Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice
ISSN: 1948-9137, e-ISSN: 2162-2752
Vol 17 (01), 2025
pp. 1043 - 1053

Surveillance Capitalism and Yarvinism: Technocratic Control in the Digital Governance

Felipe Debasa Navalpotro
King Juan Carlos University, Spain
felipe.debasa@urjc.es
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6459-1469

ABSTRACT: The present study examines the intersections between surveillance capitalism and yarvinism as converging frameworks that explain the formation of a new paradigm of digital governance. The argument is made that the accumulation of data and the technocratic logic of control have resulted in the emergence of a hybrid system, in which economic and political authority are integrated into algorithmic infrastructures with the capacity to regulate information, behaviour and decision-making. This model, the result of technological convergence, redefines sovereignty, legitimacy, and public deliberation by replacing political representation with computational efficiency. The findings underscore the emergence of algocracy as a structural form of power in the 21st century and highlight the necessity to construct frameworks capable of adapting democratic control and preserving human autonomy in the face of decision automation.

Keywords: Algocracy, Digital Government, Democratic Culture, Today's World, Artificial Intelligence, Democratic Memory Law.

Received: 08/09/2025 **Received:** 14/10/2025 **Accepted:** 06/11/2025

1. Introduction

Surveillance capitalism is an economic model that emerged with the expansion of digital platforms. In this model, personal data acquires value as a resource for service design, market segmentation and business decision optimization. The model functions by amassing a substantial volume of data pertaining to user behaviour, which is subsequently utilized to generate predictive models and personalized products. This system has driven new growth dynamics in the digital economy and opened a wide debate on its social, legal and technological implications.

Yarvinism is a political and technological school of thought associated with the ideas of Curtis Yarvin, who proposes a reorganisation of state power inspired by corporate structures and algorithmic efficiency. This approach is predicated on the premise that traditional democratic systems are inadequate in their capacity to manage the intricacies of technocratic governance models that are characterised by centralised control and authority. Its influence has spread to certain areas of digital culture and contemporary political thought, where it has given rise to debate on the relationship between technology, power and institutional legitimacy.

This research proposes a novel approach that explores the intersections between surveillance capitalism and yarvinism. The two phenomena under discussion share a structural logic based on the centralisation of information and algorithmic efficiency as a principle of social organisation. Utilising an interdisciplinary approach encompassing contemporary history, Political science, digital law and technological theory, the study identifies the manner in which the economic rationality of surveillance capitalism is articulated with Yarvinist thinking, thereby legitimising technical authority as a principle of order and efficiency.

The concept of surveillance capitalism involves the conversion of personal data into economic resources

and predictive mechanisms. In a similar fashion, yarvinism extends this logic to the political sphere, redefining the legitimacy of power in terms of performance and technical control. The study posits that at the intersection of these two models, a novel form of digital governance emerges, integrating economy and authority into a unified decision -making system. In this paradigm, information becomes a dual source of accumulation and power.

The combination of these spaces gives rise to a new form of digital governance, defined as a hybrid regime in which decision-making is articulated through technological infrastructures that concentrate economic, administrative and cognitive functions. This model combines the extractive logic of surveillance capitalism with the technocratic rationality of yarvinism, thereby generating a system in which control of information progressively replaces traditional mechanisms of political legitimation. The platform's distinguishing characteristic lies in its synthesis of economic might and technical authority, underpinned by algorithms that govern social interaction and delineate the parameters for accessing knowledge, consumption, and public engagement. In essence, this constitutes a form of government in practice, whereby sovereignty is transferred from institutions to the platforms that oversee data management.

In this context, technocratic control is immersed in digital governance as a structural dimension of its functioning. The concept of authority has evolved to encompass not only formal state institutions but also algorithmic systems that govern information flows and influence the boundaries of collective decision-making. Technocracy is thus integrated into digital platforms, which operate as new spaces of power where technical rationality replaces political judgement and efficiency is imposed as a criterion of legitimacy. This absorption of technocratic control into digital governance has the effect of redefining command hierarchies and shifting the centre of gravity of authority towards technological infrastructures that function as permanent mediators between citizens, the economy and power.

This scenario is indicative of a marked shift towards antidemocratic sentiment. The integration of technocratic control into digital governance has the potential to disrupt the established principle of national sovereignty by transferring decision-making power from public institutions to technological platforms. The prevailing paradigm of political authority is gradually being superseded by the ascendency oof algorithmic authority, thereby engendering a shift in the legitimacy of collective decisions, which are increasingly being judged by criteria of efficiency and calculation. This shift has the potential to erode democratic culture, weaken deliberative processes and reduce citizen participation to interactions regulated by algorithms. Consequently, a form of post-democratic power emerges, whereby sovereignty is no longer held by the state or the citizenry, but by the algorithmic systems that manage information and define the conditions of social consensus.

The most significant aspect of this phenomenon is its appeal to broad sectors of the global population. In a context characterised by widespread disaffection with established institutions, a significant proportion of the population perceives Western democracies to be ineffective, lethargic and susceptible to the influence of corruption. Factors such as the tax burden, the dependence on public subsidies and the exploitation of activism for profit serve to reinforce the idea of an exhausted and self-referential system. This disenchantment has resulted I the adoption of technocratic discourses that advocate for efficiency and order through technological means, even when this involves the relinquishment of the deliberative and participatory principles that form the foundation of democratic legitimacy.

These approaches demonstrate that contemporary democracies face a risk that cannot be attributed solely to classic totalitarian movements or ideological polarisation. Instead, a novel and less visible threat has emerged: autonomous algorithms that operate with minimal or no human oversight. These systems, designed to optimise decisions and manage information on a large scale, have the capacity to reproduce biases, amplify social divisions and consolidate opaque power structures. The capacity to shape public sentiment, regulate access to information, and influence collective actions gives a rise to a novel form of democratic risk, wherein the forfeiture of human agency in decision-making processes jeopardises the very pillars of deliberation and political autonomy.

This model emerged thanks to technological convergence and does not represent an administrative

evolution. Rather, it is a structural transformation of public power, whereby technological infrastructures replace traditional deliberative spaces. These infrastructures act as nodes that concentrate information, mansge resources, and determine the scope of collective action, even prospectively. Initially conceived to optimise economic processes, algorithmic logic has gradually spread to the realm of political decision-making, stablishing a regime of instrumental rationality that redefines the foundations of legitimacy.

The integration of economics and authority transforms data into the raw material of governance, with digital platforms emerging as the new mediators of power. Algorithms predict behaviour, allocate resources and determine the hierarchy of relevance, visibility and access within the digital public sphere. Consequently, information management becomes a form of consensus administration, with technical efficiency displacing deliberation as the guiding principle of government. This study hypothesises that digital governance operates as a structural control device that unites economic accumulation, political direction and social regulation within the same algorithmic framework.

This study's central hypothesis argues that digital governance has given rise to a new paradigm in which the data-driven economy and public political authority converge within a single, algorithm-mediated decision-making system. The novelty of this research lies in its use of yarvinism as an interpretative framework, which enables us to understand why this model of technocratic control is accepted, and even desired, by large sections of society. Curtis Yarvin's ideas provide an ideological explanation for the cultural legitimisation of technological authority by presenting algorithmic efficiency as a rational solution to the perceived dysfunctions of contemporary democracies.

From this perspective, the acceptance of digital governance in society does not only occur through technological imposition, but also through a cultural transformation in the perception of power. Yarvinism presents a political vision that normalises replacing deliberative judgement with technical competence and turns obedience to automated systems into a belief in the neutrality of technology. The study therefore argues that the ideological dimension of yarvinism is fundamental to understanding why citizens are increasingly accepting a political order in which authority is exercised through digital infrastructures that escape direct democratic control.

Yarvinism emerged as an intellectual movement before the full expansion of digital governance. However, it would have remained marginal had it not been for the technological context of the current phase of the Sixth Industrial Revolution. Its ideas about the inefficiencies of liberal democracy and the necessity of centralised power structures have found fertile ground in the contemporary technological convergence marked by artificial intelligence, machine learning, and automated decision-making processes.

2. Surveillance capitalism and the data economy: from behavioural prediction to political governance.

Surveillance capitalism is an economic model based on the growth of digital platforms and technologies for collecting and analysing data. Formulated by Shoshana Zuboff, the concept describes a system in which human experience is transformed into an economic resource that can be quantified, and commercialized. Unlike industrial capitalism, which was based on producing material goods and services, surveillance capitalism is based on extracting information and converting behaviour into raw material for generating value.

This model is based on the transformation of personal data into a financial asset. Every digital interaction leaves behind traces of information that technology companies use to build predictive profiles, estimate consumer trends and anticipate decisions. This data is then consolidated as a strategic, accumulable and tradable resource that can sustain business models based on the continuous observation of users. Thus, information ceases to be a means of communication or knowledge, becoming instead an instrument of profitability that fuels the digital economy.

The business models associated with this system focus on predicting and manipulating behaviour. Platforms not only record what users do, but also actively influence their decisions through algorithms that

priories certain content or stimuli. This dynamic, which is intended to maximise attention and exposure time, creates an environment in which individual autonomy is influenced by design and calculation variables.

The legal, social and ethical implications of this process are far-reaching. Mass data extraction creates an imbalance of power between technology corporations and users, limiting the law's ability to protect privacy, consent and informational self-determination. Opaque algorithms hinder transparency and accountability, and the collection of sensitive data raises new dilemmas about responsibility and control. On a social level, the culture of privacy is transforming, shifting from a right to a negotiable variable in access to digital services.

Surveillance capitalism has evolved beyond the strictly economic sphere. It has extended its logic to areas such as politics and healthcare. In politics, data is used to segment voters, personalise messages, and optimise influence strategies. This creates a system that replaces public deliberation with the algorithmic management of emotions and preferences. In healthcare, the large-scale collection of biometric and genetic information transforms the human body into an ongoing source of data, incorporating health into a system of prediction and control.

This work argues that surveillance capitalism has given rise to two distinct offshoots: political surveillance capitalism, which aims to manage collective behaviour through the systematic use of data; and health surveillance capitalism, which focuses on monitoring and commercialising biological information. Both are extensions of the same paradigm that transforms the relationship between knowledge, power and individual autonomy. This research exclusively examines the former, exploring its connections with yarvinism and analysing the mechanisms of social acceptance and legitimisation that facilitate its incorporation into modern digital governance structures.

3. The genesis of yarvinism: from early cybercultures to the ideology of the cathedral.

Revolutionary cultures, countercultural and cybercultures form a single line of continuity in the history of contemporary social and symbolic transformation. Revolutionary cultures emerged within the context of major ideological and political movements in the 19th and 20th centuries. Their aim was to change the world through collective action and radical restructuring of power. These cultures gave rise to projects that resulted in totalitarian regimes or revolutions that completely reconfigured the political, social and economic order. Examples of this include soviet communism, Italian fascism and the Chinese Revolution, which replaced one structure of domination with another. In these cultures, transforming power was seen as the only means of achieving justice or stability, even if it meant sacrificing individual freedom.

On the other hand, countercultures did not seek to replace the existing order, rather, they created alternative spaces that questioned it from the outside. Emerging in the second half of the 20th century, they manifested as cultural expressions of dissent against authority, consumerism, and social rigidity. Rather than seizing power or imposing a new model, their purpose was to symbolically oppose the establishment through creativity, experimentation and community living. Movements such as hippie culture, punk and the first self-managed artistic communities opted for a form of resistance based on identity and lifestyle, whereby emancipation was achieved through difference rather than the conquest of political power.

Cybercultures perpetuate the same emancipatory impulse in digital context. Emerging alongside the expansion of the internet, they adopt the defence of autonomy, cooperation and decentralisation from countercultures, but apply these principles to the technological field. They focus on promoting open knowledge, freedom of information and protecting privacy against surveillance. This shift represents a transition from symbolic resistance to informational control, redefining the struggle for emancipation in terms of access, connectivity and digital sovereignty. Thus, the first cybercultures emerged in the early 1990s in response to the expansion of the internet and the growing corporate control of software and information. Computer activism, hacktivism, the free software movement, and encrypted forums formed a cultural ecosystem based on technological autonomy, anonymity, and collective knowledge management.

These communities championed the concept of an open, decentralised network as a platform for social and technological innovation, where collaboration supersedes hierarchy. They aimed to liberate information from institutional structures and protect user privacy from surveillance and the centralisation of digital power. In this context, cybercultures emerged as a form of symbolic resistance, viewing the network as a territory of cognitive and technological emancipation.

It was in this context that Curtis Yarvin first came up with his ideas. In his early 1990s research, he demonstrated how his technical proposal replaced classic structural isolation, which was based on hardware and memory hierarchy, with probabilistic isolation, based on the anonymity of addresses within a shared space. This approach breaks with the centralised architecture of the operating system, proposing an environment of autonomous entities that coexisting in the same logical space without a central authority. These entities interact without identity or recognition, protected by opacity. This opacity gives rise to a new form of order. Unlike democratic transparency, anonymity offers security. The system is balanced not by deliberation, but by the calculated distribution of positions within an algorithmic space. The result is a model of order without government, where probability replaces law.

Curtis Yarvin first came to public attention in the early 2000s through his blog *Unqualified Reservations*, which he published under the pseudonym Mencius Moldbug. Through this digital platform, he developed a set of ideas that challenged the fundamental principles of liberal democracy, particularly the separation of powers and political representation. His thinking stems from a critical analysis of dominant forms of progressivism, conservationism and political moderation, which he believes are incapable of providing a stable power structure. He argues that traditional ideologies have become outdated, their validity weakened by their inability to effectively address the issue of organised violence. Assuming that modern democracies are inefficient and controlled by an invisible ideological structure he calls the *Cathedral*, consisting of the media, universities and liberal institutions, he proposes a model of centralised, technocratic government in which authority is concentrated in an executive figure whose functions are similar to those of a chief executive. He defines the *Cathedral* as a secular religion that imposes progressive values under the guise of scientific or moral rationality. This concept later gained traction in neo-reactionary circles and the alt-tech environment as a representation of the cultural dominance of progressivism associated with woke ideologies.

Yarvin's trajectory demonstrates how a discourse that was initially confined to the fringes of the internet ended up exerting influence on technological and business circles connected to Silicon Valey. Through his digital project, *Urbit,* and his relationships with technology investors, Yarvin´s ideas have found resonance in sectors that identify efficiency and technical capability as legitimate foundations of power. Here, Yarvinist thinking is not interpreted as a closed political programme, but as an organisational vision that applies engineering and business administration principles to social management. The interest in this case lies in the interplay between ideology, technology, and digital culture. Yarvinism is not confined to a political proposal; it represents a broader trend thar values automation, hierarchy and technical neutrality as solutions to the limitations of the democratic system. Its dissemination in technological networks and digital forums demonstrates how certain ideas can transition from marginal thinking to the centres of contemporary innovation, shaping a narrative that legitimises technical authority and diminishes the significance of deliberation in collective decision-making processes.

According to secondary sources, starting in 2021, the current US Vice President, J. D. Vance, began to show interest in Yarvin. In interviews and podcasts that year, Vance directly referenced Yarvin's ideas when suggesting the large-scale dismissal of bureaucrats and their replacement with loyal cadres, reflecting the influence if the CEO-State model. Media outlets such as The New Yorker and The Verger have noted that Yarvin has become one of the most influential figures in shaping Vance's political discourse, which centres on the idea of America's institutional decline and the need for a strong executive branch capable of centralising authority.

Since 2020, Donald Trump has made his opposition to *woke* culture a central plank of his political strategy. He presents it as a defence of traditional values against a progressive drift that, in his view, is penetrating

institutions, education and culture. He identifies *woke* culture with excessive political correctness and diversity policies, which he believes undermine meritocracy and national identity. In his 2024 election narrative, he promises to eradicate *woke* ideology from the state and education system, thereby setting up a culture war at the heart of American political debate. This approach clearly aligns with the ideas formulated by Curtis Yarvin under the concept of the *Cathedral*

4. Intersection between surveillance capitalism and yarvinism: Towards a new model of digital governance

The intersection between surveillance capitalism and yarvinism enable us to recognise the emergence of a novel model of digital governance, characterised by the integration of economic accumulation, informational control, and technocratic legitimacy. Both phenomena share a similar underlying structure, involving the centralisation of data, the automation of authority, and the gradual replacement of political deliberation with technical efficiency. While surveillance capitalism transforms human experience into a source of information, yarvinism provides the ideological justification for this process by presenting technical authority as a legitimate alternative to the perceived ineffectiveness of representative democracy.

This convergence has given rise to a hybrid regime in which sovereignty no longer resides in formal institutions, but in technological platforms that manage information and influence social behaviour. Digital governance is establishing itself as a system that appears decentralised but is actually concentrated, in which algorithmic infrastructures assume decision-making and regulatory functions. In this context, political legitimacy is redefined; power is exercised through the neutrality of calculations and networks' ability to manage social complexity. The union of surveillance capitalism and yarvinism shapes a new type of authority, based on the convergence of data and decision-making. Here, the information economy and algorithmic management merge into a single governing principle.

This new digital governance scenario is characterised by the convergence of economic power and technical rationality in the decision-making processes of these platforms. Digital infrastructures are responsible for the management of information and the establishment of the criteria of visibility, relevance and access, that shape social organisation. The concept of authority evolves from its traditional roles as a political mandate, becoming instead an automated data management process. In this paradigm, obedience is superseded by functional dependence, users respond to the design architectures which shape their behaviour through constant interaction. In this sense, the automation of authority constitutes a new form of control, characterised by its greater diffusion and efficacy, which is integrates into everyday life under the guise of technological neutrality.

The centralisation of information is a key element of this model, as it transforms data flows into the primary mechanism for power and social coordination. Platforms function as enduring intermediaries between individuals, institutions and markets, thereby amassing a capacity for influence that surpasses that conventional states and permeates international boundaries, thus giving rise to a novel domain for the proliferation of hybrid threats. In practice, rather than in theory, sovereignty is thus shifting from legal structures to technological infrastructures, which define the limits of what is possible within the digital space. This shift soes not necessarily imply a power vacuum, but rather a reconfiguration of power around opaque decision-making centres that operate through algorithms and artificial intelligence systems. Digital governance, therefore, manifests as a form of government that is distributed in appearance but concentrated in practice, where transparency is supplanted by traceability and legitimacy by efficiency. The expansion of digital governance can also be understood within the conceptual frameworks of algorithmic governance, which have been extensively discussed in recent Anglo- Saxon literature. These approaches delineate systems in which political and administrative decision-making is facilitated by automated computing infrastructures, which transform government procedures into data processing operations. The distribution of authority is observed across technical architectures, which function by translating norms into protocols and values into quantifiable variables. In this context, public administration becomes an extension of the computer system, and regulation is redefined as a coding problem. This phenomenon positions automated governance as a sophisticated phase of surveillance

capitalism, wherein algorithms not only execute decisions but also contribute to the establishment of norms.

The result is a hybrid regime that combines market logic and informational control. Surveillance capitalism provides the mechanism of accumulation, while yarvinism offers the ideological framework that normalises technical authority and the centralisation of power. The combination of these two factors produces a form of governance that acts simultaneously on the economy and on cognition, managing not only material resources but also perceptions, emotions and decisions. In this context, the concept of power has evolved beyond the traditional paradigms of coercion and representation, emphasising instead the capacity to proactively influence and direct collective behaviour. This process, driven by technological convergence, redefines the role of knowledge in the structure of power and poses the challenge of rethinking the foundations of democracy in an era dominated by automation and total information.

In the context of digital governance, there has been a shift in the concept of legitimacy from political representation to technological efficiency. This paradigm shift has given rise to a new form of authority that is characterised by the control of information and the automation of decision-making processes. By establishing hierarchies of visibility and access, algorithms implicitly establish normative order that determines what is relevant, what is true, and what should be prioritised. This process consolidates a model of governance in which legitimacy derives from technical functioning rather than social recognition, and where sovereignty is redefines as programming capacity rather than the exercise of representation. This phenomenon has been termed *Algocracy*, a term denoting the dictatorship of algorithms.

The legitimacy of Algocracy can be explained by various structural and cultural factors. This study employs a qualitative approach to identify three factors that are deemed to be of particular significance. The first of these relates to the public perception that public administrations have become costly, rigid and excessively bureaucratic bodies. A considerable proportion of the population subscribe to the notion that civil servants constitute a novel social class, distinguished by professional stability and diminished productivity, and associated with roles thar are frequently regarded superfluous. This diagnosis lends support to the hypothesis that automates systems could offer a more efficient, neutral and economical alternative for public management.

The second factor pertains to the institutional slowness to respond to issues that citizens consider priorities, such as security, migration management, and the rational use of public resources. The proliferation of programmes perceived as irrelevant or associated with lucrative activism serves to reinforce the sense of distance between the state and the real needs of society. In this context, the narrative of technical optimisation and spending cuts is consolidated as an argument for legitimising government automation.

The third factor pertains to the erosion of trust in representative democracy, attributable to recurring cases of corruption and political patronage. These episodes serve to reinforce the perception that institutions are deficient in the implementation of effective mechanisms for self-regulation and accountability. In response to this, algocracy emerges as a potential solution, offering a framework that purportedly ensures transparency and efficiency by eliminating the need for human intermediaries. The confluence of these three elements facilitates comprehension of the manner in which institutional fatigue, the demand for efficiency, and distrust of political elites collectively engender a conducive environment for the social legitimisation of automated government.

The sociocultural context in which algocracy emerges differs profoundly from the Enlightenment rationalism that gave rise to modern constitutional democracies. Contemporary societies in Europe, America and the Anglo-Saxon world are no longer governed by calm deliberation or the ideal of critical citizenship that inspired representative regimes after the French and American revolutions. The contemporary public sphere is characterised by polarisation, fragmentation of discourse and the pursuit of immediate solutions to complex structural problems. The realm of politics, increasingly influenced by digital information and emotional logic of social media.

In this context, technology plays a pivotal role in the transformation of collective thinking. Algorithms, designed to maximise attention and interaction, operate on the principle of the echo chamber, thereby amplifying confirmation bias and reinforcing group identities. This process serves to reduce exposure to diverse ideologies, replacing rational debate with the repetition of content that aligns pre-existing perspectives. The result is an information ecosystem that encourages polarisation and weakens the conditions for critical judgement. The technology, which was initially conceptualised as a medium for facilitating access to knowledge, consequently evolves into a structural agent of social division, thereby engendering a conducive environment for the acceptance of technocratic control models that promise to bring order and efficiency to the prevailing perception of chaos within the context of democratic pluralism.

The transfer of sovereignty from political institutions to digital platforms gives rise to a legal vacuum that the field of public law has yet to satisfactorily address. The operation of technological infrastructures occurs within a transnational space that exceeds the confines of borders and conventional regulatory frameworks, thereby engendering challenges in delineation of responsibilities and the effective protection of fundamental rights. Tis scenario engenders an imbalance between the economic and technical prowess of corporations and the capacity of states to wield democratic control over them. Digital governance, by failing to respond to an authority recognised by international law, establishes a de facto regime whose legitimacy is rooted in operational effectiveness rather than formal legality.

The expansion of generative artificial intelligence introduces a new dimension to this process, incorporating systems capable of producing decisions, discourses and representations autonomously and which, in some cases, are difficult to identify. These technologies extend the scope of algorithmic control by intervening in opinion formation, public administration and information management. Their ability to generate plausible content and modulate political communication reinforces the automation of authority, blurring the distinction between technical information and political decision-making. In this way, generative AI actively contributes to the consolidation of a governance structure where human mediation becomes dispensable.

The most significant consequence of this process is the epistemic erosion of contemporary democracies. The excess of information and the implementation of algorithmic personalisation processes serve to divide the collective knowledge base, thereby diminishing the potential for the establishment of universal criteria for truth. Digital systems prioritise visibility over veracity, replacing scientific or institutional validation with the logic of popularity and repetition. This transition from verifiable knowledge to automated information has the potential to disrupt the cognitive foundations of citizenship and consolidate a cognitive power that operates on perception rather than on norms. In this scenario, the crisis od democratic legitimacy expands to become a crisis of knowledge. In such scenarios, data manipulation, the dissemination of disinformation and the automation of communication processes become effective tools for modifying perceptions and weakening institutions without resorting to visible coercion. It is in this nexus that hybrid threats emerge and evolve within the information sphere, a domain characterised by the indistinct boundaries between security, economics and culture. A hybrid threat is a complex form of risk that integrates technological, informational, economic and social dimensions into a strategy of influence or destabilisation. The phenomenon under scrutiny here does not operate through direct confrontation or traditional mechanisms of power. Rather, it is characterised by a combination of digital tools, information flows and coordinated actions that seek to alter the internal functioning of democratic systems. Its defining characteristic is its capacity to operate at multiple levels concurrently, leveraging the interconnectedness and technological reliance that are the hallmarks of modern societies. The impact of this phenomenon is evidenced by its capacity to engender mistrust, to fragment social consensus, and to erode the mechanisms of legitimacy. In the context of digital governance, such forms of threat test the resilience of democracies, as they exploit their openness and dependence on technological infrastructures that, in many cases, are beyond their direct control.

The hybrid threats described in the informational sphere are also part of a global dynamic that coincides with the term *informational warfare* as used by international organisations such as NATO. These concepts refer to strategies that use digital flows to alter perceptions, destabilise societies and erode institutional

cohesion through data manipulation and information saturation. In such scenarios, the field of conflict has transitioned from its traditional territorial and military manifestations to a cognitive domain. The primary objective in this new terrain is to exert influence over the process of collective decision-making. Digital governance, by operating on the same mechanisms of information management and behaviour modelling, thus becomes a space susceptible to geopolitical instrumentalization, where the boundary between civil control, economic influence and military strategy becomes increasingly blurred.

5. Implications and prospective frameworks for digital governance

An analysis of the intersections between surveillance capitalism and yarvinism reveals that digital governance is not a transitory phenomenon, but rather the structural form that power takes in the age of automation. The consolidation of this system has far-reaching implications that extend beyond the realms of technology and economics, profoundly impacting the very foundation of sovereignty, legitimacy, and knowledge. The centralization of information, the delegation of authority to algorithmic systems and the erosion of public deliberation are collectively shaping a new order in which technical efficiency is gradually replacing the principle of representation.

In this scenario, contemporary societies face the challenge of designing institutional frameworks capable of integrating technological innovation without relinquishing democratic control. The question is not only how to regulate algorithms, but also how to preserve human autonomy and cognitive plurality in environments mediated by automatic decision-making systems. The future of digital governance will be contingent on the ability to achieve a balance between individual rights, technical transparency and institutional accountability. The comprehension of this intersection illuminates not only the present state of digital transformation, but also facilitates the anticipation of the ethical, legal and political dilemmas that are likely to define the global order in the ensuing decades.

The magnitude of this process necessitates a sustained interdisciplinary approach capable of connecting technical analysis with legal, historical and political reflection. Digital governance must be understood not only in terms of engineering or data economics, but as a structural phenomenon that redefines the notions of power and legitimacy in today's world. In this sense, the law plays a pivotal role in establishing the frameworks for action and ensuring the protection of human autonomy in the face of automated decision-making. In order to assess the risks associated with this transformation, it is necessary to employ a methodology that combines empirical observation with normative theory and historical analysis of institutions. It is imperative to approach digital governance not as a technological inevitability, but as a field of decision-making where the continuity or erosion of democratic values is at sake

6. Conclusions

The study demonstrates that the intersection of surveillance capitalism and yarvinism is shaping a new paradigm of digital governance, in which authority, economics and information converge within the same power structure.

This model emerges from the translation of technical efficiency into a principle of legitimacy, arising from the challenges faced by traditional democracies in a spontaneous scenario precipitated by technological progress. The automation of decision-making and the centralisation of data produce an unprecedent form of control that transforms the relationship between individuals, institutions and knowledge.

Research findings indicate that digital governance, through the incorporation of economic surveillance and technocratic elements, leads to the redefinition of limits to sovereignty and the shift of focus of democratic deliberation towards algorithmic decision-making systems. These systems are characterised by their delocalisation from traditional centres of power, such as assemblies, parliaments, and the residencies of the executive branch.

Algocracy is a radical manifestation of digital modernity, whereby transparency is superseded by traceability and legitimacy is determined by operational efficiency. The results of the study highlight the necessity for an interdisciplinary framework to assess the risks of this transformation and to build

sustainable institutional responses. The law assumes a pivotal function as an instrument of equilibrium between innovation and guarantee, proffering regulatory mechanisms capable of constraining the potency of algorithms and ensuring the preservation of human autonomy. Digital governance, when viewed from this perspective, cannot be conceived as a neutral process; rather, it is a terrain where the future form of democratic power is contested. This mutation does not imply the disappearance of politics, but rather its reformulation within technical infrastructures that concentrate power without public accountability.

The central argument of this paper is that the true challenge of the forthcoming decades will not lie in the development of more sophisticated technologies, but rather in the establishment of a political and legal culture that is capable of regulating them. The ongoing existence of democratic values is contingent upon the capacity to reintegrate ethics, deliberation and citizen control into the core of the digital system. It is imperative to recognise that a multifaceted approach, encompassing technical expertise, philosophical contemplation and legal accountability, is indispensable in order to avert the automation of power from resulting in its dehumanisation.

References

[1] Blanco González, A., Atienza, P. M., Feito, C. D. C., & Gutiérrez, L. R. (2025). How do Companies Adapt to Cultural Factors to Gain Legitimacy in International Markets?. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society*, (71), 104-120.

[2] Debasa, F. & Azcona Pastor, J. M. (2024). Tecnología global, IV Revolución Industrial y mutaciones sociales. *Historia Actual Online,* (63), 183-198.

[3] Debasa, F. (2024). Inteligencia artificial, ciberdelincuencia y desinformación en el derecho de la revolución digital. In *Seguridad y responsabilidad penal e internacional en el uso de las TIC y la inteligencia artificial* (pp. 79-94). Iustel Portal Derecho.

[4] Del Valle, G. (2024). JD Vance thinks monarchists have some good ideas. The Verge. https://www.theverge.com/2024/10/16/24266512/jd-vance-curtis-yarvin-influence-rage-project-2025

[5] Giannuzzi, P. (2022). Curtis Yarvin (Mencius Moldbug): An open letter to open-minded progressives. In *Schlüsseltexte der ‚Neuen Rechten' Kritische Analysen antidemokratischen Denkens* (pp. 263-273). Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.

[6] Karrouk, Y., & Debasa, F. (2025). Data quality in the surveillance economy: Challenges of digital governance in the paradox of data decontextualization. In *Data-driven governance through AI, digital marketing, and the privacy interplay* (pp. 31- 54). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.

[7] Kofman, A. (2025, June–July). *The neo-reactionary plot of Curtis Yarvin. Nueva Sociedad,* (318). Retrieved from https://nuso.org/articulo/318-complot-neorreaccionario-curtis-yarvin/

[8] Land, N. (2022). *The Dark Enlightenment.* Imperium Press.

[9] Luque Juárez, J. M. (2019). Las amenazas híbridas contra las democracias abiertas. *Estudios en Seguridad y Defensa*, *14*(27), 115-137.

[10] Luque Juarez, J. M. (2024). El blindaje inteligente del big data: un ejercicio para la seguridad nacional. In *Escenarios de incertidumbre para la inteligencia estratégica en el contexto de la seguridad global* (pp. 625-643). Editorial Aranzadi.

[11] Martin, F. D., Diez-de Castro, E., Suárez, A. C., & Prado Roman, C. (2025). Necessary Conditions for the Existence of Organizational Legitimacy. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society,* (71), 292-303.

[12] Moldbug, M. (2007–2016). Unqualified Reservations. Available at: https://www.unqualified-reservations.org

[13] Moldbug, M. (2008). *An open letter to open-minded progressives.* Unqualified Reservations. Available at: https://www.unqualified-reservations.org/2008/04/open-letter-to-open-minded-progressives/

[14] Payá-Santos, C., & Luque Juárez, J. M. (2021). El sistema de inteligencia criminal ante las nuevas amenazas y oportunidades del ciberespacio. *Revista Científica General José María Córdova,* 19(36), 1122-1136.

[15] Saura, J. R. (2025). AI, Data Economy, and Behavioral Intention: Towards Ethical Paths. In *Global Perspectives on AI, Ethics, and Business Economics: Charting the Future* (pp. 3-16). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

[16] Saura, J. R. (2025). *Ethics and Privacy in AI-Driven Digital Marketing: Navigating the Paradox*.

[17] Saura, J. R., & Debasa, F. (Eds.). (2022). *Handbook of research on artificial intelligence in government practices and processes.* IGI Global.

[18] Torres Assiego, C. (2025). El sesgo algorítmico como nuevos retos jurídicos frente a la IA. In *La Unión Europea, los ODS y el derecho público* (pp. 183-202). Tirant lo Blanch.

[19] Yarvin, C., Bukowski, R., & Anderson, T. (1993, June). Anonymous RPC: Low-Latency Protection in a 64-Bit Address Space. In *USENIX Summer* (pp. 175-186).

[20] Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. Public Affairs.