

---

# The Information Society as a Space of New Social Antinomies

Mukhiddinova Shahnoza Anvarovna\*

Namangan State University

\*Correspondence: Mukhiddinova  
Shahnoza Anvarovna  
Email: [email@e-mail.com](mailto:email@e-mail.com)

Received: 05-07-2025  
Accepted: 16-08-2025  
Published: 28-09-2025



**Copyright:** © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

**Abstract:** *This study examines the philosophical and sociocultural contradictions that emerge in the context of the information society. The purpose of the research is to analyze the antinomies of digital transformation, focusing on freedom and control, information accessibility and informational noise, virtual connectivity and social isolation, as well as the fluidity of identity in digital culture. The research is based on philosophical analysis, comparative review of theoretical literature, and synthesis of contemporary debates in the philosophy of technology and digital culture. The findings indicate that informatization creates both opportunities and risks. On the one hand, digital technologies expand access to knowledge, foster innovation, and democratize communication. On the other hand, they generate new challenges such as surveillance, deintellectualization, digital loneliness, fragmented identity, and environmental burdens of ICT. The study concludes that the information society represents a contradictory space in which progress and alienation coexist, making philosophical reflection and digital ethics essential for sustaining human dignity in the age of digital transformation.*

**Keywords:** *Information Society, Digitalization, Philosophy Of Technology, Social Antinomies, Virtual Reality, Postmodernism, Digital Culture.*

---

## Introduction

The 21st century is marked by the unprecedented expansion of information and communication technologies (ICT), which have reshaped every aspect of human life, from economics and politics to education and culture. This global process has given rise to what is known as the information society, a social formation in which knowledge, information flows, and their processing speed serve as key resources of development. However, the rapid spread of informatization has brought about not only opportunities but also deep contradictions that require critical philosophical inquiry.

The information society embodies a paradoxical coexistence of freedom and control, accessibility and noise, connection and isolation. Digital technologies provide individuals with tools for self-expression, access to vast knowledge, and new forms of economic participation. Yet, they simultaneously facilitate surveillance, manipulation, and the commodification of personal data. As scholars such as Byung-Chul Han (2021) and Sherry Turkle (2017) argue, technological innovations reconfigure the very structure of social relations, identity, and human subjectivity.

Another central challenge is the transformation of social interactions and identity formation in digital environments. Virtual communication has created new forms of alienation, often described as “digital loneliness,” where the abundance of online connections fails to translate into genuine human closeness. Meanwhile, identity becomes fluid, fragmented, and increasingly shaped by algorithmic feedback loops and consumerist logic. These paradoxes raise philosophical questions about authenticity, autonomy, and the boundaries of human agency in the digital age.

Furthermore, the environmental, political, and ethical implications of digitalization must be considered. The material infrastructure of the digital world generates significant ecological costs, while the concentration of digital power in the hands of corporations and states introduces new forms of inequality and domination. These dynamics highlight the urgent need for a new digital ethics and a critical philosophy of technology that can balance innovation with human values.

The aim of this study is to analyze these antinomies of the information society and reflect on possible philosophical frameworks that can guide humanity toward a more humane and sustainable digital future.

## Methodology

When analyzing the digital transformation of society, it is impossible to ignore the question of the nature of information itself. Traditionally, information has served as a means of transmitting knowledge. However, in the age of the internet and social media, information becomes not only a tool but also an end in itself. A phenomenon of informational noise arises - the excess and fragmentation of data that hinders meaningful perception of the world. As contemporary German philosopher Byung-Chul Han writes: “Information today does not become knowledge. We produce too much information to have time to interpret it” [2]. This leads to the deintellectualization of society, the substitution of deep meaning with superficial clichés, and the loss of the capacity for reflection.

Another important aspect is the transformation of social interactions. The virtualization of social life and the transition of communication into digital channels have led to a new form of alienation. People increasingly find themselves in isolation, despite being surrounded by numerous online connections. This gives rise to the phenomenon of paradoxical loneliness-where social networks are filled with contacts, yet genuine closeness is absent. This condition has been termed “digital loneliness”, becoming a symbol of contemporary postmodern existence.

Digital communication, while providing instant access to others, often lacks emotional depth and authenticity. Messages are reduced to emojis, reactions, and fragmented sentences, which impoverish the nuances of human interaction. Philosopher Sherry Turkle argues that we are “alone together” a state where individuals are physically present but psychologically distant due to immersion in their devices. Social media platforms encourage performance over presence: users curate their lives to project idealized images, reinforcing narcissistic tendencies and comparison-driven anxiety.

The philosophical challenges of informatization also extend to the realm of identity. In the digital environment, the self becomes a construct that constantly shifts depending on context and platform. Virtual avatars and profiles create the illusion of stable identity, while

in reality, they conceal a fragmented subject<sup>4</sup>. As French philosopher Luc Ferry emphasizes: “The digital revolution has changed our very notion of the self-it has become networked, unstable, and hybrid” [3].

This postmodern subjectivity<sup>6</sup> is characterized by fluidity, multiplicity, and discontinuity. Online users often maintain several parallel selves: professional, social, recreational, which may be disconnected from their offline identity. These digital personas are shaped by platform-specific norms, audience expectations, and algorithmic feedback loops. Philosopher Zygmunt Bauman called this phenomenon “liquid identity”, where the individual becomes a product of consumerist logic and perpetual reinvention<sup>7</sup>.

The gamification of social life through likes, shares, and rankings leads to what Byung-Chul Han terms the “achievement society”. In such a context, individuals internalize the logic of competitiveness and self-optimization, often to the detriment of mental health.

The erosion of privacy in the digital age undermines the possibility of autonomous identity formation. Surveillance capitalism, commodifies personal data and behavior, turning users into predictable objects of influence. The very process of self-construction is increasingly shaped by commercial imperatives and external manipulation.

From this stems another antinomy-the tension between reality and virtuality. Information technologies blur the boundaries between the ontological and the simulacral, replacing authenticity with the experience of simulations. This calls for a philosophical rethinking of the concepts of truth, authenticity, and human existence.

The ethical challenges of informatization are also becoming increasingly pressing. Issues such as digital inequality, cybersecurity, loss of privacy, and manipulation of public opinion cast doubt on the values of humanism in the digital era. There is a growing need to develop a new digital ethics capable of addressing the threats of a technogenic civilization.

Particular concern is raised by the influence of digital technologies on the younger generation. The formation of personality, worldview, and value orientations increasingly takes place in a digital environment, where aggressive content, consumerist patterns, and algorithmic filtering of information replace the educational functions of traditional social institutions such as the family, school, and culture [4]. This results in a generational gap and changes in the fundamental norms of socialization and perception of reality.

An equally significant issue is the relationship between the human and the technological. In the context of the rapid development of artificial intelligence and automation, the problem of defining the boundaries of human uniqueness becomes increasingly urgent. Machines are beginning to perform intellectual functions, calling into question traditional anthropocentric assumptions. There is a growing threat of losing subjectivity and replacing human agency with algorithmic processes.

The informatization of society is accompanied not only by technical progress but also by a wide range of new philosophical challenges. These challenges demand the development of new conceptual tools and a rethinking of the ontological and epistemological foundations of modern existence. Only through philosophical reflection can a balanced approach to digital transformation be achieved-one that avoids both technoutopianism and technophobia.

It is also important to note that the philosophy of informatization touches upon not only sociocultural but also political aspects. Technologies are increasingly used as tools of

geopolitical influence and digital sovereignty. Nations compete for dominance in cyberspace, giving rise to new forms of conflict such as information warfare, cyberattacks, and the manipulation of public consciousness. This raises urgent questions: Who controls the flow of information? On what basis and by whose authority?

Another paradox is that of the informational product as luxury: while society claims information creates value, in practice it becomes a corridor for price speculation.

The development of information technologies follows a trajectory aimed at enhancing the comfort of the informational environment. This makes ICT more accessible and lowers the cognitive barrier to information. However, this accessibility comes with an unexpected cost: the emergence of a phenomenon that can be described as “fictitious information literacy”. Users often operate software applications with confidence, yet their knowledge is acquired through rote memorization rather than creative experimentation. Lacking an understanding of fundamental principles of the digital environment, their experience remains fragmented and superficial. As a result, they struggle to transfer their skills to new platforms and feel frustrated when faced with atypical challenges.

Thus, the evolution of ICTs paradoxically leads to a decline in actual information literacy. The digital divide is no longer purely geographical or economic- it is cognitive in nature.

## **Result and Discussion**

Some may argue that low-level information literacy is still better than complete digital illiteracy. However, this argument is only partially valid. First, such users are particularly vulnerable to manipulation and lack an understanding of the social and structural principles of the internet. They become passive retransmitters rather than equal participants in communication. In a society dominated by low information literacy, so-called network communication loses its meaning, as messages circulate through automatic human relays instead of responsible communicators. This results in a communicative hierarchy, with central hubs of the virtual social network occupying dominant positions, while the periphery and numerous “dead ends” form the lower strata.

Second, a lack of technical and software competence- especially amid growing numbers of users- contributes to rising cybercrime, information breaches, and fraud. Studies show that more than 50% of sociology, public relations, and service students in Chelyabinsk ignore basic information security rules out of ignorance or negligence. This trend worsened between 2009 and 2015, coinciding with the mass adoption of mobile computers such as tablets and smartphones, whose security features are often underestimated.

We cannot accept the principle “better low information literacy than none” for a simple reason: digital ignorance poses systemic risks not only to the individual but to society as a whole. A population unprepared for the complexities of the information society becomes fertile ground for disinformation, digital manipulation, and cyber dependency. Therefore, fostering genuine digital literacy must be a strategic educational priority.

In addition, the influence of digital platforms on economic inequality must be acknowledged. The concentration of data and capital in the hands of transnational corporations has led to the emergence of digital monopolies that dictate the rules of the

game for the entire society. Users are no longer treated as subjects but rather as sources of data and resources for algorithms. In this context, a philosophical reevaluation of the concepts of labor, property, and justice in the digital economy becomes crucial.

From a philosophical perspective, the phenomenon of the “global village” also requires rethinking. Originally introduced by Marshall McLuhan, this concept has acquired new meaning in the digital age. While technology has brought the world closer, it has also intensified the fragmentation of identities and heightened local cultural differences. These tensions give rise to cultural conflicts and demand the development of a new form of digital intercultural ethics.

The problem of digital socialization also reveals a dual nature. On the one hand, the digital environment opens vast possibilities for self-development, education, and creativity. E-learning platforms, online courses, interactive tools, and access to global knowledge repositories have democratized learning and fostered new forms of cognitive autonomy. Individuals gain the ability to tailor their educational paths and cultivate intellectual skills regardless of geographic or socioeconomic constraints. Moreover, digital spaces allow for creative self-expression through multimedia formats, blogs, and social media, facilitating the emergence of new cultural practices and communities.

On the other hand, this same environment contributes to the formation of “clip thinking” a cognitive style characterized by fragmented attention, superficial information processing, and difficulty in maintaining long-term focus. Information is consumed in rapid, episodic segments, often lacking context or critical interpretation. The pursuit of instant gratification and algorithmically driven approval, such as “likes” and shares, creates a feedback loop of dependence, particularly among adolescents. As Evgeny Morozov notes, digital platforms are designed not for the user’s benefit but for behavioral predictability and monetization, turning attention into a commodity.

This dichotomy reflects the inherently contradictory nature of technological progress and calls for philosophical reflection. The digital environment, while outwardly liberating, subtly reorganizes human cognitive structures, behavioral patterns, and social expectations. As philosopher Neil Postman observed, every technological innovation simultaneously offers and takes away: it solves some problems while creating new ones. Hence, the philosophy of technology must explore not only functionality but also existential and ethical consequences.

Moreover, the environmental dimension of digitalization should not be overlooked. Despite the popular perception of the digital sphere as “immaterial,” its infrastructure: data centers, servers, satellites, and mobile devices requires vast amounts of electricity and natural resources. The carbon footprint of the ICT sector rivals that of the aviation industry. The extraction of rare-earth metals such as cobalt and lithium for smartphones and batteries is associated with environmental degradation, exploitative labor, and geopolitical tension. Additionally, e-waste has become one of the fastest-growing types of pollution worldwide, often exported to developing countries where it poses serious health risks.

Thus, the philosophy of sustainable development must expand to include digital ecology a framework that accounts for the ethical, economic, and environmental costs of

technological consumption. Questions of digital responsibility now include not only cybersecurity and privacy but also ecological awareness, repairability, and the right to digital minimalism.

A final element of analysis is the spiritual and anthropological dimension of informatization. The question of how technologies transform not only behavior but also the very understanding of the human being becomes central. The human of the future is not only a biological and cultural being, but a digitally modified subject. Technological mediation increasingly shapes consciousness, memory, and decision-making. Algorithms influence perception, filter what we see, and even co-author personal preferences and values. As a result, the boundaries of personal identity, agency, and moral autonomy are being redrawn.

In this context, philosophy must go beyond mere critique of the digital environment and seek to develop new humanitarian guidelines, capable of preserving human dignity and integrity in the midst of techno-genic transformation. This includes rethinking classical anthropological categories: freedom, responsibility, authenticity in light of cyborgization, neurotechnology, and human–AI interaction. The emerging post-human condition demands an ethical framework that does not reject technological progress but aligns it with existential meaning and the preservation of personhood.

## Conclusion

The information society emerges as a multilayered and contradictory reality in which opportunities coexist with threats, freedom with control, and knowledge with chaos. Philosophy, as a discipline focused on understanding the ultimate foundations of human existence, is more essential than ever. Without philosophical analysis, the digital age risks becoming an era of lost humanity. In this regard, the task of the philosopher is not only to critically reflect on the challenges of informatization but also to propose value-oriented guidelines for a humane future.

## References

- Alisherovna K. D. The importance of student motivation //Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal. – 2022. – T. 10. – №. 11. – C. 1188-1192.
- Bauman Z. *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000.
- Bauman, Z., & Bordoni, C. (2020). *Liquid Modernity Revisited*. Polity Press.
- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. (2020). *The Costs of Connection: How Data Colonizes Human Life*. Stanford University Press.
- Floridi, L. (2021). *The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. Oxford University Press.
- Freeman D. Antinomies of agency, structure and technology: a case study //Melbourne Journal of Politics. – 2001. – T. 28. – C. 29-54.
- Fuchs, C. (2021). *Social Media: A Critical Introduction* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Han, B.-C. (2021). *In the Swarm: Digital Prospects*. MIT Press.
- Hjarvard, S. (2019). *The Mediatization of Culture and Society*. Routledge.
- Kennedy, H., & Hill, R. (2023). Digital inequalities in everyday life. *Information, Communication & Society*, 26(4), 455–472.
- Latour, B. (2020). *Down to Earth: Politics in the New Climatic Regime*. Polity.

- Lyon, D. (2020). *Surveillance Studies: An Overview* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
- Makhamadaminovich S. M. Ethnic Factors And Attitudes Towards Human Capital Development //The American Journal of Interdisciplinary Innovations and Research. – 2021. – Т. 3. – №. 01. – С. 118-130.
- Morozov, E. (2020). *Digital Socialism? The Calculation Debate in the Age of Big Data*. Verso.
- Ochilova F. YOSHLAR SOG'LOM TURMUSH QADRIYATLARINI SHAKLLANTIRISHDA OILA INSTITUTINING TARBIYAVIY FUNKSIYASI (IJTIMOIY-FALSAFIY TAHLIL) //Иновационные исследования в современном мире: теория и практика. – 2025. – Т. 4. – №. 23. – С. 112-117.
- Peters, M. A., Jandrić, P., & Hayes, S. (2021). Postdigital knowledge ecologies. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 53(3), 213–227.
- Sodirjonov M. M. EDUCATION AS THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR OF HUMAN CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT //Theoretical & Applied Science. – 2020. – №. 4. – С. 901-905.
- Srnicek, N. (2019). *Platform Capitalism and Its Discontents*. Polity.
- Turkle S. *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*. New York: Basic Books, 2011.
- Turkle, S. (2017). *Reclaiming Conversation: The Power of Talk in a Digital Age*. Penguin.
- van Dijck, J., Poell, T., & de Waal, M. (2020). *The Platform Society: Public Values in a Connective World*. Oxford University Press.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. PublicAffairs.
- Верник А. Г. Теория социальных медиа в работах Маршала Маклюэна //Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. – 2014. – №. 23 (352). – С. 10-12.
- Латур Б. Мы никогда не были модернами / Пер. с англ. – М.: Издательство института Гайдара, 2013. – 208 с.
- Ферри Л. Человек-бог: цифровая революция и гуманизм будущего / Пер. с фр. – М.: АСТ, 2020. – 320 с.
- Хан Б.-Ч. В стае: цифровая психополитика / Пер. с нем. – СПб.: Издательство «Питер», 2021. – 144 с.