The Interface Self : A Posthuman Critique of Optimization and Aesthetic Subjectivation

Jared Smith

DOI: https://doi.org/10.64959/enjp.vol.1.issue2.1.w.009

Abstract:

This article theorizes the interface self: a mode of subjectivity emergent within algorithmically mediated platforms that organize labor, intimacy, and self-presentation. Neither merely expressive nor autonomous, the interface self is shaped through optimization logics, datafication, and feedback-driven design and use. Digital systems such as job platforms, dating apps, and social media increasingly co-constitute users as legible profiles, privileging metrics, preferences, and performative visibility. While often framed as empowering, this dynamic enacts new modes of soft coercion that aestheticize recognition, gamify self-worth, and disarticulate agency from narrative coherence. To analyze this condition, the article first revisits Michel Foucault's theory of disciplinary power and its transformation under the regime of digital modulation. It then employs Andrew Feenberg's theory of instrumentalization to reveal the political and technical structuring of platforms, and draws on postphenomenological thinkers such as Don Ihde, Peter-Paul Verbeek, and Asle Kiran to explore the layered textures of technological mediation. Finally, it turns to posthumanist theorists, including Rosi Braidotti, Donna Haraway, and Karen Barad, to refigure the interface self not as a loss of authenticity, but as a situated, relational becoming within socio-technical ecologies. Rather than seeking escape or transcendence, the article proposes a posthuman praxis of "dwelling within and against" the interface—cultivating opacity, ethical friction, and collective refusal from within systems designed to optimize and predict. The interface self, it argues, marks not the disappearance of the subject but its reconfiguration at a contemporary threshold.

Entanglements: Journal of Posthumanities
A Double-Blind Peer-Reviewed Journal
Website: *www.entanglements.in*
Open Access article, under a Creative Commons license
Copyright © 2025 *Entanglements: Journal ofPosthumanities*

E-ISSN: 3107-488X
Received: 30 May 2025
Revised: 20 June 2025
Accepted: 21 July 2025
Published Online: 31 July 2025

Key words: posthumanism, technology, subjectivity, optimization, mediation, entanglement

Introduction

In recent weeks, I've found myself confronting the same hollowing experience in two domains: dating apps and job applications. In both cases, I present a version of myself which is calibrated, curated, and compressed, packaged into profiles and cover letters tailored to anticipated expectations. I list qualifications, interests, even strategic quirks, hoping to resonate with someone, whether a hiring manager or a potential partner. The process begins with promise: algorithmic matches appear, brief correspondence unfolds, and then it dissolves without explanation. "We've decided to move forward with other candidates." "I've just got a lot going on right now. Good luck." Or worse, silence. That silence becomes the punctuation of a grammar shaped by platforms designed for efficiency rather than care. It becomes difficult not to internalize the rejection, to wonder what signal I failed to emit or what value I failed to articulate. Yet this reveals the deeper violence of the interface. It invites us to see ourselves as datasets—continuously parsed, evaluated, and discarded.

The glowing surfaces of digital life, such as apps, dashboards, platforms, do not merely frame experience. They shape it. These systems aestheticize participation, gamify recognition, and modulate behavior through promises of empowerment and usability. What emerges is a new form of subjectivity: the interface self. This concept refers to a digitally mediated subjectivity co-constituted through interaction with algorithmic systems. It is formatted through metrics, feedback, and visibility, oriented toward machinic legibility rather than narrative coherence or introspective depth.

This essay offers a critical posthumanist account of the interface self. Drawing from theories of subjectivation, technological mediation, and posthuman ontology, it maps how agency, embodiment, and identity are reconfigured by platform logics. Where earlier regimes of power targeted the body through surveillance and discipline, the interface self is governed aesthetically. The demand is not to conform to norms, but to perform legibility

and productivity in forms that align with machinic systems. Identity becomes indexed. Agency is routed through metrics. Feedback loops take the place of dialogic recognition. The interface does not merely reflect subjectivity; it molds and formats it.

Yet this formatting is not absolute. Posthumanist perspectives challenge anthropocentric narratives of self-mastery and suggest that subjectivity is always entangled with nonhuman systems, technical infrastructures, and relational ecologies. The interface self is not merely a neoliberal consumer of datafied existence. It is also a site of tension, ambiguity, and potential resistance. Through posthuman ethics and onto-epistemologies, we can unsettle the binary between technological domination and human freedom. What forms of agency persist within systems designed to predict behavior? What does it mean to care for a self increasingly shaped by invisible processes of optimization? Can a posthuman aesthetics of subjectivation interrupt the smooth surfaces of interface life?

This essay is a philosophical experiment in naming and describing a condition that many already inhabit but rarely have language to articulate. The interface self is not a fixed identity or diagnosis. It is a metaphor, a symptom, a provocation, and a continual becoming-with. It marks a shift in how subjectivity is produced, and it demands both critique and imaginative rethinking.

From Disciplinary to Interface Power: Subjectivity and the Mediation of Self

This section traces a philosophical genealogy of subject formation across shifting regimes of power, beginning with the disciplinary institutions of modernity and culminating in the aesthetic logics of contemporary digital platforms. Following Michel Foucault's account of biopower, we encounter a subject who is not sovereign but produced, made visible, legible, and governable through norms inscribed upon the body. In modernity, surveillance was architectural and institutional, embodied most clearly in the Panopticon. To be seen was to be regulated.

Yet in digital environments, visibility becomes something to be pursued rather than imposed. Byung-Chul Han argues that contemporary power no longer disciplines from

without but demands performance from within. The subject of the interface is not watched but watching itself, constantly calibrating how it appears by optimizing profiles, aestheticizing productivity, and internalizing the labor of affective self-presentation. The logic of coercion shifts from force to freedom, from interdiction to seduction.

This transformation requires more than an extension of Foucault's framework. It calls for a reconceptualization of the material, temporal, and aesthetic conditions of subjectivity. The interface must be understood not as a neutral tool, but as an onto-epistemological regime: a site where power, knowledge, and being converge to constitute what counts as a subject. The glowing frame of a screen, the architecture of a dashboard, or the logic of a matching algorithm is not incidental; it is formative.

Andrew Feenberg's two-level theory of instrumentalization offers a way to think through the political stakes of technology, and will be explored in the second section. Platforms are not mere tools but social arrangements infused with normative affordances. They configure what can be said, seen, and sensed. Primary instrumentalization refers to technical function, while secondary instrumentalization embeds these functions within cultural and political values. What looks like convenience—auto-sorting resumes, autofill in dating bios—is a site where technical decisions enact ideological commitments.

Bernard Stiegler deepens this critique by foregrounding the temporal disjunction between human interiority and algorithmic speed. For Stiegler, subjectivity is always already prosthetic—shaped by external supports of memory, communication, and relation. In the interface age, these supports become fast, recursive, and computational. Individuation risks collapse, as psychic temporality is overwhelmed by the accelerative tempo of data flows. What it means to think, to remember, or to desire is reorganized through systems that anticipate and preempt.

The interface self, then, does not mark a rupture from modern subjectivity but its algorithmic intensification. Power moves from discipline to modulation, from institutional surveillance to ambient legibility. We move from being made visible to desiring visibility, from bodily compliance to aesthetic formatting. Whether in Tinder's swipeable

preferences or LinkedIn's endorsable skills, the self becomes a performance calibrated for machinic parsing.

This section stages a conceptual conversation among critical theorists who help us grasp the shifting architectures of power and selfhood. The central question is not simply how the subject is constructed, but how this construction might be made otherwise. If platforms govern through format, might resistance lie in refusal, misalignment, or counter-design? To recognize the interface self is not to declare its inevitability but to open space for conceptual and practical friction.

1.1 Subjectivity, Power, and Foucault

Subjectivity is not a private essence but a historical and material formation. As Michel Foucault argues, the modern subject emerges not through sovereign violence but through the microphysics of power: the everyday technologies of surveillance, normalization, and internalization. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault describes a shift from external coercion to internal regulation: the soul becomes "the prison of the body," a more efficient site of control than any physical restraint (Foucault 194).

Disciplinary power operates not through spectacle, as in premodern regimes, but through the organization of space, time, and conduct. Institutions such as schools, prisons, factories, and hospitals function as laboratories for shaping docile and productive bodies. Their architectures are panoptic: control is achieved not because one is constantly watched, but because one might be. The prisoner, unsure whether they are being observed, comes to regulate themselves. Power installs itself not through force but through anticipation.

Crucially, discipline is not simply repressive, it is also productive. It generates subjects not despite constraint, but through it. Identity, agency, and the very capacity for reflection emerge from normative scripts embedded in bodily routines, gestures, and affects. The subject is neither external to power nor entirely subsumed by it. It is, in Foucault's words, "a surface of inscription," a conduit for power's operations. "Power,"

he writes, "produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth" (Foucault 194).

This logic extends to education, where the teacher's gaze, the timetable, and the grading system work to classify, compare, and normalize. One does not simply become a student but is produced as one through practices that precede and exceed intention. Learning management systems such as Canvas, Google Classroom, or Workday Learning illustrate how these disciplinary logics persist in digital form. Attendance is recorded through login data; assignment punctuality is tracked to the minute; engagement is inferred from screen time or click-through rates. Temporal discipline is no longer confined to the school bell but distributed across interfaces that silently demand regularity.

Foucault's insight is that such institutions regulate behavior and format subjectivity. And yet, these mechanisms were designed for enclosures: the classroom, the barracks, the clinic. In a digitally mediated environment, where presence is ambient and visibility is pursued rather than imposed, the disciplinary diagram begins to fray. The subject of the interface is not fixed in space but modulated through data, metrics, and feedback. Authority is less centralized, but no less effective; it is embedded in the very grammar of interaction.

Foucault's lasting contribution is not just his theory of discipline but his genealogical method: the critical unmasking of how power historically produces subjectivity through material dispositifs. He does not offer a static model but a way of tracing transitions. If discipline is the diagram of modernity, then what diagram structures interface life? What kind of subjects are produced when control no longer operates through enclosure but through flow, when regulation is enacted not by an overseeing authority, but through interaction itself?

1.2 From Discipline to Desire

If Foucault maps the disciplinary formation of the modern subject, Gilles Deleuze and Byung-Chul Han help us trace its mutation under late capitalist and postdigital conditions. In place of the docile, institutionally enclosed individual, we encounter a

subject incited to optimize, perform, and disclose. The imperative is no longer to conform to external norms but to cultivate a visible, productive, and desirable self through voluntary participation. Power, in this context, no longer represses—it seduces. It no longer compels from without but insinuates itself as the internalized demand to become one's best version: efficient, responsive, and continuously available.

Deleuze, in his *Postscript on the Societies of Control*, sketches the transition from disciplinary societies to regimes of continuous modulation. The central institutions of modernity (the school, the prison, the factory) give way to dispersed systems of governance, no longer organized through spatial enclosure but through access protocols, feedback mechanisms, and algorithmic parsing. Individuals become "dividuals": fragmentary data-flows, tracked through passwords, profiles, and usage metrics (Deleuze 5). Control operates in real time, across boundaries once marked by discipline. Education becomes lifelong and modular, as seen in platforms like Coursera or Duolingo, where learners are encouraged to optimize pace and progress through gamified dashboards. Work becomes ubiquitous and platformized, often managed through metrics and micro-evaluations. On Slack, Trello, or Upwork, productivity is not assumed, but demonstrated algorithmically. Power no longer needs to impose limits. It simply configures the channels through which behavior is nudged, scored, and looped back to the user.

"Man is no longer man enclosed," Deleuze writes. "He is man in debt" (Deleuze 6). Control no longer fixes the body in space but governs through modulation, delay, and precarity. The subject is not disciplined by the visible gaze of authority, but by the invisible protocols of interface design. Surveillance becomes participation; obedience becomes affective investment. The panopticon persists, but it is now ambient—suffused into every interaction, framed as empowerment.

If Deleuze maps the infrastructural transformation of power, Han explores its affective costs. In The B*urnout Society* and *Psychopolitics*, he argues that neoliberal subjectivity is no longer structured by repression but by auto-exploitation. The "achievement subject" is not ordered from above but driven from within, voluntarily

enacting the imperative to optimize, disclose, and enhance across professional, social, and intimate domains. Freedom becomes a mode of control: one chooses to produce and compete, but the choice itself is already captured by the structural demands of legibility and performance.

Consider the interface of LinkedIn, where the injunction to be visible is expressed through profile optimization scores, engagement metrics, and algorithmically mediated recommendations. The user is not merely seeking employment—they are curating a machinically legible professional self. Success is tied to constant refinement: quantifying skills, showcasing affective traits, remaining present in the system's rhythms. "Exploiting itself," Han writes, "the achievement subject has no enemy from whom to liberate itself" (Han 8–10).

The disciplinary subject may have been guilty, but the achievement subject is exhausted. The injunction to "be yourself" becomes a burden, measured not in freedom but in fatigue. This is a subject that burns out not because it is constrained, but because it is free in the most insidious sense: entrapped in the obligation to perform a datafied ideal of the self. Resistance does not disappear. It is rendered illegible.

These transformations demand a rethinking of mediation and control. If the interface governs how the subject appears, behaves, and becomes recognizable, then visibility itself becomes a moral and aesthetic obligation. Feedback loops replace interdictions. Rewards displace punishments. The subject is not only branded, but brand-generating. An interface not between selves, but between data streams, desires, and machinic evaluation.

Foucault's genealogical method, while rooted in the institutions of modernity, remains indispensable. Yet it must be extended. The diagram of power has liquefied, flowing through interfaces, behavioral incentives, and affective economies. To track contemporary subject formation, we must attend not only to the enclosures that shape conduct, but to the systems that solicit desire. What subject emerges when control no

longer operates through constraint, but through freedom? When recognition becomes conditional on legibility? When the imperative to optimize eclipses the capacity to refuse?

Technological Co-Construction

The interface self is not forged only through cultural logics of optimization or diffuse regimes of desire. It is also materially structured by the technologies through which it is enacted. While thinkers like Deleuze and Han diagnose the infrastructural and affective dimensions of late-modern subjectivity, they often leave the concrete workings of technological mediation underdeveloped. This section shifts focus from the what of subjectivation to the how: how platforms and systems modulate behavior, shape perception, and encode normative scripts. Here, we bring Andrew Feenberg's critical theory of technology into conversation with postphenomenological accounts of mediation, asking not simply how power circulates, but how it is designed, operationalized, and inhabited.

Rather than treating technology as a monolithic or external force, Feenberg and postphenomenological thinkers approach it as a site of relational entanglement: structured by political choices, institutional logics, and cultural values, but also lived through embodied use and interpretive negotiation. Feenberg's two-level theory of instrumentalization reveals how technical systems embed ideologies and affordances that subtly condition action and legibility. Postphenomenology, meanwhile, offers a granular vocabulary for how technologies mediate experience by shaping what can be perceived, done, and known. Together, they allow us to reframe the interface not merely as a conduit for neoliberal subjectivity, but as a co-constitutive infrastructure through which the self is formatted, recognized, and potentially refigured.

2.1 Feenberg's Two-Level Theory of Instrumentalization

Feenberg's critical theory of technology dismantles the illusion of technological neutrality. Technologies are not inert tools employed to achieve predetermined goals; they are historically situated, institutionally embedded, and normatively loaded. His two-level theory of instrumentalization distinguishes between primary instrumentalization, the

decontextualization and abstraction of objects for technical control, and secondary instrumentalization, the reintegration of these objects into social life where meaning, interpretation, and resistance take shape (Feenberg 82–85). Subjectivity arises primarily within this secondary layer—not as a unilateral imposition, but through processes of negotiation, appropriation, and contestation.

Feenberg's approach avoids both technological determinism and naïve voluntarism. Technologies do not dictate behavior directly, but they configure what can be done, perceived, or imagined. Through embedded affordances and design assumptions, systems orient conduct without overt coercion. Consider platforms for hiring, dating, or education. These systems are not neutral infrastructures; they encode a value regime that privileges efficiency, legibility, and self-optimization. Within such environments, subjectivity is not interpolated into a fixed structure. Rather, it is iteratively co-constituted through ongoing interaction, recursive evaluation, and algorithmic calibration.

At the heart of this co-constitution are technical codes, the rules, defaults, and structural constraints that remain largely invisible to the user but shape how technologies function and how subjects are positioned in relation to them. For Feenberg, challenging these codes is a political act. He names this intervention democratic rationalization: the collective reworking or reappropriation of technological systems to reflect alternative values and ways of being (Feenberg 111–13). In this model, subjectivity is not formed outside of technology but within its tensions, limitations, and moments of breakdown.

A hiring platform like LinkedIn makes this process concrete. Its promise of efficiency rests on abstracting the applicant into discrete data points—skills, endorsements, educational credentials—organized into categories optimized for machine sorting. This is primary instrumentalization. Yet subject formation emerges more clearly in the realm of secondary instrumentalization, where users are compelled to make themselves intelligible to the system. Profile completion becomes a performative act involving strategic language, keyword placement, and self-branding. What results is not pure repression, but a form of preformatted self-expression shaped by platform logic.

Still, these systems are not totalizing. Users resist in subtle ways: by foregrounding unconventional experiences, introducing ambiguity or irony, or declining to optimize for machinic readability. These gestures do not escape the system entirely, but they inhabit it differently. They mark interruptions in the expected logic, and in doing so, enact Feenberg's notion of democratic rationalization in lived practice. Here, subjectivity asserts itself not through withdrawal from technological mediation, but through the redirection of its terms.

Feenberg's theory thus offers a powerful framework for analyzing how platforms do more than mediate existing social values, they actively produce them. They script norms of visibility, competence, and desirability, shaping what kinds of selves can emerge and which futures appear attainable. To use such a platform is not merely to seek employment; it is to enter a recursive economy of self-fashioning governed by the requirements of algorithmic legibility.

Yet even within these constraints, subjectivity is never fully captured. As Feenberg emphasizes, technical systems contain fissures and afford openings for reappropriation, refusal, and redesign. These tensions (between system and self, constraint and creativity) are central to any critical account of the interface self.

To explore these dynamics further, however, we must move beyond systems and codes to consider the texture of lived mediation. How do interfaces shape perception, embodiment, and experience? What ethical possibilities and ontological implications arise from these relations? These questions lead us into the postphenomenological tradition.

2.2 Postphenomenology

Where Feenberg uncovers how technologies encode social norms and capitalist rationalities, postphenomenology offers a lens through which to grasp how these structures are lived, embodied, and experienced. Developed by Don Ihde and extended by thinkers such as Peter-Paul Verbeek and Asle Kiran, postphenomenology attends to the micro-relational entanglements between humans and technological artifacts. It asks not

only how technologies are used, but how they mediate perception, shape agency, and inform self-understanding.

Like Feenberg, postphenomenologists reject both instrumental neutrality and technological determinism. Technologies are not passive intermediaries between subject and world; they are mediators that co-constitute experience. Ihde's typology of human–technology–world relations (embodiment, hermeneutic, alterity, and background) maps the ways in which technologies embed themselves in perception and action, often disappearing into the very conditions of appearance (Ihde 72–93). Technologies do not merely extend human capabilities; they reshape how the world appears and reconfigure the subject who acts within it. These mediations are not static. They evolve with material design, social uptake, and habituated use.

Peter-Paul Verbeek develops this insight by foregrounding the ontological and ethical stakes of mediation. For Verbeek, technologies both participate in experience and shape subjectivity itself. Technologies exhibit what he calls technological intentionality: a directedness toward certain actions and interpretations, shaped by design affordances and normative assumptions (Verbeek 115–17). Artifacts do not command, but they invite, discourage, or exclude behaviors. As such, they influence how users perceive themselves and their world. This dynamic is especially pronounced in digital interfaces, where mediation is no longer only perceptual but also ontological and moral. The self is not merely extended by technology, it is formatted through it.

Consider hiring platforms or dating apps. These are not just tools for information exchange; they structure who can appear and how they are legible. Fields like education, employment, height, or hobbies are not neutral data points. They reflect encoded normative priorities. In Verbeek's terms, these platforms function as moralizing machines: technologies that mediate not only conduct but also the perceived contours of what is responsible, desirable, or worthy (Verbeek 91). The ethical frame is not chosen—

it is embedded in code, interface layout, and design defaults. Presentation becomes constrained by an implicit grammar of what counts.

Asle Kiran expands this lineage by offering a multidimensional framework for analyzing technological mediation. His account focuses on four interlocking dimensions, the ontological, epistemological, practical, and ethical, each of which operates through what he terms a two-sided structure. Technologies reveal and conceal, enable and constrain, magnify and reduce, involve and alienate (Kiran 81–84). Mediation, in this view, is never neutral. It shapes the field of appearance and the very conditions under which subjects become intelligible to themselves and others.

This dual structure aligns closely with Feenberg's two-level theory of instrumentalization. Primary instrumentalization refers to the abstraction and reordering of the world for technical manipulation. Secondary instrumentalization concerns the reintegration of that abstraction into social life, where meaning and resistance take form. When mapped onto Kiran's schema, Feenberg's theory provides an account of how small design choices accumulate into larger regimes of subjectivation.

The ontological dimension becomes clear in platforms like LinkedIn. Users are rendered as potential employees, bundles of competencies, affiliations, and endorsements optimized for both algorithmic and human readability. Simultaneously, the interface conceals context, ambivalence, and resistance. The world is reorganized into machine-readable data. Yet the abstraction is not left inert, it is fed back into social norms and rankings. Questions such as who is employable or trustworthy are not merely cultural judgments. They are structured through design decisions, database schemas, and algorithmic filtering. The interface becomes a site of ontological filtration, shaping who and what can appear.

The epistemological dimension follows. Interfaces amplify some forms of information, such as clicks, matches, endorsements, while downplaying and reducing others like uncertainty, hesitation, or contradiction. Primary instrumentalization parses experience into quantifiable signals. Secondary instrumentalization turns those signals

into modes of self-understanding. Metrics become mirrors. Users begin to understand themselves not through introspection, but through outputs: likes, impressions, profile views, rankings. Feenberg's framework here shows a displacement of epistemic authority from lived experience to machine readability.

The practical dimension focuses on the field of action configured by interfaces. Design features like "apply now" or "add a photo" buttons or prompts to "update your profile" gently guide user behavior. These cues are not coercive, but directive. They suggest what actions are expected, desirable, or efficient. What appears as freedom is often a tightly bounded field of operational legibility. This is where Kiran's analysis of affordance meets Feenberg's attention to system constraints. Action is shaped not by command, but by interface choreography.

Finally, the ethical dimension concerns how platforms structure moral perception. Responsive, punctual, and streamlined behavior is rewarded; ambiguity, opacity, or refusal are marginalized. The platform does not merely reflect ethical values—it enforces them through its architecture. What emerges is not simply a moral economy, but a moral infrastructure. Efficiency becomes conflated with virtue. Kiran helps us grasp how this ethic is internalized, while Feenberg explains how it is codified into technological systems.

Together, Kiran and Feenberg offer a compelling analytic convergence. Kiran provides a phenomenological account of how technologies feel, how they shape perception and action from within. Feenberg reveals the institutional and political scaffolding behind those effects. They show us that interfaces do not merely manage behavior—they constitute subjectivity. Users are neither entirely autonomous nor passively determined. They are entangled in systems that configure what counts as legible, actionable, and desirable.

Crucially, this mediation extends even to those who do not participate directly. Opting out of platforms does not exempt one from their effects. Workplace expectations, cultural norms, and relational dynamics are increasingly shaped by systems like LinkedIn

or Tinder, regardless of one's engagement. The conditions of social appearance have already been reorganized. This is why Verbeek's idea of moralizing machines returns with such force. Technologies do not merely mediate what is seen or done; they shape the normative frameworks through which judgment occurs. These frameworks are rarely contested in open discourse. They are embedded silently in menus, defaults, and feedback structures. In becoming infrastructural, they become formative.

Kiran gives us the affective texture of mediation, and Feenberg shows us its systemic architecture. Verbeek makes clear that it is also cultural, shaping subjectivity not just in function but in form. Through their convergence, we come to see the interface self not simply as a user profile or data node, but as a subject-form: shaped by design, formatted by systems, and yet never fully captured. This is why technological mediation must be treated as a central ontological, ethical, and political problem of contemporary subjectivity.

Posthumanism, Interface Ontology, and the Ethics of Becoming

We have traced a genealogy in which subjectivity no longer rests upon a stable interior essence or sovereign agency. Instead, it emerges from networks of power, regimes of optimization, and recursive circuits of visibility. With Foucault, we dismantled the fiction of autonomy, revealing the modern subject as an effect of disciplinary organization. With Feenberg and the postphenomenological tradition, we turned our attention to the material infrastructures through which technologies co-constitute perception, action, and self-understanding. The self, once imagined as a locus of inward reflection, now flickers within feedback loops, algorithmic profiles, and interface logics.

This final section marks a shift in orientation. The aim is no longer solely diagnostic. We turn from critique to reconstruction, not in search of lost humanist coherence, nor in celebration of machinic transcendence, but toward a conceptual framework attuned to the hybrid, unstable, and relational forms of subjectivity that emerge within a posthuman condition. The interface self, fractured yet improvisational, is not

reducible to surveillance or compliance. It demands a language that can hold paradox: a subject-form that is at once constrained and co-creative, formatted and indeterminate.

Posthumanism, in this frame, offers not a theory of the future, but a rethinking of the present. It is not reducible to technological enhancement, biological hybridity, or speculative science fiction. Rather, it constitutes a philosophical orientation that decenters the human, contests the metaphysics of identity, and affirms entanglement as the ground of being. As Rosi Braidotti writes, the posthuman subject is "a transversal entity, constituted across multiple axes—embodied, embedded, techno-mediated, and relational" (Braidotti 190). The interface self, understood through this lens, is not a failure of authenticity but a situated articulation of distributed subjectivity: coded, porous, and emerging within thick ecologies of mediation.

This section undertakes a speculative synthesis. Having traced how the subject is produced through power, designed through systems, and experienced through mediations, we now ask: What kinds of agency and ethical possibility remain, or become imaginable, once the human is no longer the given point of departure? How might a posthuman orientation reshape dominant imaginaries of education, labor, intimacy, or governance under algorithmic conditions? And crucially, how can we cultivate ways of thinking and living that resist both the melancholia of humanist nostalgia and the accelerationist drift toward technocratic control?

To explore these questions, the chapter unfolds in two parts. First, it maps the conceptual terrain of posthumanism, drawing on the work of Rosi Braidotti, Donna Haraway, N. Katherine Hayles, and Cary Wolfe. Each contributes a distinct but intersecting account of posthuman subjectivity, technocultural hybridity, and ethical reorientation. Second, we return to the interface self—not as a symptom of control, but as a site of becoming-with. Here, we reframe mediation not as a loss of agency, but as a condition for new relational and ontological possibilities.

In closing, we reflect on the stakes of this reframing. To think the interface self posthumanly is not merely to offer a descriptive correction. It is to invite a new ethos of

responsibility, attunement, and a situated becoming in a world increasingly shaped by technological infrastructures we neither fully control nor entirely escape.

3.1 The Contours of Posthumanism

Posthumanism does not seek to eliminate the human, but to interrogate the assumptions that define and delimit "the Human" as a metaphysical, political, and epistemological category. It does not aim at transcendence or dissolution, but at decentering the anthropocentric subject and reconfiguring the ethical imaginaries that follow from this decentering. It asks what becomes thinkable—ontologically, ethically, and politically—when the human is no longer treated as foundational, autonomous, or ontologically prior to its relations.

The first contour is this decentering itself. Posthumanism challenges the Enlightenment ideal of a universal, rational, self-contained subject. As Rosi Braidotti argues, this figure has always been sustained through violent exclusions: of women, racialized others, nonhuman animals, and nature. "The human" is not a neutral descriptor, but a regulatory fiction, historically constructed, unequally distributed, and mobilized to secure normative hierarchies (Braidotti 15–17). The posthuman critique exposes this fiction, foregrounding vulnerability, multiplicity, and situatedness as constitutive of subjectivity. The human, in this sense, is not an essence to be protected but an assemblage to be rethought.

This leads to a second key claim: ontological hybridity. Posthumanism asserts that the human has never existed in isolation. It has always been formed through relations with nonhuman forces—biological, technological, symbolic. Here, posthumanism intersects with postphenomenology. Don Ihde's taxonomy of human-technology-world relations (embodiment, hermeneutic, alterity, background) maps how tools shape perception and action (Ihde 72–93). Peter-Paul Verbeek extends this insight, arguing that technologies possess technological intentionality—they guide interpretation and behavior through embedded affordances and normative structures (Verbeek 117). Posthumanism radicalizes these insights. It contends that the human is not merely technologically

mediated, but technogenetically constituted. As Donna Haraway famously wrote, "the cyborg is our ontology," not a metaphor for fusion, but a recognition of our material entanglement with systems, codes, and infrastructures (Haraway 150–52).

Yet posthumanism is not a celebration of hybridity for its own sake. It is attuned to the asymmetries, exclusions, and power dynamics that operate through technocultural systems. As Asle Kiran notes, technological mediation is never neutral: it reveals while concealing, enables while constraining, includes while excluding (Kiran 82–84). Smartphones connect, but also monitor; algorithms recommend, but also categorize and sort; interfaces render subjects visible, but only within preformatted templates. The posthuman condition is not post-political. It is shaped by optimization logics, surveillance infrastructures, and technocratic governance; and these demand critical attention.

Accordingly, posthuman subjectivity must be understood in terms of distributed agency. The subject is no longer a sovereign origin point, but a node within dynamic assemblages: affective, algorithmic, ecological, and institutional. Subjectivity is emergent and relational, co-constituted across systems. This resonates with Feenberg's claim that technologies, while reproducing social hierarchies, are not closed systems. They remain open to reappropriation, hacking, and redesign. For Feenberg, agency is exercised not by stepping outside technological systems, but by inhabiting and redirecting them from within (Feenberg 112–13). Posthumanism amplifies this view. It calls us to recognize that agency is entangled with nonhuman actors—technical, biological, environmental—and that these entanglements are constitutive, not incidental.

Finally, posthumanism demands an ethical reorientation. If the human is no longer the privileged locus of value, ethics must become situated, responsive, and material. Haraway's call to "stay with the trouble" exemplifies this ethos: an ethic grounded not in transcendence or mastery, but in partial connection, cohabitation, and care amid complexity (Haraway 1–4). Karen Barad's concept of response-ability further articulates this shift: ethical action emerges not from sovereign decision, but from accountability to the intra-active relations that constitute us (Barad 393–95). Ethics, in this view, is less

about autonomy and abstract rights, and more about the labor of ongoing negotiation within relational fields.

In sum, posthumanism reframes the self not as a discrete and self-identical substance, but as a becoming-with—an emergent formation shaped by code, infrastructure, embodiment, and discourse. It invites us to rethink subjectivity as both shaped by and shaping the systems in which it is embedded. Rather than promising liberation through transparency or detachment, posthumanism calls us to dwell within ambiguity, to navigate entanglement with care, and to cultivate new forms of situated responsibility. The posthuman subject does not seek to recover wholeness, nor does it celebrate machinic mastery. It learns to live with the interface, not as a tool or adversary, but as a condition and companion.

3.2 Posthuman Subjectivity and the Interface Self

The interface self does not mark the end of subjectivity, nor its dissolution into machinic code. Rather, it signals a transformation in the grammar of becoming. If the liberal subject was presumed to be unified, autonomous, and expressive, the interface self is distributed, recursive, and contextually legible. It emerges not through introspective depth but through patterned interaction: algorithmic feedback, platform logics, and infrastructural conditions that mediate how one appears, acts, and understands oneself.

This shift demands that we move beyond both the nostalgic mourning of the autonomous subject and the fetishization of computational transparency. Posthumanism offers a conceptual language for navigating this terrain. It understands subjectivity not as lost, but as reconfigured—formed through entanglements with technological systems that are themselves historically situated and normatively charged. The self, in this framework, is neither reducible to data nor entirely captured by it. It is a node within a mesh of relations, shaped by interfaces but not exhausted by them.

As Verbeek and Haraway remind us, subjectivity is not merely something expressed through technology, but something constituted within its folds. The interface does not serve a preexisting self; it scripts the conditions under which the self becomes

legible. Profiles, prompts, metrics, and affordances organize visibility, shaping what is seen, what is sayable, and what is valued. In this sense, the interface is not a surface but a structuring threshold. It is the zone where subjectivity is continually formatted, interpreted, and negotiated.

Importantly, this formatting is not deterministic. Posthuman agency is distributed and situated, but it is not absent. Following Braidotti, we might understand the interface self as a transversal subject: one that traverses technological, affective, and epistemic layers without being reducible to any single plane (Braidotti 190). It is constituted through flows of data, habits of interaction, and platform architectures. Yet it remains a site of improvisation, refusal, and excess. The interface constrains, but it also enables differential articulation—a situated capacity to act otherwise within the very systems that mediate us.

This view diverges from critiques that describe surveillance capitalism as a totalizing regime of capture. While such critiques rightly identify the extraction of behavioral surplus (Zuboff), they often understate how users tactically inhabit and repurpose platforms. The interface self is not merely extracted; it is performed. It is responsive to metrics but also plays with them. It can withhold, distort, or engage ironically. These are not forms of full autonomy, but partial agency. Haraway's notion of "response-ability" captures this: a situated capacity to negotiate the terms of one's appearance within algorithmic frames.

Ambivalence is central to posthuman subjectivity. The interface self is both legible and opaque, scripted and improvisational. It is interpolated into classificatory systems, yet capable of modulating its contours in ways that exceed machinic comprehension. This does not mean it escapes power. Rather, it means that power operates through dynamic relations, not static domination. Technologies of categorization are never complete. The self, even when profiled, remains a process.

Moreover, the interface self reconfigures the temporality of subjectivity. It is no longer anchored in a coherent narrative arc, but in the immediacy of feedback. The timeline, the notification, the analytic dashboard—these fragment and reorganize

experience, privileging iteration over introspection. Yet even here, posthumanism resists despair. The breakdown of narrative unity does not foreclose meaning; it invites other modes of orientation such as rhythm, intensity, and relational coherence. The posthuman subject becomes less a storyteller of an internal essence and more a cartographer of situated relations, navigating fields of force, feedback, and friction.

To theorize the interface self, then, is to attend to how subjectivity is materialized at the intersection of code, design, and social practice. Our tools do not merely extend our capacities; they shape what counts as capacity. Affordances are not neutral options. They are constraints embedded with normative assumptions. The profile does not simply describe; it prescribes modes of being. Yet within these prescriptions, there remains the possibility of re-description, reorientation, and resistance.

In this light, the interface self becomes a critical figure for thinking posthuman subjectivity. It foregrounds the conditions under which subjects become intelligible, while also pointing to the fractures and excesses that haunt every apparatus of capture. It is neither a sovereign agent nor a passive artifact. It is a mediated, negotiated, and unstable subject-form. The interface is not a window onto the self but the terrain where the self is stitched together and undone.

3.3 Living Within and Against the Interface: A Posthuman Praxis

To live within and against the interface is to live within contradiction. Our most basic gestures (logging in, updating, liking, sharing) are at once expressions of agency and acts of submission. The digital platforms we rely on for connection, visibility, and recognition are the very infrastructures that format us as measurable, predictable, and optimizable entities. In this context, posthuman praxis does not begin with a decision to accept or reject technology. It begins in ambivalence.

The interface is a paradoxical terrain. It promises personalization but demands standardization. It offers immediacy yet operates through opaque systems of delay, ranking, and filtering. What feels intimate, such as an online conversation or a shared playlist, is mediated through impersonal metrics. What appears as agency, choosing a

profile picture and writing a bio, is filtered through assumptions embedded in interface design. These systems shape not just what we can do, but who we can be seen to be.

Consider LinkedIn. It claims to empower users to showcase their professional identity, but that identity must be formatted according to machinic priorities: keywords, endorsement counts, algorithmic legibility. A user may wish to express their career as a journey of experimentation, failure, and reinvention. But such narratives fall flat in a system designed to reward linearity, stability, and self-optimization. The platform doesn't forbid this expression, but it makes it invisible. The paradox is this: your "freedom" to be authentic exists only within a narrow grammar of legibility.

The same holds for dating apps like Tinder or Hinge. A user may desire slow, complex intimacy. But the interface encourages rapid, affective decisions based on visual cues, curated prompts, and swipeable binaries. Even the refusal to participate, to delete the app, or step back, does not fully escape its influence. Expectations shaped by the app linger in social interactions, recalibrating how attraction and desirability are understood in broader culture. The interface is infrastructural: it extends beyond the screen into the habits, norms, and rhythms of daily life.

This is the terrain where posthuman subjectivity must operate. Braidotti calls for repositioning the human within a broader field of entanglement: technical, affective, ecological. The self is not erased, but redistributed. It is no longer a sovereign source of meaning, but an emergent effect of relations. Praxis, then, is less about recovering autonomy and more about learning to live with, through, and sometimes despite the systems that structure us.

Feenberg's notion of democratic rationalization offers a strategy here. It calls for engaging with technological systems not as destiny, but as sites of contestation. We might tweak the algorithm, obscure our metadata, or collectively pressure platforms to change design choices. These are not revolutions. They are refusals, small acts of friction. For instance, freelance workers may intentionally blur the boundaries of their availability to avoid being over-optimized by platforms like Upwork. Some educators subvert learning

management systems by embedding unexpected content or by using feedback functions for reflective dialogue rather than assessment. In each case, the platform is not rejected outright, but reinhabited. Its logic stretched, repurposed, or resisted.

Postphenomenology adds further nuance. Verbeek's model of technological accompaniment suggests that we do not simply use tools, but co-exist with them. Our perception, action, and sense of self are shaped by their affordances. Living well with technology, then, requires a kind of design literacy: not just knowing how to use tools, but being able to read their biases, anticipate their effects, and cultivate practices that subvert or reorient their functions. Critical pedagogy, for example, can foreground this literacy, such as teaching students to interrogate how platforms script their behavior rather than passively conforming to it.

Yet we must not romanticize resistance. The power of the interface lies precisely in its partial openness. It invites participation, even resistance, but always within constraints. A de-optimized profile may express defiance, but it may also result in fewer opportunities, lower visibility, or exclusion. Opting out of platform normativity often comes at a cost. This is the ethical paradox: to resist the system is also to risk being erased by it.

And so, posthuman praxis must learn to dwell in that tension. Haraway's notion of "staying with the trouble" captures this beautifully. It is a call to remain present within contradiction, to refuse both technological utopianism and reactionary nostalgia. Making kin in this context might mean forming support networks for those harmed by algorithmic bias. It might mean building cooperative alternatives to gig platforms. Or it might simply mean carving out moments of slowness, humor, or opacity within overdetermined systems.

Opacity, following Glissant, is not the enemy of relationality. It is its condition. The right not to be fully known or parsed is a form of ethical defense. It is a way of preserving difference without domination. Within the interface, this may mean crafting identities that exceed platform logic, declining to rank others, refusing the compulsion to constantly

update or perform. These acts are not outside mediation. They are within it, but they work against its grain.

Ultimately, posthuman praxis is not about resolution. It is about holding the contradiction: to know that your self is mediated and still insist on care, complexity, and agency. To critique the platform while depending on it. To be legible enough to survive but illegible enough to remain uncontained. This is not a stable politics. It is a situated ethics. An ethics which treats entanglement not as contamination but as the material of response. The interface self, then, is not a stable identity to be recovered or transcended. It is a site of ongoing negotiation, a dynamic choreography of compliance, friction, and improvisation. It is where power is both internalized and redirected, where agency is partial but still real. And it is within this space, not beyond it, that new forms of relation, care, and political imagination must be forged.

This is not an ending. It is a commitment: to remain with the problem, to speak from the middle of mediation, and to practice subjectivity as an act of technological and ethical composition.

Conclusion: Dwelling Within and Against

The interface self is not an aberration. It is a revealment, showing the quiet capture of subjectivity by systems that speak in the language of optimization, self-presentation, and legibility. It reflects a culture that governs not through repression but through design; through dashboards, drop-downs, and defaults. This transformation does not unfold with spectacle. It arrives through micro-adjustments: a reformatted CV, a curated dating profile, a compulsively refreshed analytics page. These gestures, mundane and habitual, mark the sedimentation of power into practice.

Yet the danger here is not simply alienation. It is ontological narrowing. The interface self does not conceal an authentic interior. It formats what a subject can be. This is not a mask but a mold. What counts as identity is increasingly that which can be parsed, scored, and circulated. Subjectivity becomes infrastructural, not expressive. It is routed

through platforms that reward consistency, responsiveness, and machinic legibility, qualities which sit uneasily with opacity, ambivalence, or refusal.

To critique this is not to retreat into nostalgia. There is no untouched self to return to, no pure agency uncorrupted by systems of mediation. Mediation is not an accident of our condition. It is constitutive. Posthumanism urges us to relinquish fantasies of autonomy and coherence, not to embrace fragmentation for its own sake, but to rethink the self as emergent, entangled, and situated. In this frame, the human is not a fixed substance but a process, always in relation, always becoming-with.

The question that remains is not whether we are mediated, but how we live with and through these mediations. Can we inhabit the interface critically, without fully capitulating to its logic? Can we carve out spaces for hesitation, misrecognition, and complexity within systems that thrive on speed and clarity?

Feenberg's theory of technological codes gives us a grammar for resistance. Platforms may encode dominant values, but they remain sites of contestation. They can be repurposed, subverted, misused. Kiran and Verbeek help us feel the texture of mediation from within: how technologies accompany us, shape perception, and guide ethical response. These thinkers remind us that power does not operate only from above. It emerges in the design of the interface, in the script of the button, in the affordance of the field.

But they also remind us that resistance is possible, if provisional. Not grand refusal, but friction: a refusal to optimize a profile; a delay in response time; a misuse of tags or prompts; a practice of ambiguity in systems that reward clarity. These acts are not pure escapes. They are lived negotiations. They tear, however slightly, at the smooth surface of control. In these ruptures, the interface falters, and something else—a gesture, a difference, a voice—flickers into view.

To dwell within and against the interface is to accept this entanglement. It is to live amid infrastructures that shape us, while insisting that shaping is not the same as closure. It is to remain in the tension between legibility and opacity, between presence and

withdrawal, between visibility and refusal. This dwelling is not defeat. It is practice; slow, adaptive, situated.

The interface self is not the end of subjectivity. It is a threshold. What lies beyond cannot be predetermined. But the way we cross it. The forms of care, solidarity, and imagination we bring to it will determine whether subjectivity contracts into machinic compliance or expands into new forms of co-becoming. This is the posthuman opening, to a self no longer grounded in sovereignty, but capable of responding—ethically, relationally, and obliquely—to the systems that see through it.

Author Bio

Jared Smith is an independent philosopher and educator, with a degree from the University of Tartu, Estonia. His research centers on posthumanism and the philosophy of technology, examining how technological entanglements transform subjectivity, agency, and knowledge production. He is particularly interested in the onto-epistemic disruptions technology poses to both individual and collective modes of being, as well as in the ethical and political possibilities opened by these transformations. His current work explores how posthuman thought can inform more situated, relational, and accountable forms of theory and practice.

Works Cited

Barad, Karen. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Duke University Press, 2007.

Braidotti, Rosi. *The Posthuman*. Polity, 2013.

Deleuze, Gilles. “Postscript on the Societies of Control.” *October*, vol. 59, 1992, pp. 3–7.

Feenberg, Andrew. *Between Reason and Experience: Essays in Technology and Modernity*. MIT Press, 2010.

———. *Questioning Technology*. Routledge, 1999.

———. *Transforming Technology: A Critical Theory Revisited*. Oxford University Press, 2002.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books, 1995.

Glissant, Édouard. *Poetics of Relation*. Translated by Betsy Wing, University of Michigan Press, 1997.

Han, Byung-Chul. *The Burnout Society*. Translated by Erik Butler, Stanford University Press, 2015.

———. *Psychopolitics: Neoliberalism and the New Technologies of Power*. Translated by Erik Butler, Verso, 2017.

———. *The Transparency Society*. Translated by Erik Butler, Stanford University Press, 2015.

Haraway, Donna. *A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century. Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, Routledge, 1991, pp. 149–181.

———. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Routledge, 1991.

———. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Duke University Press, 2016.

Hayles, N. Katherine. *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics*. University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Ihde, Don. *Technology and the Lifeworld: From Garden to Earth*. Indiana University Press, 1990.

Kiran, Asle H. "Four Dimensions of Technological Mediation." *Philosophy & Technology*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2012, pp. 77–92.

Stiegler, Bernard. *Technics and Time, 1: The Fault of Epimetheus*. Translated by Richard Beardsworth and George Collins, Stanford University Press, 1998.

Verbeek, Peter-Paul. *Moralizing Technology: Understanding and Designing the Morality of Things*. University of Chicago Press, 2011.

———. *What Things Do: Philosophical Reflections on Technology, Agency, and Design*. Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005.

Wolfe, Cary. *What Is Posthumanism?* University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

Zuboff, Shoshana. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. Profile Books, 2019.