



REVISTA INCLUSIONES

CENCIA EN TIEMPOS DE CAMBIOS

Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales

Volumen 7 . Número Especial

Julio / Septiembre

2020

ISSN 0719-4706

CUERPO DIRECTIVO

Directores

Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras

Universidad de Tarapacá, Chile

Editor

Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Editor Científico

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidade Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Editor Europa del Este

Dr. Aleksandar Ivanov Katrandzhiev

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

Cuerpo Asistente

Traductora: Inglés

Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Portada

Lic. Graciela Pantigoso de Los Santos

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

COMITÉ EDITORIAL

Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dra. Heloísa Bellotto

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Nidia Burgos

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

Mg. María Eugenia Campos

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Werner Mackenbach

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

Ph. D. Natalia Milanese

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

Ph. D. Maritza Montero

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

Dra. Eleonora Pencheva

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira

Universidad de La Coruña, España

Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona

Universidad San Clemente de Ojrid de Sofía, Bulgaria

Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra

Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia

Dra. Mirka Seitz

Universidad del Salvador, Argentina

Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov

South West University, Bulgaria

COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL

Comité Científico Internacional de Honor

Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía

Universidad ICESI, Colombia

Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Martino Contu

Universidad de Sassari, Italia

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Patricia Brogna

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

REVISTA INCLUSIONES

REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Lancelot Cowie

Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago

Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar

Universidad de Los Andes, Chile

Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo

*Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla,
México*

Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto

Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina

Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo

Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandia

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España

Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar

Universidad de Sevilla, España

Dra. Patricia Galeana

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dra. Manuela Garau

Centro Studi Sea, Italia

Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg

*Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia
Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos*

Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez

Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia

José Manuel González Freire

Universidad de Colima, México

Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera

Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España

Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre

Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

+ Dr. Miguel León-Portilla

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura

*Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel",
España*

Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros

Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil

+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández

Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela

Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango

Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México

Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut

Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España

Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dra. Francesca Randazzo

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras,
Honduras*

Dra. Yolando Ricardo

Universidad de La Habana, Cuba

Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha

Universidade Católica de Angola Angola

Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza

Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica

Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix

*Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades
Estatales América Latina y el Caribe*

Dr. Luis Alberto Romero

CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Juan Antonio Seda

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso
Universidad de Salamanca, España

Dr. Josep Vives Rego
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Comité Científico Internacional

Dra. Elian Araujo
Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil

Mg. Romyana Atanasova Popova
Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa
Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal
Centro de Estudios Africanos, Portugal

Dra. Noemí Brenta
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Ph. D. Juan R. Coca
Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel
Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España

Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik
Universidad de Colonia, Alemania

Dr. Eric de Léséulec
INS HEA, Francia

Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant
Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalem, Israel

Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro
Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia

Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov
Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez
Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia

Dr. Gino Ríos Patio
Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Perú

Dra. María Laura Salinas
Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina

Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo
Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina

Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec
Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía
Santiago – Chile
Representante Legal
Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:





REX



UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN



Universidad de Concepción



BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN

ANTHROPOLOGICAL CRISIS AND MODERN NET GENERATIONS

Ph. D. Julia J. Sugrobova

Crimean Federal University, Russian Federation
ORCID 0000-0001-6530-621X
yulia.culture@mail.ru

Ph. D. Irina D. Karpova

Crimean Federal University, Russian Federation
ORCID 0000-0002-2390-8404
irinadanilovna@mail.ru

Ph. D. Yulia O. Dorofei

Crimean Federal University, Russian Federation
ORCID 0000-0002-3394-6754
julia_dorofej@mail.ru

Ph. D. Gennadiy S. Kaushliyev

Crimean Federal University, Russian Federation
ORCID 0000-0002-8445-3714
genasimf@mail.ru

Fecha de Recepción: 02 de abril de 2020 – **Fecha Revisión:** 30 de abril de 2020

Fecha de Aceptación: 19 de junio de 2020 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 01 de julio de 2020

Abstract

The relevance of the study is due to the escalation of the anthropological crisis caused by the transition of humanity into a new worldview stage of post-industrial and information development, which led to globalization and the humanitarian revolution. In this regard the paper is aimed at identifying the causes and parameters of the anthropological crisis; its philosophical-anthropological and culturological comprehension; definition of characteristics and life strategies of modern net generations of Millennials and Centennials. The main methods of research are the socio-historical and historical-philosophical analysis, and system analysis of social institutions and cultural forms allowing a comprehensive study of the problems of the anthropological crisis.

Keywords

Anthropological crisis – Net technologies – Net generations – Values – De-identification

Para Citar este Artículo:

Sugrobova, Julia J.; Karpova, Irina D.; Dorofei, Yulia O. y Kaushliyev, Gennadiy S. Anthropological crisis and modern net generations. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 7 num Especial (2020): 576-587.

Licencia Creative Commons Attribution Nom-Comercial 3.0 Unported
(CC BY-NC 3.0)

Licencia Internacional



Introduction

A peculiarity of modern reality is the anthropological crisis, the problem of which began to emerge in the intellectual space at the junction of the XIX-XX centuries. Anthropological crisis is a manifestation of a deep worldview crisis that engulfed modern societies in the XX century, aggravating in its second half and continuing in the realities of the XXI century. The reason for this phenomenon was the transition of mankind to a new worldview stage of post-industrial (information) development, which led to globalization and the humanitarian revolution.

The processes of globalization on the one hand and the world fragmentation on the other blur out the image of man, which have always been determined through national, ethnic, cultural and other identities. However, systemic changes and the upheavals of the XXI century introduce coevals into a situation of uncertainty, unreliability and futility.

Anthropological crisis became the major topic of a fairly new philosophical trend - the "philosophy of crisis". Many foreign scientists are concerned with this topic: D. Bell, J. Baudrillard, R. Guénon, H. Marcuse, R.K. Merton, G.H. Mead, T. Parsons, A. Peccei, A. Toffler, A. Schütz et al. as well as Russian researchers: M. Berulava, A. Gorban, E. Dugin, V. Inozemtsev, O. Karpukhin, E. Korobko, O. Krasnoyarova, O. Kupriyanov, E. Makarevich, M. Mamardashvili, V. Podoroga, O. Prokhovnik, K. Smirnov, M. Khorkov et al. Philosophers, sociologists, culturologists, philologists and psychologists in their works raise the problems of the human crisis, its causes, as well as the prospects for the further development of mankind.

The topics of the value orientations transformation, the changing priorities of youth, the formation of new worldview and psychological characteristics of modern net generations of Millennials and Centennials, and a technological change in their mind are considered in the works of foreign authors: R. Jenkins, M. Prensky, D. Tapscott, and Russian scientists: M. Bezbogova, M. Iontseva, M. Isaeva, N. Nikitina et al.

Despite the rather extensive study of the theme of the anthropological crisis of society, the general study of its specifics in the XXI century is still in the stage of promotion and awaits a systematic analysis, which influenced the choice of presented research topic.

The aim of the scientific work is the philosophical-anthropological and culturological comprehension of the causes of the anthropological crisis and its parameters; definition of characteristics of modern generations of Millennials and Centennials, the analysis of virtualization of their interaction at the expense of real contact communication. Hypothesis of the present study lie in the idea that one of the reasons for the anthropological crisis that continues in the XXI century is the de-identification of a man, i.e. loss of life guides, disorientation, and a departure toward consumer and hedonistic existence.

Materials and Methods

The methodological basis of this study was the concept of the post-industrial society by D. Bell, who notes changes in three main, relatively autonomous spheres of society: the social structure, political system and culture; and information theory by M. Castells, comprehending the latest trends in the development of society associated with the information technology revolution, globalization and economic movements.

The whole spectrum of methods used in philosophical and anthropological research was applied in the study, namely methods of socio-historical and historical-philosophical analysis, system analysis of social institutions and cultural forms.

Results

Modern society is characterized by such markers as active technification and the growth of the significance of information and knowledge. Knowledge, on the one hand, becomes a product, an instrument, and, on the other hand, a commodity and a productive force. Traditional ways of production, mental labor and communication are changing.

There is a heightened interest in the human problem appears. There is also a uniformity of social and political structures taking place, when forms of human identification are being destroyed. Mass culture is dominating; a consumer society is being formed, including entertainment and different kinds of temptations. Social and political life is being transformed into a process of demonstrating images that are viewed by the audience more or less indifferent.

The peculiarities of being of Millennials and Centennials generations, which, on the one hand, are distinguished by a higher level and rate of mental development, but, on the other hand, have lower adaptive capacities. Social connections undergo a certain transformation when real, personal communications are replaced by virtual ones. Net generations with a natural environment of being in virtual reality and Net technologies are transformed into a global generation. There are negative consequences of the impact of mass communications on the existence of a “mass-man” observed. The global informatization of society is evolving. The game is becoming a popular form of information delivery, as well as the impact on the audience. In addition, Computer-mediated communication (CMC) communities - social networks - are being created. The individual is forced to adopt a corresponding cultural identity and to become a carrier of the behavior logic, which is formed beyond the social community in which he/she developed and lives. This is the threat to the information security of the individual.

Discussion

Active technification, the growth of information and knowledge significance, according to the concept of post-industrial society by D. Bell, are the features of modern society. In turn, traditional ways of production, mental labor and communication are also changing¹. As a consequence of this phenomenon, and in particular the cause of the anthropological crisis, becomes the spiritual and moral development of mankind skewed from scientific and technological progress². In this regard, Russian academician Vladislav Inozemtsev argues not about a skew, but about the lag of one process from another³. Then a natural way out of the crisis situation will be the qualitative personal correspondence of a man with a technologically developed society and rapidly changing reality.

¹ D. Bell, *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting* (Moscow: Academia, 2004).

² O. A. Prokhovnik, *Cultural-Anthropological Crisis and the New Challenges in the Postmodern Age of Education: PhD thesis, author's abstract: 09.00.13* (Rostov State University, Rostov-on-Don, 2006)

³ V. L. Inozemtsev, *Modern Post-Industrial Society: Nature, Contradictions, Perspectives* (Moscow: LOGOS, 2000).

Consequently, it can be assumed that the roots of the anthropological problem have also germinated in the bosom of cultural processes, since “culture has taken the initiative in changes activation”⁴. Therefore, contemporary culture does not nurture humanistic oriented individuals who are optimistic about the world. One of the notions that characterizes today the contemporary cultural status quo is “anti-culture, with its cults of violence, lust, animal pack and drug rush” as opposed to the “genuine” culture, based on recognized by all world religions basic values and cults of charity, love, family, sense and good will⁵.

Researchers find an explanation of the current civilizational processes in the fundamental shift in culture resulting in the establishment of a new cultural space with its features of a universal, global, technocratic and virtual character⁶. To denote a new development that replacing traditional culture, the term of “quasi-culture” is used.

One of the definitions of the anthropological crisis as a culture crisis is based on a break with tradition. Thus, René Guénon in his book *The Crisis of the Modern World* emphasizes the cause of similar anthropological consequences, namely, confirms the turn from traditional culture of sacral character to modern profane culture. The author believes that this transformation occurred naturally, because the modern world has reached a critical point and changes in orientation are inevitable⁷. According to his theory, the humanity is in the “dark age”, when the cyclical development takes place from the top down in the descending direction, and is explained by the fact that the development of each manifestation assumes a greater distance each time from the principle from which it comes: “The development of modern humanity truly resembles movement of a body thrown on the slope and advancing faster the closer it gets to the bottom”⁸.

One of the characteristics of present time is hedonism, i.e. the process of active materialization as an orientation of consciousness, when a person more or less consciously gives preference to things of material order and related activities. A consumer society with a dominant mass culture is forming, imposing on mankind a certain faux-ideal of human being, when it is possible to consume and entertain more than others and possess a great many things. In this case, the personal lower moral and moral threshold, ignorance and mediocrity have no significance in the context of the consumer-hedonist human.

A feature of modernity, which the researchers note, is progressive compression of time. For example, speed, according to Guénon, has a characteristic of constant increase, and this will occur before the end of the cycle. “Here comes, as it were, a progressive “contraction” of duration”⁹. The French philosopher says that time in a sense “depletes” the space¹⁰.

⁴ D. Bell, *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting* (Moscow: Academia, 2004).

⁵ M. N. Berulava, “Anthropological crisis and human perspectives”, *Bulletin of the University of the Russian Academy of Education*, num 4 (2006): 26-34.

⁶ K. S. Smirnov and E. V. Korobko, “Anthropological crisis of the modern era in the context of the philosophy of integral traditionalism”, *Bulletin of Volgograd State University. 7 Series: Philosophy. Sociology and Social Technologies*, Vol: 1 num 7-13 (2011) 45 – 50.

⁷ R. Guénon, *Selected works. Traditional Forms and Cosmic Cycles. The Crisis of the Modern World* (Moscow: Belovodye Publishing House, 2004).

⁸ R. Guénon, *Selected works. The Reign of Quantity and the Signs of the Times. Studies in Hinduism. The Esoterism of Dante* (Moscow: Belovodye Publishing House, 2003).

⁹ R. Guénon, *Selected works. The Reign of Quantity and the Signs...*

¹⁰ R. Guénon, *Selected works. The Reign of Quantity and the Signs...*

Knowledge today is an instrument, and a product, and a commodity, and a productive force. Here it is possible to trace the dependence of states on the effectiveness of the use of technological knowledge. Therefore, a situation is created where knowledge that is incapable of bringing “benefit” (philosophical or aesthetic) is “not in the ball game”, staying unclaimed by society. In turn, this comprehension of knowledge becomes decisive in the formation of the foundational paradigm of society, which is the basis for creating a cultural worldview space for the future society.

Due to the globalization technologies and the postmodernism ideology a uniformity of social and political structures emerges; cultural, historical and spiritual forms of human identification are being destroyed, as well as the worldview foundations of the human self-determination.

Postmodernism, establishing an era of cultural and social diversity growth, argues that absolutely everything in this world is relative. Some can believe in one or the other, some can defend such values, or argue the opposite ones. All criteria and boundaries lie in the context of the agreement between people.

Researchers distinguish the following specific features of the culture of the postmodern society: lack of depth and a superficial view of the world; the weakening of emotions; the phenomenon of alienation; the uncertainty of the directions of social progress; separation of the society and the active subject; transformation of motives and stimuli of an individual; increasing the role of individual consciousness and behavior; predominance of reproducing, but not producing technologies. Reproducing technologies create completely new conditions for the existence of culture, leading to a huge variety of “cultural products” - images, signs, symbols, which people often cannot figure out^{11, 12}.

The human problem in the new conditions of being and the fuzzy future becomes one of the topical, central problems of modern philosophical discourse. Professor Valery Podoroga as one of the manifestations of modernity considers the phenomenon called “competition of the future”, “rational wishes” about the future of a man, which directly relates to various attempts by intellectuals to project the models of evolution and transformation of contemporary society¹³.

According to researchers, an increased interest in the human problem manifests itself at certain stages in the development of society. Thus, Martin Buber noted that in certain epochs, when the surrounding world appears to be settled and prosperous, reflections on what a person is cannot arise at all. Only a very acute sense of loneliness and despondency gives rise to the desire to address the subject of man¹⁴. Therewith, Max Scheler stressed that at the key points of history the growth of human consciousness is increasing, and then in the development of anthropological ideas a leap is observed¹⁵.

¹¹ American sociological thought: Robert K. Merton, George Herbert Mead, Talcott Parsons, Alfred Schütz. V.I. Dobrenkov (ed). (Moscow State University Publishers, 1994).

¹² A. V. Gorban, “Anthropological crisis as a state of the society of the transition period”, Culture of the peoples of the Black Sea region, num 214 (2011): 124-127.

¹³ V. Podoroga, Epoch of Postmodernism and Anthropological Crisis. Retrieved 15.04.2018 from: <https://www.finam.ru/>

¹⁴ M. Buber, Das Problem des Menschen (Heidelberg: 1948).

¹⁵ M. L. Khorkov, Genesis of Philosophical Anthropology and the Social Crisis: PhD Thesis, author’s abstract. 09.00.13. Institute of Philosophy (Moscow: 1998).

The peculiarity of social reflection was that it was recorded not only in philosophical sphere, but also by representatives of public thought of various directions, namely: H. Marcuse, A. Peccei, A. Toffler, et al. It was concluded that the main source of anthropological crisis is the man itself¹⁶.

Thus, Aurelio Peccei argues that “the current global crisis where all elements of the human system were unbalanced with one another is a direct consequence of a man's inability to rise to the level corresponding to his new powerful role in the world, to realize his new responsibilities and commitments. The problem is within the man himself, but not beyond, so a possible solution to it is connected with the man himself; and from now on the quintessence of everything that matters to the man is precisely the qualities and abilities of all people”¹⁷.

Whereby, Alvin Toffler sees the anthropological crisis as a loss of human adaptation to social change. The way out of the current crisis realities is the human's ability to adapt in the rapidly changing social realities¹⁸.

Jean Baudrillard, a French researcher who advocates the idea of a radical divide between modernity and postmodernity, believes that in the context of postmodernism it makes no sense at all to talk about the differences between “real” and “unreal” – since such difference disappears¹⁹.

A man sees only signs that are worth nothing. Signs designate themselves, and not any objects hiding behind them. Such a reality philosopher calls “hyperreality”; the mass media play the most important role in its formation. What is shown by television is real. What does not fall into the framework of the “televised picture”, as if at all does not exist. But at the same time, what television shows does not reflect what “there really is”. The domination of the “masses”, according to J. Baudrillard, is a sign of the disappearance of “social” as a space of stable relations between people. And this is another feature of postmodernity²⁰.

Based on the characteristics of the mass-man, given by the Spanish philosopher and sociologist José Ortega y Gasset in the works *The Revolt of the Masses* and *The dehumanization of art and Ideas about the novel*, the Russian researcher Olga Krasnoyarova singles out the main features of mass-society communication:

- Stereotypification, when in the transmission, selection and reception of information the main thing is its correspondence to widespread average perceptions. This being said, communication acquires a negative aspect, since in humans the orientation toward stereotype supersedes creative and spiritual search in the communicative strategy of behavior;

- Constant repetition, when a person already has ready-clichéd answers to all questions and the essence of communication is not the expansion of the information world or discovery of a new one, but the constant repetition and approval of the adapted old;

¹⁶ H. Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man* (Moscow: REFL-book,1994); A. Peccei, *The Human Quality*. (Moscow: Progress, 1985) y A. Toffler, *Future Shock*. (St. Petersburg: Lanbook, 1997)

¹⁷ A. Peccei, *The Human Quality* (Moscow: Progress, 1985).

¹⁸ A. Toffler, *The Third Wave* (Moscow: AST Publishers, 1999).

¹⁹ J. Baudrillard, *In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities. Or, the End of the Social* (Yekaterinburg: Ural State University Publishers, 2000).

²⁰ J. Baudrillard, *In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities...*

– Situational value, when pragmatism predominates in informational communication; such pragmatism is determined not by the cultural value and spiritual status of information, but by its profitability for achieving any material goal, therefore information as a product of culture in such communication depreciates and loses the status of knowledge. In the masterpiece of art, a person perceives only that which satisfies him/her as entertainment and fits his/her stereotyped expectations. Whether such masterpiece causes the upset, the person aggressively rejects it as a threat to his/her sustainable existence. Thus, “utilitarian information is created - single-used at bottom, but infinitely repeating and affirming what is necessary for the comfortable existence of a mass-man, meeting one’s expectations”²¹.

By this time, “not the supremacy of human rights, not ethical norms, “moral” laws and traditions, but communications increasingly “gets a hold” of the society. The modern state builds its relations with society through communications. And knowing the nature of communications (information exchange) it can be argued that, in fact, it is about ruling with the help of information”²².

Such manipulations are implemented through a thematic set of entries in Internet resources; usually these are obligatory appraisal and expressive responses to all important events. In general, the texts of the official-business style, along with the texts of other styles of speech, in the virtual space are subjected to the total influence of the conversational style. Messages abound with neoplasms, abbreviations, and non-literary expressions. Interpretations of new concepts are adapted to the norms of the Russian language, and being corrected they make argotic versions. In the tradition of forming a network media text, verbal components are complemented by visual ones: text can be accompanied by photographs, graphic images, and notations of various emotional states of a person (smileys, stickers, emoji, etc.).

Under the conditions of the modern virtual information space development, a qualitatively new media discourse with original genre, language and stylistic features was formed. The communicant achieves a feeling of comfort in a virtual environment, which is associated with alleged anonymity and a sense of security, lack of censorship, protection from outer control and generally accepted norms. This, in turn, gives a feeling of unlimited freedom and relaxedness, opens the opportunity to simultaneously assume several different positions while communicating with different people. In the process of interaction in a virtual environment, a person is more likely to choose whether to remain oneself, to speak on behalf of a certain aspect of one's personality, to take fictitious individuals, to remain a complete anonymous or even invisible. However, the possible anonymity of participants in such communication does not contribute to confidence building in virtual communication, and can also provoke an abusive and irresponsible manner of behavior. A good example of this is the activity of various kinds of “trolls, haters, abusers who are engaged in shaming, flaming, bullying, and mobbing (the list of terms is constantly replenished). Plain speaking, the networks are filled with rudeness, provocations, mockery, harassment, incitements to hatred, etc.”²³.

²¹ O. V. Krasnoyarova, “To the question of communicative strategy of modern mass society”, *Izvestiya IGEA*, num 5 (73) (2010): 188-192.

²² E. F. Makarevich, and O. I. Karpukhin, “Culture of Mass Communications”, *Knowledge. Comprehension. Skills.*, num 3 (2008): 30-40.

²³ E. Ya. Dugin and O. A. Kupriyanov, “Anthropocentric model of communication in the context of value preferences of the television audience”, *South Russian Humanitarian*, Vol: 6 num 5 (2017): 82-91

In the modern information society, communication has become both a public and an individual necessity that regulates human behavior, reveals the social essence of personality and determines its needs.

By 2018 the information society has formed and brought up two special net generations, the basis of consciousness of which, in its dominant, is the basis of Net-technology. One of them appeared simultaneously with the birth of these very technologies – “Generation Y”, also called Millennials (they are aged 18 to 35 now). Representatives of the other were born during the active development of Net-technologies – “Generation Z”, respectively called Centennials (under 17).

The first researchers talking about the serious impact of the Internet on humans as early as in 1990 were Don Tapscott and Marc Prensky. Tapscott introduced the term of “Net-Generation”, or “N-Generation” into the categorical apparatus of the social sciences and formulated its characteristics²⁴. Nowadays, in the realities of 2018, the researcher Ryan Jenkins identifies 8 differences between the two net-generations: the Millennials - Y and the Centennials - Z. “Generation Y” are earnest optimists, collectivists, digital pioneers; they are open-minded, they consider formal education as an ideal option, in interaction with colleagues they prefer online-communication, they are ready to take another job if necessary, in so many words they are world-wide observers. “Generation Z” are realists, individualists, digital natives; they are closed-minded, in interaction with colleagues they prefer personal communication, they consider ideal on-demand learning or just-in-time learning, they would choose to switch roles in the same job if necessary, be made as citizens of the world²⁵.

In favor of the present study, we consider it necessary to determine not only the differences between Y and Z, but also to analyze their common features. Representatives of these Net-generations are different in race, religion, value orientations and living space, but in general their Net-cultures are identical.

So, they are equally quick to understand and navigate in software, video games and in the Internet in general. The combination of technical knowledge and creative skills allows them to come up with and create their own programs and various creative original Net products.

Noteworthy is their huge craving for Net games. Basically, these games are built according to a linear structure, have an interdependent scheme of actions, the possibility of game-saving, encouragement or punishment. They also unwittingly transfer the same gaming mechanisms to real life, so their behavior is characterized by inefficiency of acting without specific instructions and control, unwillingness to do anything at all without obvious advantage, focus on the process of action itself - and not on its outcome, as well as a tendency to retreat, if something does not work out.

These two generations are simply dependent on modern technology. Easy, constant access to a fairly systematic information is allowing not to analyze it and, as a rule, not to think. This is one of the reasons affecting the inability of Y and Z to perceive complex

²⁴ D. Tapscott, *Growing Up Digital: The Rise of the Net Generation* (McGraw-Hill Companies, 1999).

²⁵ Ryan Jenkins, *Generation Z vs. Millennials: The 8 Differences You Need to Know*. HR Management. Monday – September 25, 2017. Retrieved 07.05.2018 from: <https://hrdailyadvisor.blr.com/2017/09/25/generation-z-vs-millennials-8-differences-need-know>

information in large volumes²⁶. Millennials and Centennials prefer to receive information through simplified formats: clips, tabloids, advertising, movies, audio, video files.

The global development of the Internet environment led to a change in the format of social relations, turning them virtual. Such communication is the most simplified, accessible and fast. It does not require mental and physical expenses, and therefore it is usually chosen instead of real. The practice of communicating in social networks transfers their mechanisms to real communication, simplifying and reducing the processes of social interactions in general. All of that may form a fear of personal contact and lead to the problems of communication with real people in the future²⁷. There is a dichotomous contradiction: Millennials and Centennials need constant communication, but they do not know how to do this, they do not know how to correctly formulate and express their thoughts and to contact people in the real world.

Despite all the opportunities that the network provides, the cognitive abilities of N-Generation have declined. The world narrowed only to their social orbit and themselves, despite the fact that the Internet makes the world more accessible for interaction and research. Due to the availability of information on the network, they lose the necessity to “go out into the world”. Social skills of N-Generation are their active virtual activities to the detriment of reality, a plentiful discussion of events on the network, instead of personal participation. For N-Generation, the computer acts as the best medium of influence, since the Internet environment provides the most extensive coverage of the population, influences and forms public opinion with its multiple formats.

Net-generations are the first in the world, for which virtual reality and Net-technologies become the real, natural habitat. N-Generation is a priori inherent in understanding of these very Net-technologies, and therefore, as a matter of fact, they can transform society. The constant life in the network and the opportunity to be in touch with people living in the remotest parts of the world has turned the N-Generation into a global generation.

Having gone into the sphere of axiology, it is possible to establish unified signs in the value orientations of these two network generations: ambivalence, unity of opposites, pronounced eclecticism, commitment to elements of opposing values, political apathy, lack of authority, primitiveness of ideals, mercantile and pragmatism, domination of hedonistic intentions.

Referring to the results of the “Tomsk Initiative” project, it is possible to demonstrate the dominant life strategies of Millennials and Centennials: 77% of survey participants belonging to the net generations noted that they are optimistic about the future and believe that life will be better ahead. The most basic for them (82.7%) are initiative, improvisation, and novelty. The possibility of remaining in the minority, increasing risks during the achievement of goals is not considered particularly important. They want to live by their own parameters (79.3%), not taking into account the priorities of the majority (20.7%). Almost half of them (44.8%) believe that in the unstable and even crisis conditions of the country

²⁶ M. Isaeva, “Generations of crisis and recovery in the theory of V. Strauss and N. Hove”, Knowledge. Comprehension. Skills., num 3 (2011): 290-295.

²⁷ M. S. Bezbogova, and M. V. Iontseva “Socio-psychological aspects of user interaction in virtual social networks”, The World of Science (Pedagogy and Psychology Series), Vol: 4 num 5 (2016).

they were able to achieve the result desired solely through their own efforts. The mainstream value is freedom (82.8%); their optimism and faith in tomorrow are based exactly on that²⁸.

Thus, the Net-technologies, being a key factor in the transformation of contemporary space, change the forms of socio-cultural interaction, manufacturing practices, transformation and transmission of information; Net-technologies also require the development of special forms of spiritual and practical assimilation of reality, and forms of self-reflection of individuals.

Conclusion

The freedom that the man finds in modern sociocultural space is manifested in pretty much everything: from the state of mind and ways of self-expression to travels around the world and gender relations. However, the unlimited freedom of choice turns into freedom from oneself, denoting the problem of identity crisis, which grows into an anthropological catastrophe. The cause of the anthropological crisis is the imbalance between the spiritual and moral development of the individual and scientific-technological progress.

The modern man is helpless in the context of the self-created reality, which is purposely uncontrolled, but at the same time forming values of the personality, which do not always correspond to internal potentials. In addition, a person is powerless before social organizations and institutions that form certain frameworks and norms of socially necessary behavior in spite of the possible disagreement of the individual with the existing way of life. Today, philosophical thought records this disorientation of a man who is unable to find own place in the changing natural and social reality.

A person loses own integrity, individuality, uniqueness, turning into a passive being, a faceless thing. Characteristic features of the personality becoming internal emptiness, alienation, spiritual depression, mental instability, ethical breakdown and moral expediency, which exacerbates the anti-humanity of relations in the modern world. All this is confirmed by one good reason as a possible cause of what is happening – de-identification. When, on the one hand, it gives man freedom and the opportunity for innovative technological development, so the man can overcome own one-dimensionality and disclose creative opportunities, but on the other hand is fraught with the loss of basic meanings and values of life.

References

American sociological thought: Robert K. Merton, George Herbert Mead, Talcott Parsons, Alfred Schütz. V.I. Dobrenkov (ed). Moscow State University Publishers. 1994.

Basic values of Russians. Social settings, Life strategies, Symbols and Myths. Based on the "Tomsk Initiative" project materials. Moscow. 2003.

Baudrillard, J. In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities, Or, the End of the Social. Yekaterinburg: Ural State University Publishers. 2000.

Bell, D. The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting. Moscow: Academia. 2004.

²⁸ Basic values of Russians. Social settings, Life strategies, Symbols and Myths. Based on the "Tomsk Initiative" project materials (Moscow: 2003).

Berulava, M. N. "Anthropological crisis and human perspectives". Bulletin of the University of the Russian Academy of Education, num 4 (2006): 26-34.

Bezbogova, M. S. and Iontseva M.V. "Socio-psychological aspects of user interaction in virtual social networks". The World of Science (Pedagogy and Psychology Series), Vol: 4 num 5 (2016).

Buber, M. Das Problem des Menschen. Heidelberg. 1948.

Dugin, E. Ya. and Kupriyanov, O. A. "Anthropocentric model of communication in the context of value preferences of the television audience". South Russian Humanitarian, Vol: 6 num 5 (2017): 82-91.

Gorban, A. V. "Anthropological crisis as a state of the society of the transition period". Culture of the peoples of the Black Sea region, num 214 (2011): 124-127.

Guénon, R. Selected works. The Reign of Quantity and the Signs of the Times. Studies in Hinduism. The Esoterism of Dante. Moscow: Belovodye Publishing House. 2003.

Guénon, R. Selected works. Traditional Forms and Cosmic Cycles. The Crisis of the Modern World, Moscow: Belovodye Publishing House. 2004.

Jenkins, Ryan. Generation Z vs. Millennials: The 8 Differences You Need to Know. HR Management. Monday – September 25, 2017. Retrieved 07.05.2018 from: <https://hrdailyadvisor.blr.com/2017/09/25/generation-z-vs-millennials-8-differences-need-know>

Inozemtsev, V. L. Modern Post-Industrial Society: Nature, Contradictions, Perspectives. Moscow: LOGOS. 2000.

Iontseva, M. V. and Nikitina, N. V. "Theoretical analysis of the Ego-concept in the organization". Bulletin of The State University of Management, num 22 (2013): 229-232.

Isaeva, M. "Generations of crisis and recovery in the theory of V. Strauss and N. Hove". Knowledge. Comprehension. Skills., num 3 (2011): 290-295.

Khorkov, M.L. Genesis of Philosophical Anthropology and the Social Crisis: PhD Thesis, author's abstract. 09.00.13. Institute of Philosophy. Moscow. 1998.

Krasnoyarova, O.V. "To the question of communicative strategy of modern mass society". Izvestiya IGEA, num 5 (73) (2010): 188-192.

Makarevich, E. F. and Karpukhin, O. I. "Culture of Mass Communications". Knowledge. Comprehension. Skills., num 3 (2008): 30-40.

Marcuse, H. One-Dimensional Man. Moscow: REFL-book. 1994.

Peccei, A. The Human Quality. Moscow: Progress. 1985.

Podoroga V. Epoch of Postmodernism and Anthropological Crisis. Retrieved 15.04.2018 from: <https://www.finam.ru/>

Prokhovnik, O.A. Cultural-Anthropological Crisis and the New Challenges in the Postmodern Age of Education: PhD thesis, author's abstract: 09.00.13. Rostov State University, Rostov-on-Don. 2006.

Smirnov, K.S. and Korobko, E.V. "Anthropological crisis of the modern era in the context of the philosophy of integral traditionalism". Bulletin of Volgograd State University. 7 Series: Philosophy. Sociology and Social Technologies, Vol: 1 num 7-13 (2011) 45 – 50.

Tapscott, D. Growing Up Digital: The Rise of the Net Generation. McGraw-Hill Companies. 1999.

Toffler, A. Future Shock. St. Petersburg: Lanbook. 1997.

Toffler, A. The Third Wave. Moscow: AST Publishers. 1999.

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo
Puede hacerse sin permiso de **Revista Inclusiones, citando la fuente**.