CYBORG NORMALIZED
FUTURE LIFE IN A DIGITAL FLOW

Dzmitry Boichanka

Abstract

The contemporary digital world suggests a new model of subject construction. In the center of new transformation is a life that happens in-between the real and virtual dimensions. Made famous by Dona Haraway cyborg as a cultural hybrid of biology and technology is a key definition if we want to talk about the digital subject simply because technologies became inseparable from their practices. Reality of the cyborg is two-dimensional and can be partially seen: one side is consumer-friendly and shaped with a user interface and the second one is concealed as a general user does not know how gadgets work. This dualism first of all raises a question about the status of contemporary surveillance and different ways of its development. In turn, new practices of surveillance make us to reconsider the presence and the future of cyborg.

Keywords: cyborg, liquid modernity, adiaphorization, silent intelligence, digital surveillance, trust and transparency.

The definition of 'cyborg' entered the academic discourse with a huge semantic explosion. The main reason for that is that Donna Haraway's "A Cyborg Manifesto" itself is an ironically charged myth which has certain political goals. In its turn a 'myth' according to Rolan Barthes is a vague, intentionally blurry image (not necessary a visual one) that hides a perfectly structured content. Haraway's texts were filled with metaphors, but they contained a significant amount of ideas which were highly relevant and important for the time when "A Cyborg Manifesto" was published. I think due to the form of presentation, the style of this work could also be named mythical. Therefore the Haraway's work provoked a lot of discussions, which usually happens with unclear or provocative forms of expression. Technologies literally gave people their new ontology, but it did not happen the way Haraway supposed it to be. The primary goal of this article is to investigate, where and how a cyborg lives right now and what dilemmas (s)he faces.

The liquid condition

The collocation "information technologies" was always connected with instability. Early in the 80s and the 90s every computer had congenital fragility: one of the main things that was learnt by digital migrants and I hope never would be known by digital natives is that software and hardware used to be critically unstable. Every file required at least its copy or maybe a serial of copies of all versions of the file. Computer was the long lasting future of human kind, but usually it failed to provide one week of stable work.

Today's instability can be considered as liquidity, said Zygmunt Bauman.[1] Informational flows of globalization are highly multiplied, hybrid, unstable, continuous and by all prognosis are eternal. Insomuch they are also ambivalent and insecure. Zygmunt Bauman says that solid state can grasp space and time and fix them on each other, but a liquid one neglects space in favor of time to make mobility a main priority. The sense of space is finally lost and pastiche as a form of perception can reproduce itself in various forms according to any conjuncture it may choose and rely only on its specific economy.

It must be said that Bauman's metaphor describes the state, but not its origins. Liquid is a unique meta-category that describes the various forms of changeability and flexibility, but the origins of liquid modernity are akin to the Fredrick Jameson's postmodern(ism) and Ulrich Beck's second modernity. He argued:

> "What was some time ago dubbed (erroneously) 'post-modernity', and what I've chosen to call more to the point, 'liquid modernity' is the growing conviction that change is the only permanence, and uncertainty the only certain".[2]

It means that 'origins' here look similar to other diagnoses of time as information age or other modification of a word 'modernity'. Bauman also includes such concepts as network society, crisis of national power and glocalization into the concept of liquid modernity, so it is no doubt complementary with theories of the informational epoch and it is also more comprehensive than just a story about changes, but here we will use only this aspect of it.

When Bauman wrote the first edition of "Liquid modernity" he argued that space is something that cannot be changed, it is doomed to be rigid, and time in opposite is a category of creativity.[3] Later in his book about globalization he argued that a new rich management class of cosmopolitans is colonizing the class that does not have any opportunity to leave locality (Paul Virilio called almost the same phenomenon endo-colonization)[4]. Basically time-population was confronted with the space-population. At the same time liquid is dissolving any solid material that it can find: firm materials are falling apart, while fluid ones are establishing the new rules of uncertainty. Today we still have a division in social scheme, but time has infected space: one of the fundamental features of culture of real virtuality is a space which consists of bytes and therefore is exposed to the virus of creativity. In the early 90s Bauman argued: *"Fluids, so to speak, neither fix space nor bind time"*[5] and today 'to fix space' has a completely new meaning: it is not about wars for territory and relocation of borders, but about its design (which, surely, does not exclude the original meaning).

---

1 Z. Bauman: *Liquid Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity press 2012, Foreword: On being Light and Liquid.

2 Z. Bauman: *Liquid Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity press 2012, Foreword to 2012 edition: Liquid modernity revisited.

3 Bauman, op. cit.

4 Z. Bauman: *Globalization: The Human Consequences,* New York: Columbia University Press 2000, 24.

5 Bauman, op. cit.

Control and prediction are lost as a common cultural category and became a privilege which the distribution creates a new social division[6]. Bauman argues that politics as a local execution and power as a global control are now separated – power have escaped from "mutual engagement" and a person who runs things can be reached only through electronic networks. A famous expression "*Think globally and act locally*" here is presented in the bluntest sense: the ability to think and to act now is not a common practice anymore. If Baudrillard thought that social and political ways are parted and it is the guilt of masses, Bauman guesses otherwise and argues that national and global power have abandoned a local level.

The ability to control flows is an ability to control knowledge, imagination, identification perception and all those categories that once were "nature" – that is why power is necessary in the age of globalization. The order is remote and power executives are always somewhere else. It may be considered as an exaggeration or a false question, but it is a daily situation of users or flexploitated informational worker[7]. It maybe unperceived or unknown, but it is how the digital works for everybody, who is not a coder enough. Even despite the fact of the power deprivation in real virtuality, the liquid situation requires a specific person to operate with it as the social now flows and does not pretend to be solid.

The original Althusserian concept of the subject presupposes one dimensional national state of a human. It is clear that Althusser described the idealization, conceptual framework that can help us to understand why society exists in a strong dependence on the state and how state as a huge and transcendent element can operate on the local level (or simply whence convergence of society and government came from). Imaginary structures, rituals as recursive practices, interpellation as a method of a way to address the hidden attitude to maintain identity and godlike example as Subject are a key feature of the Althusser model[8]. National or local here is a priori unspoken and dynamic changes or deviance are notably missing features that allow me to conclude that Althusser draws a perfect image of a solid subject, who is tied and dominated by the territorial fixed apparatuses.

There are quite a lot of post-Althusserian concepts, but I will mention only several of them. Mark Poster using Fredrick Jameson's idea of fragmentation highlighted that a contemporary subject is fragmented and gives an example of the daily Internet activity where a person is in contact with many services at the same time[9]. Judith Butler took Althusser's idea of subject and reinterpreted it using the idea of subordination and retroactive practices: subject has to behave in a certain way as it is an indispensable and natural way which is legitimated by history[10].

6 Bauman, op. cit., 25.

7 Manuel Castells's definition.

8 L. Althusser: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses, in: S. Zizek (ed) *Mapping Ideology,* London: Verso 1994, 100–141.

9 M. Poster: *The Information Subject*, New York: Routledge 2001, 80.

10 J. Butler: *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*, Stanford: Stanford University Press 1997, 107.

Butler also considered the idea of a so-called postmodern subject and argued that this definition supposes freedom of constructivism: subject can restructure him/herself[11]. Here the subject can finally reshape a discursive frame of modernity. A strong dependence on state here is blurred by the actualization of the individual, community and network ambitions. As Laclau and Mouffe would argue it is the act where the subject can unlock a discursive chain. So this process of unlocking is a starting point of fragmentation as the system tells itself from the solid structure and flows into a flexible one.

From the system that refuses to recognize unconventional and stigmatize deviations we moved to an era of flexible domination where every possibility to choose can be recognized as a repressive one. Basically by the unlocking of chain we tune hegemony and improve the 'soft power' of the late capitalism. Once we could personalize ourselves by practices of consumption in the epoch of passages described by Benjamin and then receive almost absolute freedom of choice in Baudrillard's universe of simulacra where every creation can refer only to an operationalized model, but now we live in a flow which was created after the modern stopped pretending to be solid or rigid. The system turned itself into pieces, which opened a way to all we know as post-Fordism and service economy.

It may seem that I want to dramatize this situation, but I am actually more positive about it than a lot of theorists. Digital is an area of opportunity, a long awaited promise of technologies has been fulfilled and in many ways the digital age is better than it used to be in utopian views. The narrative in the digital age is highly similar to a postmodern one, but a lot more radical and in many ways designed to deliver more opportunities than any consumption 'temple' thirty years ago: it is also non-linear, but, despite all notions about alienation it fulfills its main premise – it actually connects people and benefits of it could not but be underestimated. It is one of the reasons why people can be considered more advanced than ever. The digital age gives a lot more to an individual and the community than previous epochs did. The main problem it faces with is a price and many theorists not without reason think that it is an ultimate one. The main problem here is a continuation of its many advantages: to be helpful technologies have to study and challenge culture very closely, to the complete absorption, which would not be a problem if power relations of the modern did not evolve simultaneously.

The cyborgian drama

Haraway's work describes a highly positive and dramatic cyborg state, that is very similar to a super-hero tale, where the prototype runs away form the laboratory and fights against its creators for humanitarian values. Cyborg is unique because he or she is clearly different from human and therefore is much better and effective, it has a very difficult

[11] J. Butler: Contingent Foundations: Feminism and the Question of "Postmodernism", in: J. Butler and J. W. Scott (ed) *Feminists Theorize the Political*, New York: Routledge 1992, 3-21.

past, which actually makes him\her a protagonist and creates a perfect conflict where there are vested interests, difficult choices and human future. In many ways the transformation of this narrative can be an example of the power shift which was accelerated by technological innovations.

Dona Haraway's cyborg theory is built to work like a creative myth that is aimed to transform physical presence. Basically cyborg theory can be recognized as a role model for digital humanity:

> "The cyborg is our ontology; it gives us our politics. The cyborg is a condensed image of both imagination and material reality, the two joined centers structuring any possibility of historical transformation"[12].

Haraway's main idea is the coding one (mostly female as it is a feminism paradigm that she fits in), the subject, which is capable to code, can be recognized as cyborg (originally it is a symbiosis of a human and machine from science fiction). She writes:

> "The cyborg is a kind of disassembled and reassembled, postmodern collective and personal self. This is the self feminists must code"[13].

Code here can be used in a very broad sense, as a creative weapon, a transmorphing tool which can reprogram reality.

The primary goal of Haraway is to show how technological innovations can be symbolized as a political toolkit. She writes:

> "A cyborg is a cybernetic organism, a hybrid of machine and organism, a creature of social reality as well as a creature of fiction"[14].

So originally cyborg is a project of subject, which by his/her status is similar to Deleuze and Guattari's nomadic war machine whose main task is to undermine the sacral modern order of life by the remaking borders.[15] Haraway also wants to blur the rigid modern framework, where everything is masterminded by entitlement and points, that a destroying line between artificial invention and biological organs is a good place to start.

> "The machine is us, our processes, an aspect of our embodiment. We can be responsible for machines; they do not dominate or threaten us. We are responsible for boundaries; we are they"[16]. Technologies here are a creative tackle: "Communications technologies and biotechnologies are the crucial tools recrafting our bodies. These tools embody and enforce

---

12 D. Haraway: A Cyborg Manifesto Science, Technology, And Socialist-Feminism In The Late Twentieth Century, in: D. Haraway (ed) *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature,* New York: Routledge 1991, 149-181.

13 Ibid.

14 Ibid.

15 G. Deleuze and F. Guattari: *Nomadology: The War Machine*, Cambridge: Semiotext(e) The MIT Press

16 Haraway, A Cyborg Manifesto Science, Technology, And Socialist-Feminism In The Late Twentieth Century, Ibid.

new social relations for women world-wide. Technologies and scientific discourses can be partially understood as formalizations"[17].

Speaking on cyborg's origins Haraway notes its totalitarian character:

"The main trouble with cyborgs, of course, is that they are the illegitimate offspring of militarism and patriarchal capitalism, not to mention state socialism"[18],

which is in a way a quoting of a famous theory that origins of every technology can be found in secret military facilities. This statement should be understood as an attempt to identify the status of technological rebellion in a world where technologies as Paul Virilio usually argues had colonized the western world. It is necessary to mention that according to technological evangelists, software and hardware should be recognized as a continuation of human nature which should be developed by the person. So in a way technology here is the stolen art, which was turned from anthropological passion into the routine military activity and cyborg's task is to take it back.

It is sometimes very difficult to grasp the certain definition from Haraway's canonical work, but from her paragraph of the same work it can become clear that 'informatics of domination' is a 'network' of '(re) production' and 'communication' where a woman is integrated, which means that she is exploited. So "Informatics of domination" is Haraway's way to describe the hegemony. It is actually a digitalization of Antonia Gramsci's definition that highlights the fact that cultural acceptance is a programmed thing. I think the difference here is that informatics delivers discipline as a sum of technological tools and methods that power cyborgs practice.

What I call here a 'normalized cyborg' is a cyborg turned into consumption. The theory of consumption looks like an obsolete one as it was one of the core concepts of postmodern theory and there can and should be other theories related to the contemporary state of 'real virtuality', but if we are trying to find the main modus of existence in a digital sphere, consumption is an obvious choice, because all recent innovations were extraordinary devoted to revive and improve practices of consumerism. After all the consumer society ideology (cyber or not) is still a biblically valuable option for well-being. But 'normalized' here does not necessarily mean oppressed or harassed, but rather pacified or disarmed.

The normalization of cyborg does not take away his or her unique status and abilities, but adopted them to a liquid condition. The normalization is a result of repartition of skills with an eye to the consumption values. Instead of a heroic one here works another narrative where self-discipline can be useful for improving time-economy to extend the period of survival. In the process, where there are form constant time and space reformation, cyborg is trying to reclaim identity. Cyborg is still a protagonist, but his/her ambitions do not live up to the transcendental level: challenging the liquidity order can not be the aim

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.

of struggle for him/her. In Marxist definition it is commodification, but this commodification is not one-dimensional. Informatics of domination is not going anywhere, but it has been cloaked by anonymity.

The otherworldly ethics

I have described the early computer culture as a situation of uncertainty. I think the main reason of this is complexity of machines. It is obvious that engineers had a deal with much lower level of risks as they exactly knew how to cope with them. On the contrary, general users frequently fall as a victim of software and hardware malfunctions. Machine insides were always unknown and logarithms of its work was unclear. Thus machine was always covered by anonymity, which among other thing caused serious ethical issues. People needed machines to work with, but if a machine makes a mistake, whose responsibility is it?

Zygmunt Bauman and David Lyon argued that a phenomenon of adiaphorization described by Hanna Arendt must be now reconsidered. Adiaphorization is a transformation of ethics which leads to a prior absence of responsibility for the actions. For instance when a soldier pushes the trigger which leads to death of a human being he/she cannot be blamed for this action as he/she is following orders and has certain duties. The main problem here is that practice approves and systematizes the ritual of killing with neutralized guilt. The presence of this phenomenon also indicates that in the modern society technologies can take over the person and colonize the intersubjective level of relationships.[19]

Bauman and Lyon argue that the contemporary situation is more difficult as the technology now is able not only to mediate, but also to perform the action on its own. Artificial intelligence is capable of gathering information, making its own conclusions and executing its own tasks. A human here can be recognized as an observer who is controlling the stability of a machine's performance. If in the first case the practice is to be blamed, than in the second case the guilt is always on the side of the operating system.[20] The key factor here is a 'system malfunction', not the 'sniper's mistake'. This way in Lyon's and Bauman's opinion liquid modernity continues the twisted modern way to absorb ethical level of actions.

I think we can make at least two useful notions from this description. The first one is that cyborg is always coping with risks (even if he/she does not know about it) and depends on stability of given software or hardware piece. What is crucial here is that in case of emergency a human operator (Amazon 'click to call' adviser for instance) will help you to fix the 'machine', but the human him/herself is at the end of the line: the whole situation supposes that a machine is a primary actor, the first and the last instance that classifies, certifies and makes decisions. A human monitors only requests when a machine does not want to work

[19] Z. Bauman and D. Lyon: *Liquid Surveillance*, Cambridge: Polity Press 2013, 105.

[20] Ibid, 107.

properly or when it is broken. A mechanism described by Ulrich Beck and coping with risks now mostly relies on machine properties rather than on social relations.

According to James H. Moor the real challenge in computer revolution is "logical malleability" of computers[21]. He defines "logical malleability" as a basis for computer multi-functionality. Moor argued that malleability can be understood syntactically and semantically. Syntactically means that a computer can perform a great amount of operations and semantically – that it doesn't matter what operation a computer performs. Moore compares the computer revolution with industrial and names two stages of its development. The first one is an invention of a computer and its short spreading and the second one is its massive popularization.

Moor also noted that a computer will make a huge impact on all spheres of live. He proposed that in the middle of the 80s the questions are still "How well do computers count money?" and "How well do computers educate?", but in the future they will be changed for more radical questions. Moor stated that computerization can significantly challenge a social life and institutions[22]. For example he proposes that computerization will challenge the space and time conditions of education and make face-to-face contact of people with teachers unnecessary which will raise the question "What is education?". Therefore Moor stated that computer ethics should be produced.

Moor also stated that one of the most important preferences of the computer is that most of its operations are invisible[23]. The second one is the presence of invisible programming values. A machine can have preferences which are known only to its creator (or unknown to him/her if we are talking about bugs). And the third one is the ability to calculate, which exceeds human capabilities. And here there is a very important ethical dilemma. On the one hand one can always be suspicious about the machine calculating because one simply does not know how well it can work (or what it calculates). But on the other hand it is impossible to launch a rocket without a computer due to the limits of human brain.

"We are open to invisible abuse or invisible programming of inappropriate values or invisible miscalculation", concludes Moor[24]. A computer here is a "risk machine". The technology that due to its ability to operate invisibly produces risks and as far as computerization goes on these risks become more and more important. Moor formulates two main reasons to create computer ethics. The first argument for it is the revolution potential of logical malleability. The second one is that in the end we will have to decide when to trust computers and when not to trust. Here he raises a very important question about trust that will have a key role below.

In 2011 when Google Glass was released to the public the similar question was raised by the first reviewers. They drew attention to the

21 J. H. Moor: What is Computer Ethics?
in *Metaphilosophy*, 16/4 (1985), 263 275.

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid.

24 Ibid.

fact that the device which has a built-in camera does not have an external indicator of activity. Therefore nobody but a user knows if a camera is active or not. That fact was recognized as a direct violation of individual privacy and provoked a lot of discussions. Now there is no such question anymore as whether we should trust computers or not, as we must do it.

Enter of silent intelligence

Bauman and Lyon argued that it can be summarized under the word *context*[25]. Hundreds of marketing analysts, business advisers, engineers and magazines from *Forbes* and *Bloomberg* to unknown local sites agree with them: "context is the king" they say. However there is still no clear definition of *context* of value which can fit in an academic paper, I will suggest the preliminary one. *Context* here is everything what gadget is able to 'sense' relating its user: it can be a physical state of a cyborg or surrounding. So main functions of gadgets now can be explained as contextualization (prescription, searching for relevance, etc). If earlier we said that "software takes command", now – the cyborg does.

We see a lot of gadgets that are dedicated not to mobile use (but are inevitably connected to every smartphone), but to the 'smart homes': IT industry started to expand itself beyond the known categories as phones, watches, TV and gaming consoles on every technological exhibition. It was made actually clear at the last CES that took place in January 2015: at this exhibition smart things like fridges, kettles, coffee-machines dominated others. The scale of next billions market is hard to imagine. "*What's more, you don't have to be an engineer to figure out how to turn your house into a smart home. Get ready, the Rise of the IoT is upon us*" – says *The Verge* reporter[26]. We soon will hear advertising slogans about how obsolete our homes are and that it is time to stop worrying about the turned on iron when you are on the way to the office as you will be able to check the status of lots of things through smartphones or wearable gadgets.

The notion of 'silent intelligence' has been recently introduced by Daniel Kellmereit and Daniel Obodovski in their non-fiction book of the same title.[27] *Silent intelligence* follows the "smart" trend in phones: it works unnoticeable, surprises with its wise actions and are hidden in old world's physical furniture. If previously cyber-theorists as Mark Poster called virtual reality an alternative environment, which had colonized physical world by replacing its value with virtualization of practices and its inventions, today virtual reality returned for the physical objects. "Internet of things" is a network, which operates not with virtual objects, but with real ones. Ideally every object should have an integrated chip that can enhance it by connecting it to the network of user's gadgets. So

---

25 Bauman and Lyon, *Liquid Surveillance*, 17.

26 Verge Staff: the verge awards at CES 2015: the year in tech starts here, *The Verge*, 2015, [online] Retrieved from: http://www.theverge.com/2015/1/9/7509787/verge-awards-best-of-ces-2015

27 D. Kellmereit and D. Obodovski: *The Silent Intelligence: The Internet of Things*. California: DND Ventures LLC 2013.

at least every electrical device at home can be tuned through the virtual interface and become a part of a new domestic 'integrated circuit'.

Apart from the Internet of things the industry is also engaged with the wearables: glasses or watches (mostly watches) that are able to determine user's health status or his or her work out. Almost every massive company today announced its place to conquer the new market and next crisis seems to be found in Switzerland watch industry.

Journalists Robert Scoble and Shel Israel named five main trends of the forthcoming age: mobile as the only future of a personal computer, social media as a sphere where people usually produce information, data as a new world symbolic form, sensors as an ability of gadgets to 'see' and locations as contexts, overlapping of which constructs cyborgs and their identities.[28] It is a preliminary architecture of the digital world that already works today, but waits for its mass distribution and trivialization. In my opinion the potential benefit and using of these combinations cannot be underestimated: so far the creative spirit of the digital age performed better than anybody expected it to. As William Gibson once said about the Internet "*The future has already happened, it just isn't very well distributed*".

The third important ideologeme of the forthcoming time is a "drone". It is an attractive fashion word which for years has been in the focus of futurologists and critical theorists as prognostics of the future. "Drone" is in contrast with cyborg did not copy any human's physiognomy, but instead of it takes a scientifically inspired pragmatic form. In biology "drone" is a male honey bee which has huge eyes. One of the drone's roles is to support the queen when she travels from one hive to another. Due to the size of its eyes a drone can provide a better visual support than warriors and workers. There are a lot of types of drones in science-fiction. Usually they ere relatively small droids with specializations (observers, scouts, soldiers, miners, etc) whose common feature is a supportive role. I think drones mostly can be recognized as dehumanized servants, which were created for routine work. Drones usually have intellect, but they are designed to replace particular human actions and to improve them. However drones are always under control of human supervisors and act more like pets than fully functional companions. A drone can be considered as an inhabitant of the new world, which has never been wild.

In our world drones have been used in military operations for a long time and for most of us they were semi-fictional characters from TV-news. Relatively recently the practice to buy and play with them became a habit of many people. There are even videos on *YouTube* that were made with the help of flying drones. Also we have been recently informed that *Amazon* is planning to make drone delivery real.

For now the Internet of things, wereables and drones make a triangle of the nearest technologies future. We are not yet in the future, but we are at the stage when cultural prototypes of the future have already been developed and are trying to find a way into our daily life. And behind all

[28] R. Scoble and S. Israel: *Age of Context: Mobile, Sensors, Data and the Future of Privacy*, CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2013.

of this is the sum of technologies that was named "silent intelligence" and that we used to call artificial intelligence. As Lev Manovich once mentioned the entire story abut IT is a narrative of software and this notion is highly relevant here as silent intelligence is a software that keep under its control a living room, a human body and various transportations lines.

Dominion

All these facts undoubtedly raise the questions of control and power. According to Foucault power is an invisible tissue of every society. He argued that there is no type of relation that can be brought to life without power.[29] In his theory Foucault introduced a number of characteristics of power but I would like to address the issue of its productive potential and non-subjective nature of power. Individuals can be recognized as 'vehicles' of power, not its executives, which is formed and produced by power. Individuals can be recognized as a locus of power realization.[30] Basically power is the network of relations which is using subjects as preventatives to be productive. So one cannot really possesses power, he or she can be possessed by power. Power mechanisms are supported by dispositifs, patterns that maintain the exercise of power. Dispositif is basically any apparatus or theoretical structure that can presuppose the existence of subjects, control them and simultaneously produce them (Judith Butler frequently describes this state of subject as paradox). I will leave the argument about power analysis untouched instead of it I will consider how contemporary strategies of possession were challenged by technologies.

Bauman and Lyon argued that for Foucault panopticon was the very basis of the modern organization and it went nowhere in the new liquid condition, but there is more to consider today to fully understand the contemporary surveillance phenomenon.[31] There is a notion of "liquid surveillance" that according to Bauman and Lyon refers to the contemporary state of surveillance, where we are uncertain of surveillance limits and boarders: on the one hand surveillance now is everywhere and on the other – surveillance now has different purposes, among which the consumption is a key one.

Zygmunt Bauman (citing Thomas Mathiesen) suggests the notion of *synopticon*, which describes a new situation of surveillance when majority watches minority: the limited amount of cyborg is forced to mainstream for a wide audience.[32] This concept originally was created to describe the specific of reality TV and its spreading of voyeurism fashion, but after Web 2.0 and social networking where semi-voyeuristic attitudes became the main part of social life it became much wider. Mark Zuckerberg's mantra about "connected world" supposes that every

---

29 M. Foucault: Subject and Power, in *Critical inquiry*, 8/4 (1982), 777–795.

30 M. Foucault: *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, New York: Vintage Books 1995, 200.

31 Bauman and Lyon, *Liquid Surveillance*, 76.

32 Bauman, *Globalization: The Human Consequences*, 53.

person should invest to the visual register of others and be available as a firefighter brigade even if there are no flammable materials around.

Moreover Both Bauman and Lyon suggested the term *ban-opticon*. Ban-opticon is a digital apartheid that legitimates global digital division: "*Its dispositif shows who is welcome or not, creating categories of people excluded not just from a given nation state, but form a rather amorphous and not unified cluster of global powers*"[33]. In ban-opticon potentially irrelevant groups are excluded and the chosen ones are normalized. So ban-option is an unnatural selection, which means that symbolical boarders between target audiences are more than they seemed and every commodity has not only a purpose to be sold to somebody, but also a purpose not to be sold. In real virtuality, where people are usually pleased to be advised by the algorithms that recommend them goods based on their purchases, it is very easy to hide something because visible is only what the machine thinks should be visible. This situation is not that critical in most cases, but when we touch the availability of contemporary streaming technologies we will see that DVD and Blu-ray technically are dead only in the USA and in 'Old Europe', where such services as Hulu, Netflix and its doppelgängers are available. So called 'New Europe' has been left in the world of physical retails.

There are more versions of what had happened to the power execution of the late modernity. I think some of them are complementary for the liquid semantics of Lyon and Bauman. For instance Jean Baudrillard argued that panopticon is over due to the influence of reality TV. As people who are watched and who watch are completely aware of the situation, panopticon is simply neutralized[34]. Baudrillard thinks that the entire panopticon idea is based on the presence of the unknown or dangerous (or somehow else ambivalent) Other and confused the state of the controlled subjects. After the appearing of reality TV this situation became ordinary, the conflict disappears. Also David Solove and following him Siva Vaidhyanathan titled the new era as "nonopticon"[35]. The main difference here is that surveillance is not realized by most of individuals. If a prison-like model works every time reminding about its presence by its material shape, the Internet cannot provide the same conviction. Of course legitimacy of this statement strongly depends on the level of media literacy, but for now it does make sense as for contemporary users the Internet is mostly a non-problematic area. There will be time, when Solove's definition will disappear and Baudrillard's point of view will win, but we are not quite there yet.

Despite the fact that a lot of users are still not aware of the dystopian perspectives of real virtuality, almost every year a lot of important events that can be called "exemplary" happen. The entire history around ACTA, SOPA and PIPA, Edward Snowden's case. The presence of cyber-terrorists in North Korea, which was revealed by the attack on

[33] Bauman and Lyon, *Liquid Surveillance*, 77.

[34] J. Baudrillard: *Simulacra and Simulations*, Michigan: University of Michigan Press 1995, 60.

[35] S. Vaidhyanathan: Naked in the 'Nonopticon', in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (2008).

Sony servers at the end of 2014. The secret war between Hollywood and Google, where Google was marked as "Goliath", which was reveled after this attack. Demonstrations in Tokyo. Also in the European Union recently the "right to be forgotten" has been introduced, which means that now a user can delete all data about him or her from Google services. The awareness of the importance of the digital is slowly becoming the common knowledge. It is a new narrative that later will be constructed retrospectively and will be recognized as the only possible identification of the 21st millennium.

Processing an individual

Smartphones and wereables today ere designed to be very sensitive to user preferences: they collect a tremendous amount of data to create the 'second self' of the subject as accurate as possible. Every action is written down, analyzed and symbolized and for now the main reason of it is an adaptation of services. In fact only now we know who an individual is, as the disenchantment of the world can go as far as consumerism can allow it. Bauman and Lyon also stated that in the same time as technologies became invisible, the actions of subjects are visualized as never[36]. In the long run, the entire idea of Panopticon had almost nothing to do with the third person control as for instance prisoners and pupils controlled themselves using the acquired experience and the supervisor on the tower was rather a mythical than real figure. The entire idea of agoraphobia before the appearance of surveillance cameras was rather a symptom of paranoia, which had a productive value. The main result of the discipline was the obedience and to explain this phenomenon we had to refer to the humanitarian theories as dispositif and look through the unseen dimension of disciplinary environments. In the virtual sphere today the presence of supervising elements is obvious as virtual sphere is programmed to be flexible and adaptable.

Jean Paul Sartre and Hanna Arendt pointed that an individual was a product of his/her time, which as Zygmunt Bauman argued a few decades later was radicalized in the age of globalization. Firstly the person was separated from the community and abandoned then the government became irresponsible due to neoliberal transformations. Bauman once said that the identity became not given 'by default', but it turned into the project that was necessary to fulfill[37]. So it is the first important purpose of modernity to make social units independent, self-disciplined and creative. There is also the second purpose that can be called "processing" or "identifying" of an individual: from the boom of consumption in the first modernity with its translucent models of quantity sociological analysis, focus groups and opinion polls we moved to the late modernity where all these approaches were digitalized and enhanced. An individual slowly became transparent and what is crucial

[36] Bauman and Lyon, *Liquid Surveillance*, 153.

[37] Z. Bauman: From Pilgrim to Tourist – or a Short History of Identity, in: S. Hall and P. Du Gay (ed) *Question of Cultural Identity*, London: Sage 1996, 18–36.

it is possible to see not a static but dynamical perspective: history as many things today has been turned into data.

With an enter of the described above triad that situation can evolve in something entirely different: the situation where not the cyborg or his/her being-in-the-world will be analyzed, but his/her entire way of living or entire narrative of life, which includes not only him/her and his/her practices, but also his/her personal environment. So theorists will say that environment became 'visible', more radical thinkers will say that it is the end of personal space. The main innovation here is that surveillance practices will be devoted to simple things, to this old fashion world of the first modernity, to which people usually come back, when the Internet suddenly disappears.

The tradition of fragmentation continues, but on a new scale. The idea of normalization is also going beyond the certain cyborg. And this is where the irony is hidden: technologies actually do the same what the humanitarian knowledge once did – they reconsider its subject of interest. From the Descartes's subject of the absolute autonomy we moved to the phenomenological 'dasein' and a postmodern decentered subject. Both definitions suggest a wider understanding of human existence and ask us to improve our scientific focus. I think the new 'context situation' can only work in the world where the presence of multiple identities have been revealed (consciously or not).

This situation actually asks us to reconsider the political approach once again, but I will not do it right here. Instead of it I want to turn to the definition that was useful when the solid structure of modernity started to bulge at the seams. I mean that the following statement can be easily applied to an early postmodern condition and to the contemporary one. If it happened that a cyborg has been multiplied, I suggest the following dualism: heterogeneity as a positive multiplicity and fragmentation as a negative one. Heterogeneity is a controlled segmentation of a cyborg and its environment and fragmentation is an approach of informatics of domination. First of all it is a political question of control. And 'control' here should be understood as the ability to decide in the first place (unless we consider the idea that everybody should start to code, what is utopia) which technology one should use and what should happen to the information that was extracted in the process of contextualization. Then it is the issue of "doubled T": trust and transparency. Contemporary IT industry is overwhelmed with corporative secrets, which creates a perfect storm of newsfeed spectacle: scandals, leaks, courts, huge announcements, etc. It is of course curved with uncertainty and secrecy to create the enigmatic atmosphere, but this performance looses its entertainment capabilities when manipulation with data appears in the center of the stage. Processing should be maximally clear and obvious. There should be no corporative secrets that can harass the user.