simultaneously organizes the behavior of huge masses of the population and at the same time performs identification of each individual as a citizen, which should ensure constant power control.

However, institutional structures support inequality, contributing to the preservation of the positions of elites. State and private organizations represent similar structures in which the formal organization and the organization of individuals themselves intersect and replace each other in real relationships, as the American social philosopher Manuel DeLanda draws attention to. But in his opinion, in modern society, means of control are becoming more differentiated, developed, and hard. To analyze the process of the formation of a modern legal state, DeLanda refers to the research of M. Foucault, – about the disciplinary or supervisory, police-legal origin of the state with its «permanent registration of bodies and actions», during which the territorialization of society is carried out through constant accounting and military control (DeLanda, 2006, pp. 72–73).

Therefore, the most effective means of performing the controlling function over biomass is provided by the widespread introduction of digital technologies for the effective implementation of biopolitics in the new socio-political and socio-economic conditions of *neo-globalization*. At the same time, a challenge to biopower can only be raised by individuals who do not wish to become the object of biopower control, namely those who have «completed the experience within themselves», who know how to govern themselves, those who are able to constantly (in Foucault's words) demonstrate «care for themselves» as the ability to cultivate individual practices of freedom.

To prevent this from becoming a mass phenomenon, the modern bio-power of the financial, economic and political elite is working to stay ahead – further developing digitalization and medialization, which consumes huge financial and intellectual resources. This is fully facilitated by the use of the newest digital and technological capabilities, on the one hand.

On the other hand, neo-behaviorism is now «blooming», becoming one of the most popular socio-philosophical doctrines of our time in modern civil society. According to this doctrine, modern individuals, that is, individuals as representatives of biomass, can be constantly controlled, and their behavioral orientation can be shaped at all levels of their life activity through the introduction of modern Internet technologies. This is exactly what the founder of radical behaviorism, B.F. Skinner, dreamed of at one time. The American scientist denied the importance of freedom for man, he did not see an autonomous individual as such or, in his own language, an «internal homunculus» and greatly regretted that in his time, that is, in the middle and second half of the XX century, there were no technological possibilities to control and change the behavior of individuals in the necessary direction (Skinner, 2002). One of the current followers of this socio-philosophical and psychological doctrine now is A. Pentland, the author of the book «Social Physics», who radically simplified and reduced complex individual behavior to endless repetitive patterns of behavior. The author argues that there is no difference between observing humans, monkeys, or bees, which allows us to derive rules of behavior, response, and learning for the formation of a modern individual as a representative of some community. This research approach allows him to define his research program exclusively in terms of mathematical, predictive social science, which takes into account individual differences and relationships between people and makes it possible to radically change the thinking and actions of individuals. According to A. Pentland, this will allow individuals to use social network incentives to establish new norms of behavior (Pentland, 2015).

Thus, when planning biopolitics, today's globalists get into their hands a perfect tool not only for control, but also for programming the consciousness and unconscious of individuals, which cannot but worry famous modern philosophers, in particular G. Agamben (2021), H. Alemán (2023), S. Žižek (2020, 2022). The famous American sociologist and political scientist Sh. Zuboff (2019) writes in her work that today humanity has faced that historical moment when the basic right to life in the future is threatened by the ubiquitous and comprehensive digital architecture of behavioral changes, which belongs to surveillance capital and is constantly managed by it. This, in the researcher's opinion, is very dangerous for the individual and his freedom of existence.

Thus, by collecting all kinds of data about each individual, global information corporations appropriate (for their own and not only their own purposes) «behavioral surpluses», which are then used to predict what the individual will do, – not only now, but also in the near and distant future. But this, according to the idea of Sh. Zuboff, undermines the individual, who defines himself as the pillar of the institutions of democracy, which, in turn, remains the only channel for reforms, the only idea that was born from a long history of suppression of man by man and which insists on the inalienable right of people to govern themselves (Zuboff, 2019).

The essence of this threat is to make the most of the individual's «openness» to the modern digital community, his ability to tell all sorts of «stories» about himself to the audience of social networks, using the entire digital and spectacular arsenal, at the same time introducing the audience to his purely personal, intimate details of life. But the phenomenon is that then digital control is not perceived as an external restriction of the individual's activity and freedom. In other words, there is as if there is no external restriction of individual freedom, where its subjective feeling coincides with its external, objective expression. But in this contained his sophisticated deception, where the individual perceives his already unfreedom as a free expression of will, and this is a voluntary deprivation of his freedom, a kind of voluntary slavery. And since permissiveness and freedom of choice are reduced to the highest value for the individual, then there is no particular need to fear any external restrictions and control, as if they no longer exist at all. However, this is self-deception – the digital network knows

everything about the individual, down to the smallest details, thanks to the latest digital technology Big Data, which calculates, accumulates and stores all quantitative parameters, the entire voluminous database about the individual.

But this poses a certain threat to the social freedom of the individual also because such global media and information corporations as Google, Facebook, Instagram, Amazon, Twitter and others, engaged in collecting information and constant monitoring of the entire range of behavior of individuals, directly cooperate with state power structures and provide personal data of individuals.

At the same time, global digitalization takes into account the important fact that individuals are now largely constituted in the process of communication with others. Moreover, through a varied palette of discursive practices and narratives, their identity is constructed, which is determined by processes of identification (Palahuta, 2023). Subjectivity always exists for individual as effect of the individual's search for the meaning of his existence precisely in discursive practices and narratives. This is what social constructionists pay attention to. From the position of social constructionism, everything that we consider to be existing, real, valuable, beautiful, correct, worthy of scientific or spiritual understanding is constructed with the help of language in direct relations with other individuals. Different constructs of worldview are closely related to *intragroup agreement* in different communities (ethnic, professional, scientific, religious) about what exactly exists and what is valuable for the individual here and now. That is, the concepts of community, social conventions, live speech, discourse, narrative, dialogue, and social practices became key for social constructionism (Gergen, 1994).

However, current power structures, through the spread of digital medialization and total control, will generate a networked transformation of narratives and discourses. They are already produced and consumed as commodities, which H. Byung-Chul has defined as storytelling (Byung-Chul, 2023). Their peculiarity is expressed primarily in the fact that they are promoted as effective communication techniques, but are used as sophisticated manipulations of individuals, where surveillance capitalism purposefully appropriates discursive and narrative practices, taking over the life of the individual at the conscious and unconscious levels. That is, storytelling lulls the individual into sleep, slipping away from conscious control and reflection, thereby significantly changing the identity in the necessary direction, which blocks the «practices» of autonomous existence.

But the paradox of such control in imaginary dialogues and narratives is that they turn into coercion and enslavement not from an excess of external controlling force, but from a constant lack of internal identity of individuals, forcing them to dissolve in external objectivity, «kindly» constructed by information mega-giants and encouraged by power structures. In them, the internal and external, the private and the social are mixed together on the pages of social networks, where individuals voluntarily post information about themselves and allow someone else's devalued information to occupy their self in the affective narrative of virtual terrorism, cyberbullying, abuse, meaningless chat dialogues and online comments, in quasi-discussions about empty subjects in popular coaching on various virtual platforms.

Because of this, digitalization is the most effective form of contemporary control of the population as a biomass, and consists of three of its varieties: information-cybernetic, mental and psychotic. Forms of control: screen-based, network, discursive-narrative. The results of the impact of this control cover individuals at the ideological and behavioral level, forming the self of individuals, that is, their entire mental structure.

And one more feature of modern digitalization. For authorities at all levels, it is a good sign when individuals are constantly in a state of danger, which stimulates fears among the population of some real or potential threat that must be overcome and survived. According to Agamben, in our time the decisive action of biopower is not so much the preservation of life, which is characteristic of a classical disciplinary society, nor the condemnation to death

as in a sovereign society, but the production of a modulated and practically endless survival for biomass (Agamben, 2002), where various kinds of fears are constantly instilled and hopes for a sovereign existence are blocked. By the way, for the purpose of total control and management of the world's population as biomass for modern surveillance capitalism and financial-economic elites, experiencing a state of emergency by individuals in one form or another is not the exception, but the norm. Walter Benjamin wrote about this in the VIII fragment of his work «On the Concept of History». Intimidation of people with global cooling, global warming, the severe consequences of financial and economic crises, terrible epidemics, and energy shortages has become a common phenomenon in world biopolitics. With the advent of the digital age, this has become an even more feasible possibility.

Conclusions

It has been found that the process of individual digitization significantly transforms the subjectivity of modern individuals. Thus, the calculations of information globalists have a sufficiently transparent goal – in the process of immersing individuals in the digital world, to ensure constant control and management of almost all aspects of its existence. Therefore, right now, the most favorable conditions are being created for the implementation of the long-term goal of the global financial and economic elites – to gradually form a new generation of individuals through the total digitalization of almost the entire world's population. These «new» subjective types of individuals are being formed right now in the consumer society due to the widespread introduction of the newest Internet technologies, which are managed by transnational information corporations, into all spheres of activity and people's lives. In other words, now the modern global financial and economic elites, who control information flows and power structures almost all over the world (primarily in developed countries of the world), have launched global technologies for managing the behavior of individuals as biomass.

In the process of considering the problem of digitalization and medialization, it became clear that there are no concepts for adequately studying the mechanisms of modern enslavement of individuals using modern computer and information tools, because all conceptual constructions are oriented towards the arsenal of classical Modernism, dogmatic Marxism of the 19th century, and postmodernism of the second half of the 20th century. Individuals cannot fully realize their slavish dependence on power. Therefore, when using such technologies, due to the widespread use of digitalization, the modern individual almost completely loses such an individual dimension as «being in freedom».

Moreover, modern biopolitics gives rise to numerous international and state institutions of strict control and, ideally, – the loss of significance in society of the institutions of democracy, and neoliberalism is a «fertile environment» for the formation of digital totalitarian regimes of governance. In our opinion, this reveals the strategic plan of the world's financial, economic and political elite of the world – the organization of a kind of digital concentration camp. This digital camp, in the long term, will contribute to the gradual formation of «new» types of subjectivity, a kind of 21st century mankurts, for whom freedom and democracy become only abstract concepts, and they are completely immersed in the realization of their temporary and changing interests, mainly commercial, and desires.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Agamben, G. (1993). *The coming community*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Agamben, G. (2002). *Remnants of Auschwitz: The witness and the archive*. Zone Books.
- Agamben, G. (2021). *Where are we now? The epidemic as politics*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Alemán, J. (2023). *Lacan and capitalist discourse: Neoliberalism and ideology*. Routledge.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. Polity Press.
- Berardi, F. (2007). *The soul at work: From alienation to autonomy*. Semiotext(e).
- Butler, J. (1997). *The psychic life of power: Theories in subjection*. Stanford University Press.
- Butler, J. (2005). *Giving an account of oneself*. Fordham University Press.
- Byung-Chul, H. (2011). *Topologie der Gewalt*. Matthes & Seitz Berlin.
- Byung-Chul, H. (2015). *The burnout society*. Stanford Briefs.
- Byung-Chul, H. (2017). *The agony of eros*. The MIT Press.
- Byung-Chul, H. (2023). *Die Krise der Narration*. Matthes & Seitz Berlin.
- Carpentier, N. (2017). *The discursive-material knot: Cyprus in conflict and community media participation*. Peter Lang.
- Debord, G. (1996). *La société du spectacle*. Gallimard.
- DeLanda, M. (2006). *A new philosophy of society: Assemblage theory and social complexity*. Continuum.
- Deleuze, G. (1997). *Negotiations, 1972–1990*. Columbia University Press.
- Eco, U. (1997). *Cinque scritti morali* [Five Moral Essays]. Bompiani.
- Ferrando, F. (2019). *Philosophical posthumanism (Theory in the new humanities)*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Fisher, M. (2009). *Capitalist realism: Is there no alternative?* Zero Books.
- Foucault, M. (1997). *Il faut défendre la société: Cours au Collège de France (1975–1976)*. Gallimard; Seuil.
- Foucault, M. (2004a). *Sécurité, territoire, population: Cours au Collège de France (1977–1978)*. Gallimard; Seuil.
- Foucault, M. (2004b). *La naissance de la biopolitique: Cours au Collège de France (1978–1979)*. Gallimard; Seuil.
- Fukuyama, F. (2018). *Identity: The demand for dignity and the politics of resentment*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Fukuyama, F. (2022). *Liberalism and its discontents*. Profile Books Ltd.
- Fuller, S. (2018). *Post-truth: Knowledge as a power game*. Anthem Press.
- Goffman, E. (2007). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. Routledge.
- Gergen, K. J. (1994). *Realities and relationships: Soundings in social construction*. Harvard University Press.
- Newman, S. (2015). *Postanarchism*. Polity Press.
- Palahuta, V. I. (2023). The identity of the modern human as a problem of social and humanitarian knowledge. *Newsletter on the Results of Scholarly Work in Sociology, Criminology, Philosophy and Political Science*, 4(2), 94–103. <https://doi.org/10.61439/SHND1344>
- Pentland, A. (2015). *Social physics: How social networks can make us smarter*. Penguin Books.

- Skinner, B. F. (2002). *Beyond freedom and dignity*. Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.
- Žižek, S. (1989). *The sublime object of ideology*. Verso.
- Žižek, S. (2020). *Hegel in a wired brain*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Žižek, S. (2022). *Heaven in disorder*. OR Books.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. Public Affairs.

Author Biography

Vadim Palahuta is a PhD in Philosophy, Doctor of Philosophical science, Professor, Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Pedagogy of the National University of Technology, Ukraine.

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons [Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International \(CC BY-NC4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format for non-commercial purposes only, and only so long as attribution is given to the creator.