
TOPICAL ISSUES OF PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

UDC 001.101:572.026:141.319.8

V. H. KREMEN^{1*}, V. V. ILIN^{2*}

^{1*}National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine), e-mail president@naps.gov.ua, ORCID 0000-0001-5459-1318

^{2*}Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine), e-mail ilin_vv@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0001-9107-0829

Transformation of the Human Image in the Paradigm of Knowledge Evolution

Purpose. The knowledge influence analysis on the formation process of new anthropological images of man in the contexts of scientific achievements and innovative technologies is the basis of this study. It involves the solution of the following tasks: 1) explication of the ontological content of knowledge in the anthropo-cultural senses of the epoch; 2) analysis of the knowledge influence on the process of forming a new type of man; 3) characteristics of the modern anthropological situation in the context of digital culture; 4) substantiation of interrelation of phatic communication with post-truth society in the dimensions of anthropo-social transformations of the present. **Theoretical basis.** Ontological content of knowledge determines the anthropo-cultural context of the epoch by forming a system of intellectual, value, social meanings of human life. The assertion of new anthropological types of man is caused by the changes in social and cultural space in the context of the growing influence of achievements in scientific knowledge and technology. Digital revolution as the process of expanding the possibilities of informational-digital reality, the substitution of knowledge for information gives rise to Homo digitalis – the digital man. He focuses on phatic communication, which in its intellectual meaninglessness is commensurate with the anthropological dimensions of post-truth society. **Originality.** It is substantiated that Homo digitalis is the result of a complex set of heterogeneous effects of scientific knowledge, which in modern post-truth conditions appears as different communicative practices. A condition for the formation of a new anthropological type of man in the perspective of scientific and technological progress is the affirmation of ethical wisdom. **Conclusions.** Knowledge in the process of evolution of socio-cultural life acquires constitutive significance for the process of formation of anthropological situations that manifest themselves in new images of man. Today, he is commensurate with the demands of digital culture, in which human life practices are increasingly becoming information and digital clusters embedded in the reality of a post-truth society. The means of overcoming the passivity of digital man is the formation of a new anthropological type based on a rethinking of the value system.

Keywords: knowledge; digital revolution; anthropological image; communication; technologies; half-truth

Introduction

Homo sapiens, gained his status and position in the world through knowledge. Understanding of who a man is, where a man came from, how the world works, and what constitutes the meaning of life depends on his level of knowledge. Science is the way of accumulating systematizing objective knowledge about the world around us. Since the Enlightenment, it has gained increasing power over the lives of people (Menschenfreund, 2010). In general, science searches for knowledge, and education transmits it. Knowing means having the right understanding of a particular object or phenomenon. Knowledge is inseparable from thinking of man, who creates not only a man-made world, including ideas, values, techniques, but also himself. In the process of thinking, a man uses knowledge to reflect the world correctly, espe-

cially to "confidently transform it" (authors' transl.) (Epshtein, 2016, p. 46). In a transformed world, knowledge is forming a new man who can act adequately in it.

One can define knowledge as an adaptive mechanism of thinking, which leads to the change of man himself as result of interaction with the outside world. If the sensory activity of organisms creates an environment according to their similarity, then the intellectual activity arising on the basis of knowledge, creates a cultural environment according to its similarity, in which the corresponding type of man is formed (Lewontin, 1994). Due to the adaptive ability of knowledge, thinking coordinates human activities with the environment in order to better transform it in accordance with reality, to adapt it to oneself and oneself to it. "Human images are a historical and cultural a priori of a common life world", which retains its validity in different societies with their own structural differentiation and cultural specificity (Zichy, 2017, p. 20).

With the onset of the modern age, knowledge gained enormous importance, it expanded horizontally and vertically until it took its place alongside the state, church, family and property, becoming one of the most powerful institutions of society (Easterlin, 1981). Like these institutions that form a man according to the needs of the epoch, knowledge expands the range of opportunities for inclusion in it and at the same time affirms its new image. This is how a religious man, a moral man, a metaphysical man, an economic man, a creative man, a technological man, etc. appear. As the experience of social history and culture shows, the achievement of new knowledge constantly reformats the meaning of the words "to be a human" (Pinker, 2010).

The development of the field of photography, cinema, advertising, fashion semiotics, telecommunications distance oneself from the problems of *how* to see, inherent in modernism. The postmodern man focuses on the issues of *what* to see, places himself in the world of images and things (Bataeva, 2013). Postmodern communication through visual practices is carried out in the modes of "video-philia" and "video-mania" (Metz, 2010), which give rise to the phenomenon of social voyeurism, described by J.-P. Sartre (2000) in "Being and Nothingness" (p. 281).

The development of information and computer technologies since the beginning of the 21st century has intensified the development of the idea of "post-modernism" (Nealon, 2012), or metamodernism, which means new trends in cultural space, putting forward the anthropological problem in the epoch of digitalization as the main theme of its comprehension (Shabanova, 2020).

A new anthropological situation occurs, which in modern philosophical discourse actualizes the concept "digital". Denoting both number and finger in Latin, it goes beyond information and digital technologies and their implementation. The main focus here is on the change of anthropocultural and anthropo-social status of technology in interaction with human existence in the process of digital revolution (Kultaieva, 2020).

This change leads to the assertion of the man digital (*Homo digitalis*), generated by the digital culture, who is proposed to be considered as "digital being" (Capurro, 2017, p. 11). In the process of asserting its principles, digital culture in combination with the Internet creates "phatic communication" (Reckwitz, 2017, p. 269) as communication about nothing, the exchange of empty phrases, which is typical of social networks (Kultaieva, 2020, p. 17). In a sense, such communication fits into the context of a "post-truth" society (Fuller, 2018), in which knowledge loses its ontological status and is replaced by information and visual images.

New images of man, generated by digital culture, which is the result of innovative knowledge and the information-digital reality created by it, are becoming an urgent task of the philosophical and anthropological analysis.

Purpose

Given the above-mentioned, the purpose of the article is a philosophical analysis of the influence of knowledge on the process of formation and approval of new human images in the context of the progress of scientific and technological revolution and the achievements of information and computer technologies. The solution of these tasks involves a sequence of the following research stages: 1) identification of the ontological content of knowledge and its explication in the socio-anthropological and anthropo-cultural meanings of the epoch; 2) relationship analysis between knowledge and thinking as an intellectual and cultural basis for influencing the process of creating a new type and image of man; 3) characteristics of the current anthropological situation in the context of the dynamic development of information and digital communications and the Internet, which generates digital culture and the corresponding image of man; 4) substantiation of interrelation of phatic communication with post-truth society in dimensions of anthropo-social transformations of the present.

Statement of basic materials

The process of human evolution from physical to spiritual birth, according to Hegel, involves entering the world of intellectual culture, built on a system of knowledge. Indeed, a man is determined by the level of knowledge acquired both in the process of socio-cultural life and "grown" within one's individuality. Everything that is defined as external knowledge is only a form of representation of internal knowledge. It follows that a man produces knowledge in economic, scientific, cultural, educational and other fields of activity. In the context of the anthropological dimension, knowledge appears in three parameters: first, as a way of mastering and assimilation of the past, cultural memory. Second, the ability to master the space of the possible – the creativity of a man; at the same time, it is the knowledge for solving the question of the horizon of expectations: "what future is possible for a man?". Third, the autonomy of the individual as a mode of "existence-in-the-world" (Proleyev, 2014, p. 7). Thus, the position and condition of a man is determined by these dimensions, which results in the formation of a new type (image).

If we look at the Biblical assessment of the anthropological (anthropic) principle in cognition, which is aimed to obtain knowledge, it is considered from the perspective of the life process. The Bible describes it after the event of the "temptation by the snake", when there was a need to bring knowledge in the context of "sinful" distinction of good and evil, according to the illusory consciousness of the possibility of likening people to gods, overcoming of which has marked the beginning of forming the cognitive acts under "Logos sign", "Sophia's beginning". It is indicative that "such an aspect of the Biblical understanding of human cognition from the perspective of the life process is consistent with modern scientific trends in the analysis of vitality" (authors' transl.) (Krymsky, 2012, p. 242). In particular, cognition is identified with the life process, which cannot be productively carried out outside of knowledge.

As a condition of human vital activity, knowledge is the "foundation" of the established cognitive structure of the individual. Through thinking, knowledge is able to create objectively new, innovative knowledge. Its analogue is "generating" knowledge and its derivatives (Karpov, 2020, p. 105). But knowledge taken by itself cannot generate anything. Thinking "makes" it when a man, turning to it, creates something new, but using knowledge.

The ability of knowledge to generate something new in all spheres of human life comprises its anthropological meaning. According to the classical tradition, the essence of man is a rational understanding of the world based on the knowledge about it. Knowledge is the only force that can make a man a creative, spiritual personality. Knowledge changes the nature of man, his "matter" and purpose. In this context, knowledge should be considered in the form of a kind of energy that we actively use to create a "world for ourselves" (Pinker, 2010). In the ability of knowledge to create something new in all spheres of human life, and at the same time man himself is its anthropological content.

This situation is caused by the constitution of human position both by the retrospectives of memory and projections of expectations, which is a way of existence of "being-in-possibility", "ontological potentiality". The latter is a key element of the anthropological situation, which reaches its greatest fullness in modern culture due to new knowledge (Proleyev, 2014). The semantic polycontent of modern knowledge is a condition for the formation of a certain anthropological type, as it creates a kind of foundation that determines the entire system of reasoning and self-determination of a man of this epoch. What a man is, as he is understood, lies in the crucial role of knowledge. This is evidenced by the liberal anthropology, which was formed from the beginning of modernism, on the basis of which we can distinguish three ontological reductions in relation to knowledge. First, the reduction of knowledge about reality to the objective order of things. Second, the reduction of knowledge about the human community to the specificity of the individual subject, as a result of which society becomes an "epiphenomenon" of personal self-determinations. Third, the reduction of knowledge about the human phenomenon to the metaposition of human nature (Proleyev, 2014, pp. 8-9).

In the context of the modern perspective, man is formed as *Homo faber*, who is transformed into the man creator – *Homo creativus*. On its basis, a creative class appears. The phenomenon of creativity appears as a combination of novelty, usefulness and surprise (Florida, 2014). The ultimate goal of knowledge is not to memorize a certain amount of useful information, but to create a man. In the space of culture, knowledge differs from the information when it involves a man in the transformation of himself, the world and the meanings of life. In this context, education as an institution for providing an individual with knowledge is not limited to the amount of information provided over time. Knowledge and understanding are not added to the individual from the outside, they are not imposed on him. The power of knowledge is in its anthropological content, due to which a man awakens his inner potential. Therefore, education (as a space for the formation of the ability to productive human activity) "should be focused not so much on the transfer of ready-made information, but on the understanding and production of holistic knowledge" (authors' transl.) (Lipin, 2018, p. 41). Meaningful, holistic knowledge is always involved in the personal way of life, in which a man is present in all his integrity. Such knowledge is both a world-relation and a worldview. Integrity, i.e. contextuality of knowledge, is a cultural form of knowledge in general. In the horizon of holistic knowledge, to *know* and *be* appear in inseparable unity (Lipin, 2018, p. 44). It is the basis not only of existence, but of the transformation and development of the human "I".

As we know, knowledge is the result and at the same time the basis of the search intention of thinking, which arises from the feeling of "cognitive deficit" (authors' transl.) (Karpov, 2020, p. 106). Overcoming cognitive deficit is carried out through the creation, acquisition, search for knowledge. Which is due to the social needs of man in it, because knowledge, in turn, is a condition for the creation of his life. After all, "to live means to know" (authors' transl.) (Capra, 2020,

TOPICAL ISSUES OF PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

p. 114). It follows that education, the task of which is the development of holistic knowledge, should receive it not only through mental activity, but also in the "practical dimension of the cognitive-educational process as a problem of internal unity of man with himself and other people" (authors' transl.) (Lipin, 2018, p. 44). This, in turn, determines the perception of knowledge as a personally rooted energy for activity and self-creation as a personality and a certain anthropological image.

Lack of knowledge generates "cognitive anxiety", which appears as a process expanding the areas of epistemic instability. As a result, there is *something* that "revives" the knowledge that is in cognitive peace awakens human activity, combines it in the meaningful structures, directs and stimulates its growth. For Paracelsus, these were the "recipes" of hermeticism, for Kepler, the search for the divine harmony of the world, for Newton, the content of the "Questiones quaedam philosophicae", essays on natural philosophy, where one can follow the formation of his research program. Here there is a "*motive of cognition*" (Karpov, 2020, p. 106). This motive forms a new type of man.

The above-mentioned *something* can have a profane origin – recognition, popularity, regalia, incentives, evaluation, that is, be a motive to achieve a certain goal. Substantiating this position, M. Heidegger (2003) uses the concept of "orientation-to-success" (p. 48) to identify such a motive as the *desire* of the new European man. It is an essential feature of this man's behaviour – the objectification of the desire to obtain knowledge, formed by the expansion of the industrial and economic world.

The motive of activity generates the initiative, which is the essence of the activating beginning, which gives rise to a new one. If the one who "aspires" to self-realization needs a "stimulus of success", then he receives his initiative from the desire for knowledge, which becomes a condition of the energy of mental activity. It is due to this energy that anthropological evolution took place, as a result of which a new man appeared in each epoch – religious, moral, metaphysical, economic, technological, virtual, and so on.

The basis of anthropological evolution in the modern epoch was the technical and economic attitude to life, which defined the pragmatic effectiveness of knowledge as the dominant of socio-economic progress. Both science and education in this period are aimed not only at obtaining knowledge, but also at its practical implementation. At the same time, a new type of man is formed, the ontological basis of whom is rational self-organization, self-presentation, individual isolation. The emergence of this type of anthropological characteristics is the result of unprecedented information and energy "explosion". As a result, a man receives a concrete existence or "full essence". Not a fixed quality, derived "from coercive external influence, combined with others, but one's own determination and self-determination" (authors' transl.) (Krasikov, 2007, p. 248). Individualism, or individuation – a fundamental anthropological principle of life and, accordingly, man is affirmed by this.

Individualism is gaining momentum, is affirmed as a new anthropo-ontological essence and a new anthropological image of man, builds itself as a project on the background of constitutively given knowledge, producing a new self-determination in its context. Reflecting on the essential foundations of human existence, M. Heidegger raises the question: how should the world exist in order to meet the capabilities of man, the priorities of his life. And he answers: provided that the world is accessible through its "semantic field" – being (Heidegger, 2003, p. 49). The semantic field is "being-in-the-world". An important aspect of "being-in-the-world" is coexistence with other people. It also forms being in which "everyone appears to be different and no one is himself" (authors' transl.) (Krasikov, 2007, p. 128).

Formation of man is realized through the "way to oneself" (Heidegger, 2003), as a reflex of a man's consciousness in relation to oneself and the world. This way is realized through knowledge that is objectified in words, texts, speeches, becomes part of an objective human world, one of its actual manifestations. These facts are then reconciled with new knowledge, through which new meanings are defined and, in their context, a new man. The most important task of the acquired knowledge is to form, in our opinion, an anthropo-existential nucleus of society. In other words, the formation of a man corresponding to the demands of the epoch of the generated knowledge.

Scientific and technical progress resulted in dynamic growth of scientific and technical knowledge, which as "spiritual-intellectual reflexion, knowledge about creative-transformative activity of a man fixes the entity of the process of man's coming out (but not leaving) outside of being as finding (feeling) the boundedness of being" (authors' transl.) (Melnyk, 2010, p. 228). On this basis, it is possible to speak about a man technological (Homo technologicus).

The assertion of the information society was facilitated by the work of M. McLuhan (2016), who substantiated the fundamental nature of influence of communication technologies on culture and man in general, providing for the constitutive establishment of a digital society. The analysis of information and communication transformations has shown the ambivalence of the latest trends not only in the problem field of scientific and technical knowledge, but also in the field of philosophical anthropology and philosophy of education (Rügemer, 2018). The result was the emergence of Homo digitalis, a digital man. This image fixes the external characteristics of individuals who mechanically poke their finger into the marks on the screen of tablets or smartphones (digitalis in Latin means both a number and a finger). This man is the product of the dynamic development of scientific and technical knowledge, initiating a new stage in the further evolution of man and human civilization. But to what extent Homo digitalis, having mastered information technologies, productively applying them in his activities, becoming a "construct of a new passive man, who made himself comfortable in the interiors of public entertainment" (Kultaieva, 2020, p. 12), corresponds to such a desirable image of Homo creativus, whose activity has always overcome the contradictions and challenges of the world?

The trivial one-dimensionality of the existence of Homo digitalis within the framework of the information-digital society forms a "philosophy of selfie", or a false existence that tries to be better than the real one. This man is focused on himself, practising active narcissism using various computer programs and platforms. The communicative space of the Internet, structuring the life world of Homo digitalis, oversaturated with advice, quasi-sensations, gossip, becomes a meeting place of half-educated people, full of self-esteem and contempt for others. They are far from the ideals of education of the past and erudition, except for demonstrating diplomas and certificates in the networks (Kultaieva, 2020, p. 14).

The presence of this type of man, who multiplies and today represents a large community, is a "breeding ground" for the expansion of post-truth. From the point of view of Steve Fuller, the author of "Post-truth: Knowledge as a Power Game" (2018), one of the main features of post-truth is the blurring of the boundary between truth and ambiguity, half-truths, obvious error and deliberate deception. In post-truth conditions, truth is among the plurality of faces of untrue, so the belief in its existence, in the fact that it is unique and has the highest cognitive value, is doubly problematic: it is difficult to find and preserve, but even harder to act according to it. The widespread dissemination of information through the Internet, social networks, etc. makes objective assessment of facts less significant than subjective beliefs, moral judgments, and emotions.

TOPICAL ISSUES OF PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

In fact, post-truth is a game of knowledge that, as such, best meets the demands of Homo digitalis, a kind of player, the "acrobat" who does the "splits" between reality and the virtual world (Sloterdijk, 2009).

When information flows through the Internet are widespread, their accessibility becomes difficult and even impossible to validate. As a result, the formation of opinion on a question, the facts and the truth of the theories that describe them, play a less important role than beliefs, subjective assessments and passions. Therefore, true knowledge is difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish from various opinions and conjectures, and Homo digitalis loses the desire to achieve this knowledge, because it is more appropriate, due to his poor education, to focus on himself, to imitate erudition and self-publicity in social networks and various computer programs. "Millions of Facebook users", says Z. Bauman, "compete with each other, finding out who will reveal and flaunt the most intimate and secret details of their lives, their connections, thoughts, feelings and actions" (authors' transl.) (Bauman & Donskis, 2019, p. 96).

Does this mean the final "annihilation" of man? Indeed, the digital man, being in the space of informalization processes, does not notice and does not want to notice the problems caused by the growing social stratification, to calculate the risks of unpredictable future life. Thus, this type of man demonstrates a certain degeneration, as he loses the ability for active, productive transformational activities. That is, first, due to the influence of digital technology on the human brain; second, the cognitive abilities of man, his sensory system, change. As a result, humanity today is at the beginning of a new round of anthropo-sociogenesis (Kultaieva, 2020).

Achieving each stage of the scientific and technological revolution posed new challenges to humanity. The entry of information and digital technologies in the practice of everyday life changes the theoretical foundations of the definition of man, the specifics of his image. However, despite the existing real threats to man in the further evolution of digital culture, he still retains himself and his intellectual and cultural potential. The condition for this is the assertion of ethical spirituality, moral politics and the moral world, the conceptualization of which is wisdom in its ethical sense. The peculiarity of such wisdom is "radical superiority of human values over any intellectual temptations and benefits" (authors' transl.) (Krymsky, 2012, p. 284).

In this situation, evolution of man does not end with his digital type or image. Knowledge, which is still actively produced by science today, cannot and will not focus on the poorly educated people. Human progress has been and remains dependent on those people who have a creative, intellectual principle. If the information-communication and economic-technological process is in constant dynamics of its forms, then the mental-archetypal, intellectual-cognitive foundations of civilization retain the enormous potential of preserving the spiritual and cultural essence of man and his further productive development.

Originality

It is substantiated that the process of human evolution is conditioned by the development of knowledge. Its influence forms certain anthropological human image, the features of which are determined by the system of values. Homo digitalis generated by the information and computer age as a result of changes in his cognitive abilities, sensory perception, and perception of the world, demonstrates an alienation from productive thinking, creativity, and axiological imperatives. The formation of a more perfect anthropological type of man in the conditions of further progress of science is a complex process of socio-cultural inheritance of wisdom, intellect and understanding.

Conclusions

Each epoch in the progress of human civilization demonstrates its own, inherent type of man with specific anthropological characteristics. They are formed and affirmed as a result of the development of knowledge, the influence of which gives rise to a religious man, a metaphysical man, an economic man, a technological man, and so on. Today, information and computer technologies have become firmly established in the life of all mankind. The philosophical analysis of these technologies shows acceleration of positive changes in society, economy and culture, the enhancement of human creativity due to the possibilities of the Internet, artificial intelligence and innovative media products. At the same time, the bio-social basis of life is changing, transforming human anthropological characteristics. The all-round influence of information technologies on culture and mankind as a whole constitutes the emergence of a digital society, creating a new anthropological type of man – Homo digitalis. By his existence, he asserts a type of passive man who demonstrates a false existence, imitates creativity, substitutes information for knowledge and pseudo-erudition. In this aspect, a digital man fits into the post-truth society. However, despite the great challenge of Homo digitalis to philosophical-anthropological discourse, a society based on wisdom, creativity and knowledge can prepare a man capable of living and working in the dynamics of man-made and socio-cultural transformations.

REFERENCES

- Bataeva, Y. V. (2013). *Vidimoe obshchestvo. Teoriya i praktika sotsialnoy vizualistiki: Monografiya*. Kharkov: FLP Lysenko I. B. (in Russian)
- Bauman, Z., & Donskis, L. (2019). *Moralnaya slepota: utrata chuvstvitelnosti v epokhu tekuchey sovremennosti*. St. Petersburg: Izdatelstvo Ivana Limbakha. (in Russian)
- Capra, F. (2020). *Pautina zhizni*. Kyiv: Sofiya. (in Russian)
- Capurro, R. (2017). *Homo digitalis: Beiträge zur Ontologie, Anthropologie und Ethik der digitalen Technik*. Springer. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-17131-5> (in German)
- Easterlin, R. A. (1981). Why Isn't n the Whole Developed? *The Journal of Economic History*, 41(1), 1-17. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022050700042674> (in English)
- Epshtein, M. N. (2016). *Ot znaniya – k tvorchestvu. Kak gumanitarnye nauki mogut izmenyat mir*. Moscow, St. Petersburg: Tsentr gumanitarnykh initsiativ. (in Russian)
- Florida, R. (2014). *The Rise of the Creative Class (Revisited)*. New York: Basic Books. (in English)
- Fuller, S. (2018). *Post-Truth: Knowledge As A Power Game*. London, New-York: Anthem Press. (in English)
- Heidegger, M. (2003). *Bytie i vremya*. Kharkov: Folio. (in Russian)
- Karpov, A. O. (2020). Knowledge that Can Generate New Knowledge: from the Perspective of Science and Education. *Voprosy Filosofii*, 5, 103-115. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21146/0042-8744-2020-5-103-115> (in Russian)
- Krasikov, V. I. (2007). *Konstruirovaniye ontologiy. Efemeridy*. Moscow: Vodoley. (in Russian)
- Krymsky, S. (2012). *Mudretsy vseгда v menshinste. Stati raznykh let*. Kyiv: Izdatelskiy dom Dmitriya Burago. (in Russian)
- Kultaieva, M. (2020). Homo Digitalis, Digital culture and Digital Education: Explorations of Philosophical Anthropology and of Philosophy of Education. *Filosofiya Osvity. Philosophy of Education*, 26(1), 8-36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31874/2309-1606-2020-26-1-1> (in Ukrainian)
- Lewontin, R. C. (1994). Facts and the Factitious in Natural Sciences. In J. Chandler, A. I. Davidson, & H. D. Harootunian (Eds.), *Questions of Evidence: Proof, Practice, and Persuasion across the Disciplines* (pp. 478-491). University of Chicago Press. (in English)
- Lipin, M. V. (2018). *Osvita v modyfikatsiiakh suchasnoho svitu: Monografiya*. Kyiv: Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics. (in Ukrainian)
- McLuhan, M. (2016). *The Future of the Library: From Electric Media to Digital Media*. New York: Peter Lang. (in English)

TOPICAL ISSUES OF PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

- Melnyk, V. P. (2010). *Filosofiiia. Nauka. Tekhnika: Metodoloho-svitohliadnyi analiz: Monohrafiia*. Lviv: Ivan Franko National University of Lviv. (in Ukrainian)
- Menschenfreund, Y. (2010). The Holocaust and the Trial of Modernity. *Azure*, 39, 58-83. (in English)
- Metz, C. (2010). *Le Signifiant imaginaire: Psychanalyse et cinéma* (Trans.). St. Petersburg: European University. (in Russian)
- Nealon, J. (2012). *Post-Postmodernism: or, The Cultural Logic of Just-in-Time Capitalism*. Stanford University Press. (in English)
- Pinker, S. (2010). The cognitive niche: Coevolution of intelligence, sociality, and language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(Supplement 2), 8993-8999. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0914630107> (in English)
- Proleyev, S. V. (2014). "Knowledge society" as an Anthropological Situation. *Filosofiya Osvity. Philosophy of Education*, 14(1), 7-24. (in Ukrainian)
- Reckwitz, A. (2017). *Die Gesellschaft der Singularitäten: Zum Strukturwandel der Moderne*. Suhrkamp. (in German)
- Rügener, W. (2018). *Die Kapitalisten des 21. Jahrhunderts*. Münster: PapyRossa Verlag. (in German)
- Sartre, J.-P. (2000). *Бытие и ничто: Опыт феноменологической онтологии*. Moscow: Respublika. (in Russian)
- Shabanova, Y. O. (2020). Metamodernism man in the worldview dimension of new cultural paradigm. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, 18, 121-131. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i18.221402> (in English)
- Sloterdijk, P. (2009). *Du mußt dein Leben ändern: Über Anthropotechnik*. Suhrkamp Verlag. (in German)
- Zichy, M. (2017). *Menschenbilder: Eine Grundlegung*. Verlag Karl Alber. (in German)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Батаєва Е. В. *Видимое общество. Теория и практика социальной визуальности* : монографія. Харьков : ФЛП Лысенко И. Б., 2013. 349 с.
- Бауман З., Донскис Л. *Моральная слепота: утрата чувствительности в эпоху текущей современности*. Санкт-Петербург : Изд-во Ивана Лимбаха, 2019. 368 с.
- Капра Ф. *Паутина жизни*. Киев : София, 2020. 336 с.
- Capurro R. *Homo digitalis: Beiträge zur Ontologie, Anthropologie und Ethik der digitalen Technik*. Springer, 2017. 209 s. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-17131-5>
- Easterlin R. A. Why Isn't n the Whole Developed? *The Journal of Economic History*. 1981. Vol. 41. Iss. 1. P. 1–17. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022050700042674>
- Эпштейн М. Н. *От знания – к творчеству. Как гуманитарные науки могут изменять мир*. Москва – Санкт-Петербург : Центр гуманитарных инициатив, 2016. 480 с.
- Florida R. *The Rise of the Creative Class. Revisited*. New York : Basic Books, 2014. 432 p.
- Fuller S. *Post-Truth: Knowledge As A Power Game*. London – New-York : Anthem Press, 2018. 218 p.
- Хайдеггер М. *Бытие и время*. Харьков : Фолио, 2003. 503 с.
- Карпов А. О. Знание, способное породить новое знание: ракурс науки и образования. *Вопросы философии*. 2020. № 5. С. 103–115. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21146/0042-8744-2020-5-103-115>
- Красиков В. И. *Конструирование онтологий. Эфемериды*. Москва : Водолей, 2007. 304 с.
- Крымский С. *Мудрецы всегда в меньшинстве. Статьи разных лет*. Киев : Изд. дом Дмитрия Бурого, 2012. 400 с.
- Култаєва М. Homo digitalis, дигітальна культура і дигітальна освіта: філософсько-антропологічні і філософсько-освітні розвідки. *Філософія освіти. Philosophy of Education*. 2020. Т. 26. № 1. С. 8–36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31874/2309-1606-2020-26-1-1>
- Lewontin R. C. Facts and the Factitious in Natural Sciences. *Questions of Evidence: Proof, Practice, and Persuasion across the Disciplines* / ed. by J. Chandler, A. I. Davidson, H. D. Harootunian. University of Chicago Press, 1994. P. 478–491.
- Ліпін М. В. *Освіта в модифікаціях сучасного світу* : монографія. Київ : Київ. нац. торг.-екон. ун-т, 2018. 340 с.
- McLuhan M. *The Future of the Library: From Electric Media to Digital Media*. New York : Peter Lang, 2016. 238 p.
- Мельник В. П. *Філософія. Наука. Техніка: Методолого-світоглядний аналіз* : монографія. Львів : Видавничий центр ЛНУ імені Івана Франка, 2010. 592 с.
- Menschenfreund Y. The Holocaust and the Trial of Modernity. *Azure*. 2010. No. 39. P. 58–83.
- Метц К. *Воображаемое означающее. Психоанализ и кино*. Санкт-Петербург : Изд-во Европ. ун-та, 2010. 336 с.

TOPICAL ISSUES OF PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

- Nealon J. *Post-Postmodernism: or, The Cultural Logic of Just-in-Time Capitalism*. Stanford University Press, 2012. 248 p.
- Pinker S. The cognitive niche: Coevolution of intelligence, sociality, and language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2010. Vol. 107. Iss. Supplement 2. P. 8993–8999. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0914630107>
- Пролеєв С. В. "Суспільство знань" як антропологічна ситуація. *Філософія освіти. Philosophy of Education*. 2014. Т. 14. № 1. С. 7–24.
- Reckwitz A. *Die Gesellschaft der Singularitäten: Zum Strukturwandel der Moderne*. Suhrkamp, 2017. 480 s.
- Rügemer W. *Die Kapitalisten des 21. Jahrhunderts*. Münster : PapyRossa Verlag, 2018. 365 s.
- Сартр Ж.-П. *Бытие и ничто: Опыт феноменологической онтологии*. Москва : Республика, 2000. 639 с.
- Shabanova Y. O. Metamodernism man in the worldview dimension of new cultural paradigm. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2020. No. 18. P. 121–131. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i18.221402>
- Sloterdijk P. *Du mußt dein Leben ändern: Über Anthropotechnik*. Suhrkamp Verlag, 2009. 723 s.
- Zichy M. *Menschenbilder: Eine Grundlegung*. Verlag Karl Alber, 2017. 464 s.

В. Г. КРЕМЕНЬ^{1*}, В. В. ІЛЬІН^{2*}

^{1*}Національна академія педагогічних наук України (Київ, Україна), ел. пошта president@naps.gov.ua, ORCID 0000-0001-5459-1318

^{2*}Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка (Київ, Україна), ел. пошта ilin_vv@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0001-9107-0829

Трансформація образу людини в парадигмі еволюції знання

Мета. Основу репрезентованого дослідження складає філософський аналіз впливу знання на процес формування нових антропологічних образів людини в контекстах досягнень науки та інноваційних технологій. Це передбачає вирішення наступних завдань: 1) експлікація онтологічного змісту знання в антропокультурних смислах епохи; 2) аналіз впливу знання на процес формування нового типу людини; 3) характеристика сучасної антропологічної ситуації в контексті дигітальної культури; 4) обґрунтування взаємозв'язку фатичної комунікації з суспільством пост-правди у вимірах антропосоціальних трансформацій сучасності. **Теоретичний базис.** Онтологічний зміст знання визначає антропокультурний контекст епохи шляхом формування системи інтелектуальних, ціннісних, соціальних смислів життя людини. Ствердження нових антропологічних типів людини обумовлено зміною соціального та культурного просторів у контексті зростаючих впливів досягнень наукового знання і технологій. Дигітальна революція як процес розширення можливостей інформаційно-цифрової реальності, підміни знання інформацією породжує Homo digitalis – людину цифрову. Вона орієнтована на фатичну комунікацію, яка в своїй інтелектуальній беззмістовності співмірна з антропологічними вимірами суспільства пост-правди. **Наукова новизна.** Обґрунтовано, що народжена інформаційно-цифровою реальністю Homo digitalis є результатом впливу складної сукупності гетерогенних ефектів наукового знання, яке в сучасних умовах пост-правди постає в якості різноманітних комунікативних практик. Умовою формування нового антропологічного типу людини в перспективі науково-технологічного прогресу є ствердження етичної мудрості. **Висновки.** Знання в процесі еволюції соціокультурного життя набуває конститутивного значення для процесу формування антропологічних ситуацій, які маніфестують себе в нових образах людини. Сьогодні вона співмірна запитам дигітальної культури, в якій практики людського життя все більшою мірою стають інформаційними і цифровими кластерами, включеними в реальність суспільства пост-правди. Засобом подолання пасивності людини дигітальної є формування нового антропологічного типу, заснованого на переосмисленні системи цінностей.

Ключові слова: знання; дигітальна революція; антропологічний образ; комунікація; технології; напів-правда

Received: 12.01.2021

Accepted: 18.05.2021