

Digital Space and Human Life in A Technological Society

PhD: Hoang Minh Hoa¹, Master of Science: Ho Van Phong²

¹DNU (Dong Nai University), Vietnam

²DNU (Dong Nai University), Vietnam

ABSTRACT: The digital space is no longer merely a tool to support physical life; it has become a new environment where people exist, communicate, work, and consume. The emergence of the internet, social media platforms, artificial intelligence, and digital ecosystems has blurred the lines between real and virtual space. In the technocratic era, the digital space is realized as a vibrant dimension where people not only participate passively but also construct their own identities, relationships, and worldviews. Therefore, to build a harmonious society, the author chooses the topic of *digital space and human life in a technocratic society* as the subject of this research.

KEYWORDS: Digital space as an environment of existence; Fragmentation and power building; Redefining community in virtual space; Loss of intimate and personal space; Interaction between physical and digital reality.

1. Digital space as an environment of existence

The rapid development of the digital space goes hand in hand with the digitization of every aspect of life. Work, study, shopping, entertainment, and social activities can all take place in a non-physical environment where data becomes the dominant operating medium. This space is no longer a peripheral means but has become the survival infrastructure for billions of people on the planet. In that world, human existence transcends geographical boundaries but is simultaneously shaped by invisible power structures, which are in the hands of entities controlling data and digital platforms.

The digital space, as an environment of existence, possesses two prominent characteristics: connectivity and immateriality. Connectivity allows people to expand their ability to interact, participate in online communities, work remotely, or develop relationships beyond national borders. However, the downside of this connectivity is the risk of assimilation and standardization of behavior. Algorithms and social media platforms not only reflect but also shape needs, tastes, and opinions. People believe they are free to choose content, products, or relationships, but in reality, they are being manipulated by sophisticated designs aimed at maximizing profits for technology corporations.

In that world, personal identity is no longer formed from direct experiences with the physical environment, but from digital interactions, which are shaped by data and suggestive algorithms. Every like, share, search, or purchase leaves a data trail, becoming a source of information for systems to predict and manipulate behavior. In this process, people gradually lose the ability to define themselves, as personal identity is reduced to data profiles, consumption patterns, and pre-designed sequences of interactions.

From a dialectical perspective, the digital space possesses a dual nature. On the one hand, it opens up new possibilities for freedom: transcending physical limitations, accessing boundless knowledge, and participating in cross-border creative communities. But on the other hand, this very space also harbors the dangers of stifling freedom, as all choices and behaviors are surrounded by invisible technocratic structures. In this environment, individuals can lose themselves, becoming part of the data in an optimization network, where freedom is merely a superficial illusion.

Realistic human philosophy emphasizes that the digital space needs to be redefined not as a framework for optimizing behavior, but as an open dimension for creativity and freedom. Only by reaffirming their status as creative subjects can humans transform the digital space into a tool serving human life, instead of becoming a sophisticated confinement environment of the technocratic era.

The immaterial nature of digital space offers humanity unprecedented possibilities in history. It liberates people from traditional physical constraints, allowing us to interact, create, and work in new dimensions where geographical distance and time seem to no longer be obstacles. In that space, an idea can spread instantly, and a meeting can take place even if two people are half a world apart. This immateriality opens up a new dimension of freedom, where humanity is no longer confined within the limits of tangible material things.

However, this very immateriality also weakens the human capacity for direct perception and full presence. Communication in the digital space lacks concrete elements such as eye contact, gestures, atmosphere, or the biological rhythms inherent in physical

Digital Space and Human Life in A Technological Society

interactions. Relationships mediated by technology become fragile, vulnerable, and often remain superficial. People connect through clicks and data streams, yet feel more isolated within that very network. Dependence on digital infrastructure also causes people to gradually lose their connection with physical reality, losing their sense of place and the natural rhythm of life.

In that world, reality is digitized into sets of data. Every action, emotion, even thought – when expressed through digital interaction – can be collected, analyzed, and exploited. Humans, from being living subjects, risk being reduced to a data node in a global technocratic network, where everything is measured, ranked, and optimized to serve operational goals.

From a dialectical perspective, the digital space inherently possesses a contradiction. On the one hand, it opens up significant liberating possibilities: borderless learning, opportunities for creativity transcending physical limitations, and new forms of community independent of geographical location. But on the other hand, it also harbors the risk of profound alienation. When every human interaction is monitored, measured, and exploited, freedom becomes an illusion, and individual identity risks being dissolved into algorithms designed to optimize profit and power.

To overcome this threat, humanity needs to reaffirm that the digital space is not an autonomous entity replacing real life, but rather an extension of reality. This requires building ways of being present and interacting based on humanistic principles: protecting diversity, freedom, and the depth of spiritual life. The digital space needs to be redefined as an environment that supports holistic human development, where technology becomes a tool for liberation, rather than a machine of assimilation and control.

Realistic human philosophy emphasizes that only when humans are courageous enough to reflect on their position in the digital space, and discerning enough to distinguish between means and ends, can we restore our status as creative subjects. Only then will the digital space cease to be a soulless technocratic network and become a dimension of creativity and freedom in the contemporary world.

2. The fragmentation and construction of power

The digital space, while often lauded as an open and equitable environment, is witnessing a profound fragmentation and power reshaping on a global scale. Discourses about “digital freedom” or “global connectivity” obscure a reality where data has become a strategic resource, and those who possess the ability to collect, process, and exploit data hold the real power. The digitization of every dimension of life – from communication, work, and consumption to even perception and emotion – is shaping new power structures, where large technology corporations rise as centers of power equal to, or even surpassing, traditional political institutions. One of the most striking manifestations of fragmentation in the digital space is the phenomenon of information bubbles and hopelessness. Recommendation algorithms, designed to maximize user engagement and retention, constantly deliver content that aligns with individuals' established preferences and beliefs. This leads to a confined space where each person is surrounded by consensual viewpoints, familiar voices, and virtually no opportunity for interaction with differences. At the community level, this fragmentation erodes the foundations of dialogue and mutual understanding. Groups are isolated within their own distinct worldviews, where opposing information is not only dismissed but interpreted as threats. This contributes to the extremism of viewpoints, increases social conflict, and leads to deep divisions within communities that require collaboration to address common problems.

In terms of power, the digital space is not as apolitical as many mistakenly believe. Instead, it operates as a new power structure where tech corporations – with their control over technical infrastructure, user data, and orchestration algorithms – can profoundly influence how people perceive, choose, and act. Possessing behavioral data from billions of people globally gives these entities unprecedented power: not only to predict, but to shape consumer trends, political views, and even personal emotions. This is a form of soft power that is both subtle and insidious, because it doesn't directly coerce people, but subtly guides them, making many unaware that they are being manipulated. Every click, search, or status update becomes raw data for algorithms to optimize the user experience – but simultaneously, to optimize consumer behavior and compliance. In that environment, freedom of choice is reduced to a series of reactions to carefully orchestrated suggestions.

From a dialectical perspective, the digital space simultaneously opens up possibilities for liberation and harbors the risk of alienation. It allows humans to create new possibilities for freedom, learning, and creativity, but at the same time threatens to transform them into data entities, where every interaction, behavior, and even thought is monitored, measured, and exploited. As technology becomes a tool for coordinating behavior, humans gradually lose their ability to reflect and make free choices. Instead of actively constructing their identity and worldview, they become passive subjects, swept along by the optimization currents of technocratic networks.

For the digital space to truly become an environment of liberation rather than a controlling machine, people need to reaffirm their position as creative subjects. This requires building technical systems based on humanistic principles, respecting freedom and diversity. People need to develop the ability to reflect on how technology shapes behavior, identify the limitations imposed by algorithms, and re-establish digital communities as open spaces for dialogue, where differences are accepted rather than excluded. Only then will the digital space truly become an environment that supports holistic development, instead of a sophisticated technocratic order that confines people within data loops.

Digital Space and Human Life in A Technological Society

Fragmentation also creates new forms of inequality, where power in the digital space is not evenly distributed but concentrated in the hands of a few entities possessing the technical infrastructure and data processing capabilities. While a small group of individuals and communities have access to, manage, and exploit data to consolidate their position, the majority of users become unpaid data laborers, unknowingly providing information about their behavior, preferences, and relationships for digital platforms to exploit commercially. Personal data – from geographic location and consumption habits to social interactions – is abstracted into strings of code, exchanged and traded in invisible markets without the data providers' knowledge. This gives rise to a new form of alienation, where people are no longer the subjects controlling information about themselves but become raw material for algorithms optimizing profits.

At a deeper level, the digital space creates the illusion of absolute freedom by offering the ability to transcend physical boundaries and establish online communities that transcend geographical borders. But hidden beneath this expansion are invisible control structures, where soft power operates by guiding behavior rather than directly coercing it. People believe they are free to choose content, goods, or opinions, but in reality, those choices are predetermined by suggestive algorithms and sophisticated designs. Freedom, which requires reflection and creativity, is reduced to a series of reactions to programmed signals.

From a dialectical perspective, the fragmentation and creation of power in the digital space is not entirely negative. The digital space also opens up possibilities for individuals and small groups to build new communities, disrupt old power structures, and carry out collective actions beyond physical boundaries. It provides opportunities for marginalized voices in the physical world to emerge, connect, and form transformative social movements. However, without profound reflection and humanistic design, these possibilities can quickly be assimilated into the profit-maximizing mechanisms of technocratic corporations, transforming the digital space from a liberating environment into a tool for recreating and reinforcing power inequalities.

Realistic humanistic philosophy demands a restructuring of the digital space to minimize fragmentation and the dispersion of digital power, preventing it from being concentrated in the hands of a few entities. This cannot be achieved through purely technological solutions but requires a combination of user self-reflection, a transparent legal framework, and technology designs that place human values at the center. When people realize that data, platforms, and algorithms are not neutral entities but powerful tools capable of shaping reality, they can begin to demand transparency, democratic control, and accountability from those who create these systems. Only then will the digital space truly become an environment that expands human freedom and creativity, rather than a sophisticated control structure and an assimilation machine operated to maximize profits.

3. Redefining community in virtual space

In human tradition, community is a space where people share life, building relationships based on closeness, understanding, and connection. It is where people find meaning in their existence beyond themselves, where the presence and actions of each individual are connected to the shared lives of others. However, with the powerful rise of virtual space, the concept of community is being redefined in new ways, both opening up unprecedented possibilities for connection and posing profound challenges to the humanistic nature of relationships. In the technocratic era, community no longer exists primarily in physical locations, but has expanded into digital networks where data, algorithms, and digital platforms act as intermediaries coordinating how people connect with each other.

Virtual communities allow individuals from all over the world to connect based on shared interests, beliefs, or goals. Forums, social networks, and chat platforms facilitate the sharing of information, emotions, and ideas among people who have never met. On the surface, this represents a significant step in breaking down geographical boundaries, opening up possibilities for collaboration and solidarity beyond traditional spaces. A researcher in Europe can collaborate with an artist in Africa; small groups can form social movements and influence global perceptions without meeting in person. However, virtual communities also possess characteristics that profoundly alter the very nature of community.

First, virtual communities often lack the physical foundation of connection. In traditional communities, people share a common space, experience moments together, feel each other's gaze, gestures, sounds, and atmosphere. These physical experiences foster intimacy, trust, and mutual responsibility—elements that cannot be completely replaced by text messages, emojis, or video calls. Virtual communities, on the other hand, operate primarily through non-physical interactions, where messages, images, and symbols become the main means of connection. This increases the likelihood of rapid connection and network expansion, but it also easily leads to superficiality and fragility in relationships. A "friend" in a virtual community can disappear with a click, and easily formed bonds are easily broken.

Another problem is algorithmic mediation. Digital platforms are not merely passive environments for communities to form, but actively shape how people connect, interact, and maintain relationships. Algorithms prioritize displaying content that grabs attention and evokes strong emotions—anger, fear, or excitement—because it is more likely to retain users longer. As a result, extreme and divisive viewpoints tend to be amplified, while moderate and nuanced voices are gradually drowned out. Communities formed in such spaces are susceptible to becoming closed “information bubbles,” where members primarily encounter similar opinions and reinforce pre-existing beliefs. This undermines the capacity for dialogue, understanding, and tolerance of differences—elements that are core to a humane community.

Digital Space and Human Life in A Technological Society

From a dialectical perspective, the virtual community simultaneously opens up possibilities for liberation and harbors the risk of alienation. On the positive side, it allows marginalized voices to be heard, connecting people in remote areas to form social movements and creating decentralized community structures capable of challenging traditional power structures. However, on the negative side, it can also become a tool for technocratic corporations to manipulate behavior, collect data, and exploit human emotions to maximize profits. In such an environment, people not only participate in the community but also become commodities traded in invisible markets.

Realistic human philosophy demands a reshaping of community space within a technocratic world in a way that protects the humanistic nature of relationships. This does not mean denying the existence of virtual communities, but rather creating principles and technological designs that maintain depth, trust, and mutual responsibility among people. A community can only truly be a place where people coexist and affirm their free and creative selves if it breaks free from algorithmic structures designed to maximize superficial interaction. Only then can a community – whether in physical or digital space – become an environment that fosters freedom, creativity, and genuine human connection.

Virtual communities are often subtly commercialized. Data on user relationships, interests, and interactions becomes a huge source of profit for technology corporations. What is considered "connection" in virtual communities is often merely a carefully designed series of interactions aimed at maximizing user time on the platform and increasing the likelihood of consuming content, products, or services. In this context, people are both participants in the community and commodities traded in data markets without their knowledge. Every like, share, or comment is encoded into information, collected, analyzed, and exploited to serve commercial or political goals. Power is no longer present in tangible places like the state or local communities, but is dispersed across digital infrastructures, where invisible entities control information and behavior.

From a dialectical perspective, the virtual community holds significant liberating potential. It opens up new spaces where marginalized groups and individuals, once excluded from the physical world, can find a voice and opportunities to assert themselves. Social movements, from environmental protection and human rights to education, have leveraged the power of the virtual community to spread messages and organize collective action across geographical boundaries. A hashtag on social media can spark global awareness, and a viral video can become a catalyst for social change. These possibilities demonstrate that the virtual community is not merely a passive environment but a potential space for creating new social practices.

However, this very ability can also be manipulated and assimilated into power structures seeking to maintain control. Recommendation algorithms and content filtering mechanisms can steer public attention in directions beneficial to corporations and technocratic systems. A social movement can be neutralized simply by reducing its visibility on platforms, or transformed into a fleeting phenomenon for commercial exploitation. Meanwhile, algorithm-recommended "communities" are often not based on genuine engagement but on optimized behavioral patterns designed to maintain superficial interaction. This undermines the ability to develop deep and lasting human relationships.

In that space, people risk losing themselves when every expression, connection, and action is quantified and monitored. Instead of fostering connection, dialogue, and creativity, communities can transform into data-producing machines, where each individual becomes a link in a profit-maximizing cycle. Relationships, seemingly expanding and diversifying, are shaped by digital logic, where human presence and interaction are only perceived through numbers: followers, comments, shares.

How can we redefine the virtual community in a humanistic way, so that it is not merely a place for consuming content and exchanging information, but truly becomes a space that unleashes the potential of each individual? The answer requires both liberating technological designs and self-reflection from users. Virtual communities need to be built as open environments where data is not monopolized and algorithms do not dictate how people connect. At the same time, each individual needs to deeply understand their position within the technocratic network, so as not to be dissolved into mere data objects, but to proactively build relationships based on genuine connection, dialogue, and creativity.

Realistic human philosophy emphasizes that communities – whether existing in physical or virtual space – can only be truly free spaces when individuals reaffirm their role as subjects. Digital presence needs to be nurtured by human values, rather than allowing corporations and algorithms to design how people connect and feel. Otherwise, virtual communities will remain data bubbles, where people interact without truly meeting, connect without truly being connected. Only when we have the courage to reflect on and restructure that space will communities return to their rightful role: an environment that fosters presence, dialogue, and creative action, where people are no longer controlled entities but free subjects who collaboratively build the world.

4. Loss of intimate and personal space

Intimate and personal spaces have long been considered one of the most important pillars for humans to protect their humanity, maintain privacy, and nurture deep relationships. It's a place where people can retreat from the noisy world, recharge their mental energy, and reconnect with themselves. However, in the technocratic age, with the rise of digital systems and global data networks, this space is shrinking and even disintegrating. The rapid development of technology – from social media and artificial intelligence to smart devices – has profoundly altered how people experience and maintain their private space, leading to a silent but deep loss of a vital area where people can freely think, feel, and be present.

Digital Space and Human Life in A Technological Society

In traditional life, intimate and personal spaces are defined by clear boundaries, both physical and spiritual. It's a private, enclosed room where one can read, write, or simply sit quietly to observe the flow of thoughts. It's a tranquil garden corner, a familiar path, or even an inner space where one can temporarily escape the gaze and noise of society to reflect, create, and recharge. In such a space, one is not constrained by watchful eyes or external norms; one doesn't need to play a role or optimize oneself for the approval of others. There, one can be present as oneself – a vibrant, free, and unique being.

However, the emergence and spread of digital space has disrupted those boundaries. Smart devices and social media platforms bring private lives into the public eye, often without people's knowledge or ability to resist. From photos and status updates to search history, location data, and other digitized traces, every personal moment and behavior is recorded, stored, and analyzed. What was once considered intimate data now becomes exploitable for commercial and administrative purposes. Privacy, which is essential for a rich spiritual life, is gradually eroded as people are drawn into a network where constant sharing is seen as the only way to survive, connect, and be recognized.

The algorithms and design of digital platforms have redefined what is considered intimate and personal. Users, often unconsciously, are swept up in the stream of self-presentation, transforming their private lives into a stage where every moment has the potential to become consumable content. A simple meal, a trip, or a private moment with family can all be turned into a "story" to share, a "post" to attract attention. In this process, the distinction between the real person and the image of that person in the digital space becomes increasingly blurred. The inner self is replaced by a "digital self" that is designed, optimized, and monitored.

Digital surveillance is extending to every corner of life. Public cameras, facial recognition software, devices like smartphones, smart speakers, smartwatches... all become the eyes and ears of the system, silently collecting data even when users think they are alone. The idea of having a "private space" to think, rest, or simply be present is actually an illusion. When personal space is breached by invisible surveillance mechanisms, people lose the sense of security needed to relax, to be present naturally and authentically.

From a dialectical perspective, the intrusion of technology into personal spaces is not entirely negative. Technology, if designed and used humanely, can open up new possibilities for protecting personal space. It allows people to work remotely, stay in touch with loved ones from afar, or find supportive communities during difficult times. However, its downside, if left unchecked, is the assimilation of people's deepest needs and privacy into the operational logic of profit-driven systems. In that world, personal space ceases to be a "shelter" and becomes a resource to be exploited.

Realistic human philosophy poses an urgent question: how can humans re-establish and protect their intimate space in the technocratic age? Preserving this space is not merely a technical matter, such as setting up security tools or using anti-surveillance software, but first and foremost an act of reflection: humans need to recognize the value of privacy and its essential nature to freedom and humanity. Only by affirming the right to exist as a free subject – unmonitored, unquantifiable – can humans preserve a space for creation, love, and self-awareness.

If we fail to protect that space, we risk becoming "transparent entities"—seen, analyzed, and manipulated from all sides—but losing the ability to see ourselves. Intimate and personal space, therefore, is not just a privilege, but a minimum condition for human existence to remain human, in a world where every boundary is being technocratic and commercialized to its very roots.

The loss of intimate space is not merely a shift in the structure of personal life, but profoundly impacts the quality of human relationships. As communication and interaction are increasingly mediated through digital technologies, the deep experiences that demand physical presence become rare. In traditional spaces, relationships are nurtured through direct moments: a glance, a gesture, the natural rhythm of conversation, meaningful silences. These are the elements that build connection, trust, and mutual understanding. But in the digital space, these are replaced by quick, superficial interactions, measured and optimized by likes, shares, or instant responses. When social life operates on such platforms, intimate spaces—where love, friendship, and empathy were once nurtured—are threatened by the pressure of self-display, where each individual must constantly optimize their image to gain recognition.

Social media platforms encourage users to present their personal lives as a stage, where relationships are shaped by virtual evaluation and hierarchy mechanisms. In the process, the spontaneity and authenticity of relationships are replaced by digital norms about what is "worth sharing" and "worth noticing." Moments that were once intimate – family meals, private conversations, or even silence – are easily transformed into content for consumption. This not only weakens the depth of relationships but also creates an invisible pressure to constantly present and redefine themselves according to external standards.

From a dialectical perspective, technology and digital space are both causes of loss and potential means for people to rebuild intimate spaces if used consciously. Digital tools open up possibilities for maintaining connection in isolated settings: a video call can help people far away share moments together, online chat groups can create spiritual communities where lonely individuals find empathy. But for these possibilities not to be assimilated into the emotionless operating logic of technocratic platforms, people must be wise enough to set boundaries, protect privacy, and restore the ability to truly be present. Intimate spaces, which are essential for reflection, recovery, and love, demand respect and preservation against the invisible intrusions of technology.

How can we preserve and rebuild intimate and personal spaces in a technocratic world? The answer lies not only in developing privacy-respecting technologies, but also in fostering a deep awareness of the need for quiet spaces – areas where people can be

Digital Space and Human Life in A Technological Society

themselves, unseen, unmeasured, and uncontrolled. These are “inner spaces” where a person is entitled to be present as a free being, not as a data object or an entity to be optimized. Only by protecting these spaces can people maintain their capacity for reflection, creativity, and love – qualities that constitute true humanity.

In this context, redefining the boundaries between private and public life becomes urgent. Physical and spiritual spaces where individuals can retreat to escape constant scrutiny and noise need to be reaffirmed as a fundamental right. Intimate space is not a luxury, but a condition for individuals to retain their individuality, restore their spiritual energy, and continue to participate in the common life as free subjects. Failure to protect it risks transforming individuals into transparent entities – visible, analyzed, and manipulated from all sides – yet incapable of seeing and feeling themselves.

Intimate and personal spaces, therefore, need to be seen not only as areas to shield oneself from the outside world, but also as a foundation for building higher spiritual values: love, empathy, reflection, and creativity. When relationships are instrumentalized, when personal lives are commercialized into data, restoring those spaces where people can be fully present becomes an act of liberation. It's not about turning away from technology, but about learning to master it, restoring it to its role as a tool for service rather than a controlling force.

Realistic human philosophy emphasizes that only when people dare to assert their right to solitude, their right to anonymity, and their right not to optimize themselves according to external algorithms, can they retain their deepest humanity. And it is within that realm that freedom, creativity, and the capacity for love are nurtured, like seeds that create a life worth living in a technocratic world full of constraints and pressures.

5. Interaction between physical reality and digital reality

In the modern world, physical and digital realities no longer exist as two separate dimensions, but are intertwined and closely interact, creating a complex whole that shapes human life. The development of digital technology, from social media and artificial intelligence to smart devices, has given rise to a new layer of reality – digital reality – capable of redefining how people perceive, act, and exist. This process offers certain liberating possibilities, but at the same time poses the risk of blurring the lines between the two worlds, leading to distortions in human experience and relationships.

Physical reality is the traditional foundation of existence, where humans directly perceive the world through their senses, interact physically, and exist within a specific space-time. In this world, every step, every touch, every conversation is tied to a specific physical and social context, where relationships are built on real presence and instantaneous interaction. Digital reality, on the other hand, is built on data and algorithms, where every interaction is mediated by devices and software. Here, a screen tap can replace a handshake, an emoji can represent a hug, and a video chat can replace a face-to-face meeting. Seemingly simple actions like sharing a photo or pressing the “like” button carry social weight, shaping how individuals perceive themselves and the world around them. The interaction between these two realities creates an overlapping area where humans exist in the physical world while actively participating in the digital world. An individual might be sitting in their bedroom (physical reality) but simultaneously participating in a global meeting via an online platform (digital reality). They might share a meal through a photo posted on social media, transforming a personal moment into a public event. This overlap gives rise to a new type of existence – fragmented presence – where humans must divide their attention and energy between different dimensions. In this state, human concentration is stretched, and they no longer fully experience the vibrancy of the present, as part of their consciousness is constantly drawn to signals from the digital space: notifications, messages, continuous streams of interaction.

Fragmented presence also creates new mental stresses. Humans, who are inherently only fully present in one specific space at a time, are now forced to simultaneously be present in multiple “layers.” This dispersion reduces the ability to listen, reflect, and feel deeply. Relationships are also transformed: a meeting with friends may be interrupted by phone checks; a family meal may become a backdrop for “check-in” photos rather than a space for genuine sharing and connection.

From a dialectical perspective, the intertwining of physical and digital reality simultaneously opens up unprecedented possibilities for liberation and harbors the potential for profound alienation. On the positive side, technology helps people transcend the limitations of space and time, allowing them to maintain relationships over long distances, access knowledge, and collaborate across borders. However, on the negative side, when digital reality dominates, it threatens to flatten the experience of life, transforming unique moments into standardized data streams optimized for consumption and interaction. In such a world, people are easily drawn to a state of superficial existence, where meaning is no longer sought in the vibrancy of the present but in the number of likes, shares, or reaction symbols.

To avoid being lost in the overlapping realm of these two realities, humanity needs to develop a profound capacity for self-reflection on how it exists and acts. It requires restoring the ability to be fully present in physical space, knowing when to temporarily disconnect from digital networks and return to the natural rhythm of life. Simultaneously, when engaging with the digital reality, individuals must maintain the awareness that it is only a part of life, not the whole. The digital reality, if properly positioned, can become a tool to support and expand creativity and connection, rather than a force that dominates and defines existence.

Realistic human philosophy emphasizes that only when people dare to look directly at the overlapping area between the two worlds, recognizing its limitations and potential, can they find a way to both exploit the liberating potential of technology and protect the

Digital Space and Human Life in A Technological Society

authentic living space for humanity. Redefining the relationship between physical and digital reality is not about denying technology, but about placing it back in its position as a tool, so that people can still retain the capacity to feel, create, and love in an increasingly digitized world.

However, this interaction process is not neutral. Digital platforms and recommendation algorithms not only reflect physical reality but also shape how it is experienced. A place only truly exists if it is tagged on a digital map, a meal only becomes "memorable" when photographed and posted on social media, and an event only becomes significant when it is shared and disseminated in virtual space. Physical reality, inherently rich in specificity and diversity, is compressed into streams of data and processed images, losing some of its inherent depth and complexity. In this context, humans risk living in a "secondary reality"—where the value of things, events, and even people is measured based on their online visibility and interaction.

The proliferation of digital reality has given rise to a new way of being: to be seen. People are caught up in cycles of sharing, updating status, and interacting online, to the point where they begin to value themselves through the eyes of their followers and through virtual feedback. This not only changes how we perceive physical reality but also profoundly transforms how we construct our identity and meaning in life. Reality, instead of being experienced directly, becomes a stage where every action is calculated for display and attention-grabbing purposes.

From a dialectical perspective, the interaction between physical and digital reality contains inherent contradictions. On the one hand, it opens up possibilities for expanding awareness and connection, breaking down spatial and temporal boundaries, allowing people to access information, knowledge, and communities on a global scale. People thousands of kilometers apart can meet, exchange ideas, and cooperate in just seconds. Social movements can spread rapidly, mobilizing collective strength to overcome physical barriers. But on the other hand, this process gives rise to the risk of assimilation, where digital reality overshadows physical reality, causing people to gradually lose the ability to directly perceive and fully experience the physical world. The vibrancy of a moment is replaced by an obsession with how it will appear online; a delicious meal is no longer just about taste but becomes a photograph that must be perfect for posting.

Digital reality, if not carefully guided, can become a machine for reproducing superficial norms and values. Digital platforms, which operate on algorithms optimized for attention, encourage sensational content, polished visuals, and rapid interactions. In this environment, experiences requiring stillness and depth – such as reflection, creativity, or direct dialogue – are marginalized. Instead of living in the present, people are drawn into a fragmented state of existence, where consciousness constantly fluctuates between two worlds: physical reality and digital reality.

How can we maintain a balance between physical and digital reality? The answer doesn't lie in completely rejecting digital reality, as technology has become an inseparable part of contemporary life. What's needed is to develop a deep, introspective consciousness so that people can be fully present in both spaces, recognizing their limitations and capabilities. It's necessary to establish "offline" time and space to listen to oneself, to experience the world with all one's senses, rather than through digital filters. At the same time, when engaging with digital reality, people must be aware of algorithmic manipulation and proactively shape their presence, rather than being led astray.

Digital reality will only become an extension supporting physical reality, rather than replacing or distorting it, if humans maintain their ability to discern and choose. Only then can humans restore the capacity to live a fulfilling life in both worlds, where physical reality continues to nurture the depth of existence, and digital reality is a tool to expand the capacity for connection and creativity, rather than an invisible cage imprisoning freedom.

REFERENCES

- 1) Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2002). *Collected Works* (Vol. 1). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
- 2) Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1995). *Collected Works* (Vol. 2). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
- 3) Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1995). *Collected Works* (Vol. 3). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
- 4) Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2002). *Collected Works* (Vol. 4). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
- 5) Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1993). *Collected Works* (Vol. 8). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
- 6) Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2002). *Collected Works* (Vol. 20). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
- 7) Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1995). *Collected Works* (Vol. 21). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
- 8) Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2000). *Collected Works* (Vol. 42). Hanoi: Su that National Political Publishing House.
- 9) Nguyen, A.Q. (2022). *The Human Alienation – The Human Perfection in Liberty, Truth, Creativity* . LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing, Moldova.
- 10) Dinh Van Chien. (2025) *Vom Besetzten Raum Zum Autonomen Raum* .
https://www.amazon.com/s?k=%C4%91inh+v%C4%83n+chi%E1%BA%BFn&crd=3N96GW36F1AEZ&sprefix=%C4%91inh+v%C4%83n+chi%E1%BA%BFn%2Caps%2C330&ref=nb_sb_noss