

Family Authority and the Dictatorship of the Digital Human

The Controversy of Digitalization and the Disintegration of Family Selves

Dr. Mohamed Ouserir¹, Dr. Cherifa Rakene²

¹Lecturer A, Laboratory of crime and deviance between culture and social representations, Ali Lounici University Blida 2, Email: m.ousrire@gmail.com

²Lecturer B, Laboratory of crime and deviance between culture and social representations, Ali Lounici University Blida 2, Email: rakenecherifa@gmail.com

Received: 28/07/2024

Accepted: 04/10/2024

Published: 02/11/2024

Abstract:

New technologies are constantly imposing complex patterns of change on family life, turning its scales upside down and imposing many challenges that keep growing and spreading, and perhaps the family authority is the most exposed to the expansion of the scope of technology and its influence in all social life, as digital expansion does not occur in a vacuum but through occupying family social spaces and gradually taking their place, so the family authority of the contemporary family finds itself in an incisive confrontation with a very complex and irresistible digital authority that is able to impose its style and values on its children, especially the young ones, and this digital influence seems to be dominating in such a way that it can transform the family. The family authority of the contemporary family finds itself in a heated confrontation with a very complex and highly seductive digital authority capable of imposing its style and values on its children, especially the young ones, and it seems that this digital influence is becoming dominant, enabling it to turn into a monolithic state that exercises a new dictatorship in canceling everything that is traditional and authentic and replacing it with a digital identity that only recognizes itself, which contributes to the fragmentation of family authority and the emergence of the digital human being dictatorship.

Key concepts:

Digital human - family authority - family selves - death of identities.

1-Introduction :

The importance of the family within the structure of social life cannot be overlooked, not only because it is its solid nucleus, but because it constitutes the real guarantor of its continuity and survival, so societies, while seeking to preserve their family model, premeditate to facilitate the causes of its reproduction and continuity, as the family in this

sense fully identifies with the human ambition to excel and puts itself in the service of this goal. This gives the family a high social value that is difficult for any other institution to compete with it. Therefore, throughout its long history, it has had a very influential educational and control authority that qualified it to produce a human being who accepts, respects and submits to its authority, and from here we believe that this authority has the ability to interact with all parts of social life, allowing it to exercise its authority at all times and with all its members. However, the family today no longer has such space, but rather many challenges have been imposed on it that have reduced its status, and among those challenges are the new technologies, especially communication technologies, which have taken over a great deal of its roles and narrowed its area of influence and even made it retreat far behind so that it is not difficult for us today to notice the mass of value, taste, moral, social and cultural shifts imposed and promoted by technology without stopping, as the new value flows through this technology leave nothing of the details of social life without coming and trying to impose itself in one form or another, including the family authority. Contemporary man has begun to move towards absolute attachment to digitalization, handing over all his affairs to it and allowing it to control him under the pretext of development, facilitating livelihoods, and achieving well-being which has produced what we can call the digital human being transformed in terms of standards and values, the human being who rearranges social life in a new way and eliminates much of the human social heritage, starting from the meaning of society and reaching the meaning of his existence as a human being and passing through family authority.

2- Family Authority: basic determinants and formations:

The family needs rules and terms of reference to ensure that it takes its different practices in accordance with the requirements of the social and cultural system. This situation of harmony can only be achieved by the family's keenness to adhere by its educational and supervisory authority and carry out its duty towards its children and society. This requires them to identify and reproduce socially produced symbols within the convictions and behaviors of the children, and to design everything that can ensure a stable relationship with society not only to serve its power but also to serve the social position. In this controversial relationship, the family finds itself dealing with precise determinants of a higher authority that control its subsidiary authority, which requires extreme balances of sensitivity, so that is forced to adapt itself to the emerging need of society in existential order that respects the power of society and to designate its powerful presence in the details and particularities of social behavior of its children. So the legitimacy of family authority is derived from the delegation it receives from society and not from itself, so we can understand it only within the general social identity. The presumption that imposes itself here is based on the state of social, family and individual cohesion, and it shows through it all outputs in a balanced structure that meets everyone's goals and satisfies their diverse needs.

In view of the above, the family exercises its authority over its members with a strong and rooted reference, which provides it with a continuous momentum that allows it to succeed in most cases. The birth of the social individual who represents the values, culture, and morals of society indicates that family authority is still capable of possessing and using the tools of education, guidance, control, punishment, and building solid networks among its members

and society. It also indicates that it is still capable of creating a network of sound relationships that reduce tensions, strengthen harmony, and stabilize group spirit, which confirms that family authority has a kind of rationality that enables it to normalize the individual self with the societal self and strengthen communication among the whole social. The process of the early social education that the family performs with its children is characterized by accumulation, confronting emptiness, and preventing educational breaks that may result in confusion in the structure of social action of individuals, which in turn puts pressure on society, and this naturally requires the family to have rational fitness and the ability to understand the needs of both children and society and seal the gap between them. The use of power does not mean at all forcing the individual to cancel his privacy and feelings (Fromm, 2024, p. 92) As much as it means isolating the reasons for rejecting the other and avoiding collision, the options available to the family authority in this case do not lead according to social desire except to build a system of consensus and protect the social model. Therefore, rationality is necessary to understand society and its needs and translate that into behavior in its areas of influence.

Family authority can only exercise influence over its members if it controls the well-developed method that continuously develops its performance and coexists with social changes and gives it the ability to contribute to building the social imagination of the children, which imposes on it to redesign its educational project in accordance with the requirements of every stage and the current developments. The traditional fundamental exercise of family power cannot constantly reincarnate and cannot interact with all generations. The need to understand and absorb change is not just a challenge for family authority, but a strong determinant that interfere deeply and revolutionary modeling its practices and methods of maintaining rights and performance of its duties. This situation is not a rapidly aggressive, but a continuing situation that is not constant nor in a stereotypical condition, therefore it leaves its profound effects on everything that is social, which imposes on the family authority to modernize its tools, speech and abilities of all its practices. In this important determinant, the abilities of the family authority are reversed and many problems are shown, similar to the individualism and independence promised by the excessive capitalism. Historical determinism here requires the family authority to reduce the level of condescension that has always accompanied and characterized it and to reformulate itself in a realistic way that allows it to realize the new determinants and build a true image so that it can reproduce and ensure its future continuation. The new human being that various technologies have begun to create does not accept the idea of radical authority nor being inspired by it for his desire, or accept its absolute power and does not recognize its restraint legitimacy. In light of all this, social change will sweep through many social aspects that did not comprehend its facts and did not properly prepare for it, and the family authority will not find itself immune from such a sweeping tendency.

03- Digital Society and Manifestations of New Authority:

Technology has never stopped to amaze us and bring out all the astonishment and amazement, but we soon discover the size of the cracks it creates in our society construct, how much it is capable of widening the distances separating generations and between children and parents, and how much it is capable of changing the entire form of social life. The digital age is absolutely unlike any social historical time that humanity has experienced before. It brings us to a new social horizon without specific features at the level of social identities within their resulting social relationships, roles, positions, educational and upbringing practices, linguistic manifestations, various interactions, and so on. So that we find ourselves in a position of chronic doubt about what we will turn into and about the hidden expected consequences. The human being who has exerted any effort in defending and valuing his freedom found himself in the end subjected to a new slavery that imposed itself due to his desperate need for technology and inability to do without its services after being surrendered and pinned his future and destiny on it. Fear of technology intersects in a rare case with recognition of its necessity and importance, which makes the call to get rid and separated from it seems illogical (Toffler, 1990, p. 336) and unsustainable. This requires moving towards creating appropriate preparations to confront its potential side effects. Recognizing the indispensability of technology drives social awareness to create social safety approaches and rethink how to deal with them. However, the size of the digital technological tide, the speed of its development, and the comprehensiveness of its programs that cover all social life does not leave much opportunity for society to recover and catch its breath, as the technological flow is characterized by the ability to comprehensively sweep away all value-based traditions and assumptions and replace them with its own values as quickly as possible. Therefore, this sweep can only be dealt with through the ability to predict, proactively read about it, and create in light of that an appropriate educational programs. Despite this, we don't have to believe in the end of the challenges. Rather, we are obligated to constantly re-evaluate and aspire to maintain a state of moderation in the consumption of technology and its presence in our ethics and daily life. The real ambition that haunts contemporary societies is not related to expanding reliance on technology as much as it is related to the ability to benefit from it within the limits of preserving our humanity and human nature and continuing our sense of security over our families, values, heritage, and innate harmony. Thus paying attention to this precise equation constitutes a shared human responsibility and places the aspirations of technological innovators in a social service context and removes them from the profitable and competitive capitalist context, meaning that the current connotations of the technological flow are characterized by excessive selfishness and a shift to a comprehensive ideology which believes that it is the only one capable of overcoming the failure that hits normal social life. (De Botton, 2018 p. 268).

In this context, digital technology tends to reshape and distribute social power and remove it from its natural institutions. The contemporary family does not find itself isolated from this sweeping tide. Rearranging social structures so that digital technology and those behind it can extend their control can only be done by dismantling traditional social authority and emptying

it of its interactive vitality and authentic attractiveness. The digital society cannot coexist with a past authority that is not compatible with its innovative tendency and is obsessing of its outcomes and obstruct its acceleration towards the future. The new digital authority depends on a seductive reserve capable of attracting supporters and confronting opponents. In its view, everything that is traditional must be prevented from being reproduced and obscured from the social scene, except for what is within a heritage framework or isolated individual cases. In this way, the new digital social authority is able to create its own digitized society directed specifically through communication technology.

One of the most noticeable things about a digitized society is the dominance of the digitally manufactured independence trend, meaning that digital technology removes social authority, turns it into a marginal position, and replaces it with a digital authority that convinces consumers of independence and the ability to exercise freedom without significant limits, which attracts to it many of passionate about independence and those who complain about social life, and those affected by reality that does not keep pace with their aspirations and desires, and those who aspire to excellence. It must be pointed out here that the turning point produced by digitization does not exclude the elite or the common people. It markets itself as representing the desired salvation for everyone and is the ideal alternative that leads everyone to the moment of absolute success. It has been able to mobilize the masses behind it and subject them to its new authority. The illusion of independence does not prevent the shift from traditional social authority to digital authority, as digital technology will not stop devouring reality, disqualifying it of its usual influence and authority, and extending its authority over everyone as much as possible.

What distinguishes digital authority is its ability to hide, cover up, and re-appear in many and constantly renewed forms that are characterized by attractiveness and the ability to diversify and satisfy all required satisfactions, which increases its influence, expands its circle of control, and mobilizes more followers. What is striking here is that the major institutions and companies that represent contemporary liberalism finds itself benefiting greatly from the expansion of digital power, as has especially helped it in expanding the consumer tide, sanctifying shopping, and flattening the human mind, which is needed to achieve additional gains, expand the scope of profitability, and increase its market value. This new situation also indicates that digital technology has turned the traditional socio-cultural system into non-functionality. It is no longer able to control society according to its traditional values and standards, and its authority has been dissipated in the face of technology power and its effective symbolism in meeting everyone's demands with the least effort and in the most beautiful form. Also, traditional social institutions are like the family and the school found themselves in a position of self-defense and justifying the right to exercise their authority to maintain the safety and stability of societ. Rather, it also began to admit the authority of technology and allow it to create its individuals according to its liquid values and thus allow technology to control it. Technology exists to do what it wants and to rid its beneficiaries of moral tensions (Bauman, 2017, p. 96) and to reformulate their moral system in line with its authority.

04- Digital Human, the End of Old Social Identities :

The major ongoing and expected transformations imposed by digital technology seem to be unstoppable, and still have not revealed their true and final outcomes. However, the complete conviction inspired by field indicators indicates that digitalization cannot continue unless it is able to create a new digital human being by which his existence is inspired not from society and the family as the case with the traditional human being. The survival bet of digital technology is linked existentially to the extent of its ability to penetrate human consciousness, reformulate it and arrange its priorities in a way that serves the expansion of its authority scope and its articulation in all details of daily social life.

Digital technology will rebuild a new type of liberal capitalism that empties social institutions of their authority and further dismantles society in favor of the individual's increasing status and excessive independence. In the midst of this trend, the management of social life care will be taken of by digitalization and will strive to impose its values and style that are compatible with the passion of individuals and will not care about society nor its resistance. The basic decisions related to the future of the individual's life and his major choices will be determined according to the economic, educational, and political horizons drawn by digital technology, which means that we are in the process of birthing a new social identity in which familiar social legacies will retreat and the transition to a new societal system framed by digital values and ethics that enhance the individual's status and independence.

The new social identity will take the individual from the zone of contentment with everything social to the zone of undeclared revolution against society where the family will be its biggest victim, and as a result society will be an artificial human gathering that performs its duties in exchange for the ability to satisfy the whims and the illusion of freedom and privacy respect. The human group that we will deal with do not interconnect with each other except through a digital control device behind which major companies stand, so that they create unprecedented social ties characterized by materialism, rationality, legal boundaries, professional and administrative relations, and the contraction of social and human relations. Here the individual has the ability to isolate himself from social others because his need to them no longer exists after digitalization was able to compensate it. This individual only seeks to advance in his working life and gain more instrumental efficiency (Zinoviev, 2010, p. 77) and does not think to satisfy society as much as he thinks about pleasing his direct officials.

Digital technology imposes real existential challenges on the old social identity, as it gradually disintegrates its authority and manifestations, and has even managed to create an entire generation that is indifferent to it and has not experienced many of its moral and behavioral manifestations. Therefore, it does not find any embarrassment in disengaging from its behavioral rules, its social ties, and the values that control it. Digitization has created its own habits, which are often characterized by fluidity, speed of change, and the sequential form of the fashion appearance. The only constant within this identity is the creation of excitement, the creation of new habits, and the innovative flow that includes everything. Therefore, we notice that the digitized person quickly harmonizes with this identity and

adopts it because it frees him of moral costs, satisfies many of his whims, and satisfies his hunger for liberation. Strengthening the demands, especially of youth that were rejected and besieged by the old social identity, constitutes an important input that digitalization uses to reach its goal and impose its new identity. This is because the digital person is characterized by selfishness, and coexistence represents only a technical need required by the axioms of meeting the basic needs related to his survival, and this is the opposite of what it was based on the old social identity that takes the other seriously and takes into account his importance in regulating the rules of coexistence, so that the other is linked to human, moral, and emotional value more than to material value, the case in digital identity.

The death of old identities does not constitute the only shock, but leads to other shocks that are related to it and express it, and in turn contribute to changing the concept of society, its form, and its function, so that the familiar patterns of social action will change, and accordingly, new social practices linked to digital technology will emerge, such as work, distance education, electronic addiction, social isolation, virtual social relations, virtual public spaces and the growing presence of artificial intelligence in the media, medicine, education, industry, cultural, artistic and cinematic creativity, and the ease of spreading pornography, atheism, homosexuality, and so on. All this means the beginning of the atrophy of many traditional social patterns and the re-examination of the behaviors resulting from them in a purely digital form and the emergence instead of that a matrix of pivotal electronic systems on which future social interactions are based. Among these systems is the emergence of the individual electronic action system, which replaces the group system. The reference that determines the action here is not the group with its cultural and value system, but rather the individual reference that relies on its own interests, personal ambitions, personal choices, and abilities to impose itself and prove its existence through the new digital technology. Social interaction in this way is not derived from the group culture and goals, but rather from the meaning that the individual gives to himself and his right to excel according to his convictions and capabilities, which leads to the disappearance of the group system, which in turn expresses the death of the traditional social identity for the digital human being.

05- The Dictatorship of the Digital Human in Confrontation of the Family Authority:

The history of the family cannot be separated from the history of the general conflict that characterized the history of humanity. The family has fought great struggles for its survival as a basic entity in the structure of society, and has been described also as an indispensable social authority in the formation of the social human being who reflects the shadow of his society and recognizes over it his absolute sovereignty. The family's service to society gives it added value and legitimizes its right to possess some sovereignty and possess the duty of society to defend it and ensure its continuity in a world characterized by the high intensity of resounding change. The family has always represented the interface of society and its reflecting mirror and the most important institution in producing the required agreements between the individual and society, thus ensuring stability, balance and the continuation of social structures in performing their functions in the form and process that satisfies society. Therefore, the family never ceases to consider itself as a decisive force possessing social and

historical and moral plausibility that allows it to overcome the problems posed by social change led by neoliberal evolutionists. However, the transformational rhythm imposed by digital technology on the family today is not at all similar to previous rhythms due to its intensity, speed, comprehensiveness, attractiveness of its means, ease of spread, ability to sense and meet people's needs and aspirations, and its ability to normalize the individual with the industrial values promoted by the major companies that lead the contemporary world. What can be said about the previous natural social change cannot currently be said about the forced social change imposed by the tyranny of digital technology and those who control it. Therefore, the facts of the radical changes imposed by digitalization constitute a source of great concern for the family, not only in terms of its competition in its authority, but also in terms of its total existence and its gradual marginalization in preparation for its complete exclusion from the social scene. The digital revolution is not similar to the industrial revolution nor to the cognitive and value-based revolution brought about by western modernity. It is a complete and final break with the past with its various components and the birth of a completely different society, a society with unclear features other than those related to the obsession with liberation, the birth of individual entities and the death of traditional social institutions, the confinement of cultural distinction, and the dominance of universal culture with its capitalist spirit. In this regard, the family finds itself at the highest levels of marginalization and siege. Here we are talking about the social family, not the biological family, meaning the family that carries out the process of social upbringing, determines the identity of the children, controls their behavior, endures its moral and supervisory responsibilities, inherits the cultural and value system, and is keen on social normalization and reproducing the same obedient social individual.

Today, the family cannot deal with the challenges of digitalization in the same way it dealt with previous challenges. Digital spaces possess unlimited and invisible power. They are a torrent of diverse flows that aim to build a new awareness of life, society, the self, and the family itself. This digital awareness results in dynamic emergences (Levy, 2018, p. 159) that are new and unfamiliar and do not recognize what exists as it exists, but rather work to refine it according to its own necessities only. In other words, we are facing a force that rearranges everything according to what serves and raises the level of its power and control. To extend this control, it is necessary to change traditional social axioms and replace them with new axioms that ally with the individual ego and gradually accumulate to create its desired society, that individualistic society that is intensely reconciled with new technology and at odds with traditional social institutions. In this escalating trend of change, the family finds itself in a sharp and direct confrontation with individual entities that do not recognize it as a social institution qualified to lead it, define its ethics and behaviors, and frame its goals and its practices. In this case, the family is formed as a biological given with limited roles and is unable to accumulate its roles and functions outside this narrow framework because the digital human being imagines that the family is a past institution that does not keep pace with his intellectual and cultural structure and confiscates his awareness of independent and liberated self. Therefore, this human being does not hesitate to question about the usefulness of the family for him, while digitization with its artificial intelligence, precise and effective

electronic programs is fully capable of meeting psychological, educational, professional and instinctive needs without stopping and according to an optional logic that takes into account his desire and not the desire of the family. Accordingly, this logic of usefulness that frames the consciousness of the digital human gives him the justifications he needs to exercise his tyranny over the family and develop his individual entity and generalize it as an absolute constant that distinguishes contemporary social life. Individualism here is not only a substitution process, but rather a programmed process of getting rid of the family as a vital social symbol within the framework of the process of building a digital corporate society or the whole electronic society. The digital human being initially imagines that he is socially self-sufficient and does not need to reproduce the same family life of his ancestors, and that controlling algorithms allows him to move forward on the ladder of success and obtain self- and organizational satisfaction away from the family life tensions. The more this human being is able to develop his instrumental talent in dealing with digitization, the more his cognitive, economic and social value increases, and thus his ability to rise above the family, or so technology wanted him to imagine.

There is no doubt that the family will find itself in the future in direct confrontation with the tyranny of the digital human being with a liberal tendency, obsessed with success and pleasure, and electronically intertwined with the distant and diverse world, as this intertwining gives him a sense of superiority and the ability to transcend reality and increases his conviction that technology is more reliable than everything that already existed (Cohen, 2022, p. 95), including the family, so he does not pay attention to it and persists in not caring about it and bypassing its laws and controls, as the digital human being lives in a state of modern exchange or a form of metaphor in which he voluntarily gives up his cultural, value and even emotional references that connect him to his family in exchange for achieving his individual goals. This justifies him imposing his dictatorship on the family, his constant criticism of it, his rejection of its lifestyle, forcing it to accept his positions and orientations, clashing with it in everything in preparation for the final separation. However, this illusion is hardly stable due to the continuous renewal of digital technology and its endless thirst for profit, control, and the separation of competition in its favor, also because the attractiveness of society has not yet surrendered and the inclinations of sound human nature continue to conflict with the individual and return him to the natural social state where the family and the individual are together in their sound position. When the unbridled digital person exercises his dictatorship over the family in an attempt to eliminate it, does not mean at all that the family has surrendered and accepted this fate, but this new situation strengthens its resistance spirit and moves it from the stage of total consistency with the new situation to the stage of renewed reincarnation and adaptation to the contemporary challenges that poses to it by digitalization.

The family has often found itself facing new social projects that aim to limit and neutralize it in favor of intensifying individualism, similar to what modernity, postmodernity, and knowledge society projects have done. However, the family has remained steadfast and imposes itself as a solid nucleus of society that cannot be bypassed. In this context, we are

still unable to define the individual apart from his multiple references (Maffezzoli, 2017, p. 332).

It is worth noting at this analytical level that if digitization has enabled the individual to imagine freedom and independence from the family, it has also made him fall into its dictatorship and dominance and completely enslaved him. Today, it is not possible to separate the individual's economic, professional, educational and entertainment interests from the control of digitization. Here we are faced with a state of coercive substitution in which the digital individual exchanges his freedom for the full range of gratifications offered by digital technology. Even if this individual tries to reverse the contexts by dismantling his traditional ties with the family in order to enjoy his social independence and exercise over it his dictatorship, he soon finds himself captive to unprecedented political, economic and technical trends that rob him his freedom and care about shaping his consciousness to accept the new slavery established and practiced by digital technology.

06- The Controversy of Digitalization and the Disintegration of Family Selves:

Social activity within the family is multifaceted, social interactions are crowded and emotions are accumulated on a daily and uninterrupted basis. Family social experience indicates that functional integration is the reinforcement basis for controlling its course and organizing its relationships and interactions. The multiplicity of family selves and their different authorities, roles, and positions if they are not consistent according to the integration functional system, it will produce a state of contradiction and create the causes of disintegration. Therefore, the socio-cultural system always reinforces the causes of social coherence through the precise definition of roles, rights, duties, methodologies for managing social life, the values and standards upon which we rely in dealing with our social existence, and forms of control and punishment. Since the family cannot escape from dealing with multiple selves that form it, it always relies on the organization that society imposes on everyone within its precise hierarchy, through which it ensures everyone's submission. This allowed the family to gain balance and the ability to deal with cases of violation of its rules and threats of its usual stability. So the family is very keen to keep its various selves under its authority and submit to it with absolute obedience and loyalty but history and reality inform us that this desire has not always been accepted and respected. The erosion of the family's authority and the cracking of its power and influence have become a visible reality and a pure feature of contemporary industrial societies. The idea of liberation is an obsession and a demand to many theses, ideas and intellectual projects and ideologies. This trend coincided with a passion and desire here and there that helped it expand and spread over time and transform into educational programs and political projects defended by wide range of people, especially those who benefit from them. Digital technology has deepened this presence and helped a lot in providing the psychological and material climate to confirm its feasibility and value, so that it has restored defining the meaning of social otherness, stripping it of the meaning of holiness, removing the veils and making it permissible and subject to criticism and questioning. Otherness in the digital age is subject to exposure, debunking, and criticism by everyone. Family and friends, foreigners and strangers, elites, specialists and commoners,

everyone exercises this imaginary right, and privacy, which has long been defended by democracy projects, openness, human rights and modernity, finds itself under the influence of the redefinition that digital technology imposes on almost everyone, and today it is trying to impose the idea of the individual completeness (Zimmel. 2017, p. 216) The individual with a great self and who has the possibility of achieving happiness with his own abilities, those abilities that digital technology reaches, invests in, and pushes forward in a miraculous way. It is clear that the greater the authority of the individual self, the more the family's authority is marginalized. We are not arguing here if we say that this situation helps the family selves to escape and go further in demanding more independence from the family's authority since it is no longer a condition for superiority in comparison to what digitalization is offering.

It does not seem that digital technology will abandon its social gains, as the ability to innovate will not stop, but what matters most is finding a market that consumes this innovator and not being embarrassed to surrender to it. Therefore, the family will find itself a subject of conflict with it, because digital flows, with their many temptations, are not compatible with the actual family context that clings to its authoritarian past and its moral right to create, control and reproduce family selves with the same psychological, behavioral and cultural structure. Therefore, the extent of the tension between digital technology and the family will focus on who is able to possess the individual and control his consciousness, and digitalization here presents many factors that justify the family's fear and resistance. Its ability to create isolated worlds within the family, seclusion with children, and building their minds and personalities other than its culture and values represents an evident threat to the family existence as a whole. From the perspective of the family, the digital flow is neither spontaneous nor naïve as well, but rather a precise and planned project to create a new world in which the family is a marginal institution devoid of its upbringing, supervisory, and regulating roles. Among the fears posed by the family is also the loss of control over themselves, especially the female self and the youthful self, and scientific extrapolation cannot disable us to notice the extent of the focus they are having in the world of the digital network. The feminine and youthful, liberated, revolutionary and innovative model promoted by digital platforms is of great concern to the family and it is considered an explicit complicity against it and does not serve its usual stability and balance.

We cannot present the situation only in this way, but we must also look at other concerns raised by the family, and the matter here is related to the overlapping of roles and the disappearance of social boundaries inside the family. Thus digital technology with its universal, liberal values that dissolve cultural particularities will work to create what we can call non-social parenting., where digital technology takes over the roles of father and mother related to their relationship with teenage children, and youth, turning them into only biological parents who are unable to interfere in shaping the course of their live and influencing their various choices. Also, the digital space directly targets women and reproduces a new feminine ego that does not recognize the authority of the male ego and is not reconciled with its current roles and status. We can also notice that digitalization is capable of discouraging the marital relationship and limiting marital communication, so

digital modeling of couples quickly becomes the basis reference in creating the imagination in which the husband imagines the nature of the ideal wife and the wife imagines the nature of the ideal husband. In the event that this imagination is not consistent with the marital reality, the family will be faced with another justification for discord. With this approach, we are facing an attempt to root disarray inside the family, strip it of cohesion, and push it towards internal discontent and roles conflict.

Thus, the takeover of social life by digital technology will lead to material and spiritual submersion (Huizinga, 2015, p. 85), which generalizes individual selfishness, creates division between family selves, and imposes the logic of individualism inside them. We are not talking here about individualism as a wave of liberation only, but rather we are talking about its transformation into a real dictatorship which imposes its unilateral opinion on everyone and only believes in the interactive system that suits and satisfies it. The individualism that digital technology will lead to works to deepen the meaning of the digital person dictatorship, who does not hesitate to undermine the prestige of the family in defense of his interests and ambitions.

The defeat of the family in front of itself is no longer a distant possibility, but has turned into a real concern that worries it at all times. The scale of the challenge is increasing with the increasing dominance of digitization over economic, educational, security, media, social, and so on. Digitization is deeply rooted in our social structure and has begun to turn into the only mechanism for communication, fulfilling achievements, and managing social affairs and even began to transform into a social background that reflects the essence of each class, its new positions, and the nature of its dealings with social institutions, including the family institution.

07- Conclusion:

Digital technology is no longer just a scientific technology for communication and the accomplishment of jobs. Its revolutionary spirit is on which the entire future is betting. It is also no longer an elitist and instrumental state with limited spread. It is a new world completely separated from the past world we knew, and an invented herald of the birth of a unique type of dictatorship characterized by the production of desired slavery and voluntary alienation. The matter here is not only related to the strong prohibition in our daily lives, but rather it is related to the unnatural rooting and the shift to total control over everything related to our social, individual and psychological life, using its undeniable advantages. That's why, the situation cannot be presented at the level of technology only, as it must be presented at the level of the human being and the level of society and the tools it employs in order to preserve its entity and the continuation of its cultural and social system. Society's awareness of the digitalization effects on its institutions is very important in creating a balanced alliance between the family and digital technology. This will not happen unless society gives up somewhat on its narcissism and reaches the stage of complete awareness that technology will not stop until it robs it of its maximum power and prestige.

Therefore, we cannot ignore the extent of the erosion of space of the family's presence in the individual conscience, which digital technology has occupied and added its special touch. Today, it is no longer possible to talk about the individual who is completely identical with his family. We are in the process of getting to know more about the digitized human being who transcends his family extension and who does not recognize the social family that has the legitimacy to raise him, subject him to its values, and train him to revive the same model of life that this social family has lived over many generations. He barely recognizes the biological family that gave birth and cared for him in both physic and health, and he can only grant its rights that meet this dimension.

The digitized human who has absolute faith in the miraculous power of digital technology will not delay engaging in it more and more, seeking absolute success as he envisions. This success will gain him more power and satisfaction, which will push him towards turning into a strict dictatorship in dealing with the family, and he will be more inclined towards emancipation from it and freeing his consciousness from its value, moral, educational and supervisory remnants.

As a result of this new reality, the family will be exposed to more challenges, probably the most severe of which is its arrival in a fluid state, where family entities will slip away, the natural cohesion of the family will continue to be destroyed, the increase of the state of fragmentation, Loneliness, voluntary isolation, obsession with independence, and weakness in fulfilling one's duty toward family will continue, especially with regard to respecting parental rights. It seems that the state of disarray of family selves is not limited to the level of relationships, roles, and status only, but will extend to the concept of family leadership, which is what will be most exposed to dismantling.

Digitization technology is no longer an innovative advantage, but rather has turned into an urgent need to continue the development of humanity, so its impact on the family is not expected to decline. However, we cannot be completely certain of what the situation will lead to in the future, as the family has acquired throughout its history the ability to resist, adapt and circumvent the challenges it is constantly facing, but what seems clear now is that we are truly facing a new human being who strongly believes in the virtual world and is completely indulged in digital technologies. His social awareness has not been formed by traditional methods and the required social coexistence, which will make him more susceptible to legitimizing the transformation and start a new social era in which the family is subject to the dictatorship of the digital man.

References:

- 1- Fromm Erich: (2024), *The Sane Society*, translated by Mahmoud Mahmoud, Cairo, Hindawi Book Foundation.
- 2 - Toffler Alvin: (1990), *Future Shock - Changes in Tomorrow's World -*, translated by Muhammad Ali Nassif, 2nd edition, Cairo, Nahdet Misr Press.

- 03- De Botton Alain: (2018), *The Anxiety of Striving for Status - Feeling Satisfied or Humiliated -*, translated by Muhammad Abdel Nabi, 1st edition, Beirut, Dar Al-Tanweer.
- 04 - Baumann Zygmunt, Leon David: (2017), *Liquid Surveillance*, translated by Heba Raouf Ezzat, 1st edition, Beirut, Arab Network for Research and Publishing.
- 05- Zinoviev Alexander: (2010), *The West - The Western Phenomenon -*, translated by Adel Ismail and Nofal Nayouf, 1st edition, Cairo, National Center for Translation.
- 06 - Levy Pierre: (2018), *Our Virtual World - What is it and What is its Relationship to Reality*, translated by Riyad Al-Kahal, 1st edition, Beirut, Karaki Press.
- 07 - Cohen Daniel, (2022): *The Digital Human and the Coming Civilization*, translated by Ai Yousef Asaad, 1st edition, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Page Seven for Publishing and Distribution.
- 08 - Maffezzoli Michele: (2017), *The World of Appearances and the Life of Masks for the Sake of Aesthetic Ethics*, translated by Abdullah Zaro, 1st edition, Dar Al-Badha Morocco, East Africa.
- 09 - Zemel George: (2017), *The Individual and Society, Basic Problems of Sociology*, translated by Hassan Ahjejj, 1st edition, Cairo, Vision for Publishing and Distribution.
- 10 - Huizenga Johan: (2015), *In the Shadow of Tomorrow:- A Diagnosis of the Modern Distemper -* translated by Mustafa Abdel Zaher, 1st edition, Giza, Egypt, Al-Safsafa Library for Publishing, Distribution and Studies.