Philosophical and Anthropological Views on Understanding the Formation of Digital Culture*

T. V. Kovaleva, V. A. Kovaleva Kircicek

St. Petersburg State University,
7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation

For citation: Kovaleva T. V., Kovaleva Kircicek V. A. Philosophical and Anthropological Views on Understanding the Formation of Digital Culture. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Philosophy and Conflict Studies*, 2024, vol. 40, issue 2, pp. 331–340. https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu17.2024.213

This article is dedicated to scholarly thinking in the digital culture. The main aim is to study different approaches for the investigation of a modern culture and its significance for people. We have prioritized the following tasks: to take a look at a philosophical and a biology-anthropological direction oriented at the new ways to explain the importance of culture at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries; to analyze several approaches with the underpinning of digital culture. On the one hand, we gave ideas of the neo-Kantians who considered that you can understand the nature and spheres of human life only through values, which can build an evidence base for the significance of culture through the study of ethics and values to identify the absence of a natural component in them. On the other hand, we investigated anthropological biology views of culture by K. Lorenz, E. Wilson, and A. Fet. Russian scientist Abram Fet, based on Lorenz and Wilson`s experience, arrived at some ideas that "'culture' cannot be characterized by an individual but only by a certain community and means the special community lifestyle with the skills and mode of behaviors in it, definitions and standards of thought, inheritable from generation to generation. … man is an animal with two systems of heredity — genetic and cultural" (Instinct and social behavior). So, based on the two scientific approaches presented above, it is possible to better understand the ways to study digital culture and analyze the transformation problems of the socio-cultural life of modern society. We are at the very beginning of a transition stage in the formation of new cultural relations. It is quite evident that the digital world is complex and contradictory. It requires us to make a highly developed spiritual culture for our continued existence.

Keywords: digital culture, neo-Kantian, digital society, anthropological biology.

Introduction

If we want to learn about ourselves, we may understand ourselves as persons of culture and at the same time as animals. Nature and culture create us but as differentiated from animals we can form ourselves and all needed things around us. The culture is itself multifaceted and abstract, it "does not exist in its pure form". As then a man is a part of nature and the culture is second nature because it is difficult to understand where a natural man is over and the person of culture begins? It is the main problem which we want to research in this article. To investigate the cultural transformation of human behavior, it is necessary to study the cultural development and changes as a cultural phenomenon from

* The paper was supported by the grant of the Russian Science Foundation (RSF) "Transforming the moral awareness of the digital society: new strategies and risks", 23-28-00220/.

the 20th century and the present day. It is necessary to take the main cultural trends studied by researchers, compare obtained results with the modern situation in real life, and observe how these trends will be transformed under the influence of cyberspace.

In the article, we took two scientific directions which developed independently from each other in the direction of finding the evidence base for the existence of a 'cultured person'. This is the philosophical neo-Kantian school and the anthropological biology.

At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, scientific thought returned to the study of the nature or subject matter of man and his specific behavior. After disappointment in his godhead and classification of Darwin as an animal, due to biological similarity, interest in the study of man has only increased. Neither society nor scientists were ready to equate themselves with animals since the differences were visible to the naked eye for everyone. They were in customs, habits, traditions, lifestyle, etc. These are all parts of the culture. It is itself multifaceted and abstract, culture "does not exist in its pure form," and we get an idea of it as an objective reality in "its comparison to other forms of being of nature, society and man" [1, p. 10]. The study of culture moved towards two directions: philosophy and biology with interdisciplinary directions.

Discussion and Results

The philosophical approach to the understanding of culture was based on Kant's philosophical ideas which contrasted nature and culture even before Ch. Darwin found it as a presentation of the "public value of man" [1, p. 10]. He believed that the person's rude natural abilities would be overcome by public morality, which is built through education. The ideal social structure could take place in an alliance of culture and "art adorned humanity." It can develop natural abilities to art. The evolutionism of human development is natural, but art (culture) develops spontaneously, by good fortune.

Kant suspected the danger of such a development because man is not perfect and can expose all the achievements of culture. In his opinion, it was art and science that allowed culture to reach such a high level. Morality, relating to culture, allows the state to educate a person's inner self-improvement. Getting off on the right foot with humanity and the state based on morality can allow the development of culture in the right direction. Culture should develop according to the ideas of the Enlightenment. It should be controlled by the state.

Kant's followers, the neo-Kantians of the two schools, came to understand the need for an academic separation of nature and culture (spirit). From that moment the culture became an object of research. Heinrich Rickert proposed to assign a cultural meaning to historical human existence and not instincts. He considered that you can understand the nature and spheres of human life only through values, as they allow us to reveal their essence from comparative and historical analysis. The world of values is built as a kind of personal sense experience in a certain sphere of human activity (according to Rickert, art, ethics, science, the benefits of living, pantheism, theism). In them, you can see the beauty, truth, goodness, happiness, etc. Culture is determined by the synthesis of reality (existence in nature) and values (the world of values, as the meaning of existence). "…in all cultural phenomena we always find the implementation of some human-recognized value, for which these phenomena were either created, or, if they already existed before, <…> Cultural objects, therefore, contain values." [2, p. 55]. Rickert was one of the first to propose the interpretation of values in culture as an axiology.

Herman Cohen from the Marburg School proposed to build an evidence base for the significance of culture through the study of ethics and values to identify the absence of a natural component in them, which determines the life of all animal organisms. To prove the cultural basis of human development, he put individuality as a main indicator. Following the ideas of Plato and Aristotle, Cohen convincingly demonstrated that individuals have different value orientations. This proved that a person differed from another availability of different values that shape his behavior, character, and motivation for action. At the same time, animals of the same species are endowed with one natural life scenario in which there are no values. Cultural values reinforce and separate people, so Cohen focused on creating common values that allow them to live together in the state. He insisted that the foundation of ethics, as a moral teaching, is a teaching about experience, not about feelings. The being of existence is not a natural being, the moral law is directed at what should be. Individuality and reasonability are the basis of ethics, which knows only individuals and a community of individuals. "Naturalism is the mortal enemy of ethics" [3, p. 12]. The basis is in the tandem of ethics and the science of the state, in commonality.

Another scientific field is anthropological biology which was presented by K. Lorenz, E. Wilson, and A. Fet on the topic of ideas of theories of the biological basis of social and cultural behavior. We focused on the works of Austrian Biologist K. Lorenz *'Behind the Mirror: A Search for a Natural History of Human Knowledge, Civilized Man's Eight Deadly Sins'* (1973). American sociologist Edward Osborne Wilson's *'On Human Nature'* and Russian mathematician, philosopher Abram Fet *'Instinct and Social Behaviour'*. The main task for the scholars was to understand human behavior and mechanisms of human interaction, justify moral actions, etc.

Konrad Lorenz is most well-known as a founder of the field known as ethology and for his research into animal behavior. As the study of animal behaviour became more extensive after the turn of the century, Lorenz and other scientists helped to establish ethology as the systematic study of the function and evolution of behavior. His behavioural research focused mainly on social structure and instinctive behaviors, including imprinting, in which newly hatched birds become attached to the first moving thing they see. One of a series of scientists who had a role in establishing the field of ethology, Lorenz is often credited as the person who combined the range of behavioral also known as comparative ethology, which surrounds observational field studies and behavioral experiments. Lorenz developed the idea of an innate releasing mechanism to explain instinctive behaviors (fixed action patterns) [4].

As an entomologist, Wilson demonstrated the genetic underpinnings of the complex social behavior of ants and other species. In 1975, he extended his theories to all species, including humans, with the publication of the book Sociobiology: The New Synthesis.

The term 'sociobiology' had already been in use, but Wilson's work was the first in the field to challenge scientific and popular thinking about human behavior. Wilson's goal was to unify all the behavioral sciences based on ecology and evolutionary biology into a "systematic study of the biological basis of all social behavior." Knowing the environmental pressures facing a species and its genetic constraints should allow scientists to predict the social organization and behavior of the species, he believed. Wilson argued that social behavior is a survival trait, and natural selection preserves patterns of useful behavior.

Since Charles Darwin proposed his theory of evolution, scientists have tried to explain animal behaviour as an outcome of evolution. But Wilson was the first to argue

that the pathway to the survival of the species was the survival of individuals possessing favorable traits. Wilson explained the genetic basis of kinship, communication, specialization of labor, and even altruism. "Genes hold culture on a leash," Wilson said [5, p. 172].

The Russian philosopher Abram Fet became interested in Lorentz's ideas and decided to continue his research, but already to man. In his book *'Instinct and Social Behaviour',* he set out to "find out the effect of social instinct in human society, describe the conditions frustrating its manifestations, and explain the consequences of numerous attempts to suppress this intractable instinct" [6, p. 14]. The main theme of the book is the reaction to social injustice that existed in each historical period and was named the 'class struggle' in the nineteenth century. Fet extended Lorenz's theories to human behaviour. Lorenz first considered culture as a living system and described the analogies and differences between the evolution of animal species and the evolution of human cultures. Fet continued this description, it helped him to find conditions depending on which some emergent cultures immediately perish, while others develop in a dynamic balance of tradition and modernity. He could identify the dangers that lead cultures to a dead end and lead them to decadence.

Wilson, Lorenz, and Fet believed that man is a biological being capable of conceptual thinking and connected with its use of symbolic (verbal) language. Lorenz, and then Fet, in their cognition of man, moved from the study of instincts. Following Lorenz's ideas, who gave a classification of the great instincts, Fet proposes to consider in detail not the instinct of self-preservation, the instinct of food, and the instinct of reproduction, but the social instinct and the instinct of intra-specific aggression. Reflecting on the social instinct, Fet concludes that completely non-social animals would not exist. Fet offers his vision of the intraspecific aggression instinct, proposed by Lorenz but underformulated until the end, which explains the relationship between people. It is awareness of the individual and neighbor. Fet links the instinct of intra-specific aggression with the ability to form various emotions "recognition of the individual, friendship and love. Emotions and social interactions due to constant interaction between Positive thinking men or make unstable due to alienation and confrontation. The social instinct requires a clash of wills that is designed to determine the validity of claims to something or someone. And this is true for most of the male population, as the social instinct protects women and children. All of the above instincts are open programs. Fet agrees with Lorenz that the basic internal genetic information is not infinite and is aimed at the preservation of the species. The genome contains the patterns of behaviour and types of learning necessary to induce certain actions, which will be corrected by external programs. Cultural evolution is incomparably faster than genetic evolution…." [6, p. 38]. The conditions of living and existence affect the cultural tradition, so it will be different everywhere.

According to Fet, "convergent thinking" allowed man to create for himself another world, different from the natural one, where there is no right and wrong. Symbolic language, inherent in all people, became the bridge that connected all into a single cultural synthesis. Wilson tended to think that "our species arose through genetic combinations and by ecological necessity, not by the will of God. Since the human mind is the product of evolution, it is a mechanism of survival and reproduction, and the ability to think is only one of its many techniques" [5, p. 75]. Wilson did not deny new cultural constructs, but he considered them secondary, less significant. Every human being, as a member of the same species, lives according to the same cycle, having the same feelings.

The new naturalism gave rise to 2 moral dilemmas, to which the scientists tried to respond.

1 dilemma — human existence has no meaning, unlike animals, we realize it.

Justification for existence can look for in different forms, e. g., religion=ideology. It is a 'survival mechanism'. Wilson sees the basis of religion and ideology in genetics. He believes that higher impulses are equal to biological activity. However, his genetics is very much like cultural genetics. The stronger the foundation, the more resistant it is to change and external influences. If in the real world, we don't find the meaning of existence, then we will look for it in the virtual world. And if we find them for ourselves there, then the real world becomes partly unnecessary. It will take the form of physiological dependence, which we will seek to overcome or find acceptable constructs for general interaction in the two states.

Fet insists that man cannot live without goals and that his goals depend on his culture. Even the scientific truth is a product of culture: science creates that truth, and culture evaluates it. If culture is not ready for such evaluation, it condemns scientific knowledge, for example, in 1600, at the dawn of the Modern Times, Giordano Bruno was burned in Rome because he tried to break the cultural picture of the world of that time. All members of a certain culture aim to save it at all costs. Culture motivates conservatism, which is supported by upbringing through the values it has developed.

2 dilemma — Could morality be considered an instinct?

Wilson believed that it is 'not right to construct an ethical system' based on consequences that are born of emotion; it is necessary to understand the origin and meaning of human values, which will make it possible to understand the construction of ethical attitudes and the policies that are built on them. He suggests moving away from "automatic control based on biological properties" and toward biological knowledge. Since it is impossible to apply neuroscience and genetics to ethics, and it is wrong to give everything to ethical philosophy, it is necessary to combine the efforts of all directions to solve this dilemma. "Biology is the key to human nature. And those in the social sciences cannot afford to ignore its rapidly increasing principles. But the social sciences are potentially much richer in content. In time, they will absorb relevant biological ideas and transcend them. For reasons that already transcend anthropocentrism, man's true purpose is human" [5, p. 103].

Fet believed that morality, 'love of neighbor' came from the globalization of intra-tribal solidarity, which step by step turns into intra-species solidarity. The observance of 'moral rules' depends on education, and education depends on culture, the preservation of which is not guaranteed by a high level of consumption. Material abundance and excessive consumption lead to the disintegration of culture and Moral decay. 'Collectivistic morality' is preserved not only in the values of culture, transmitted by upbringing but also in the formal rules of conduct, and in-laws. Modern rules of behavior can be called 'moral rules' in terms of social facts or worldly observations of human behaviour, he calls laws abstract moral rules. Individualistic morality is characterized by a conscience that does not lead to success, wealth, or honour. Understanding this, the individual tends not to use it often, replacing it with cunning. Collective morality gives an understanding of social injustice and generates an aversion to asocial parasites. In particular, any phenomenon of asocial parasitism that we know excites in us a reaction of protest and a desire to eliminate it, since morality is a cultural process, not a genetic one, that is proper to all people.

Studies of modern culture are linked to the concepts of 'digitalization', 'digital transformation', 'digital maturity', 'digital ecosystem', 'digital environment', 'digital community', 'digitalization of education', etc. These concepts characterize new social and cultural relations, which are becoming more and more obvious for modern society of developed countries, like Russia, by the adaptation period for the creation of a 'new world', (which) is dated the stage following the post-industrial society [7, p. 606]. "The digital society is also defined as the modern stage of the development of the information society, in which the most important thing is not the information, but primarily its digital format, methods of digitization, encoding, and transmission of information" [8, p. 349]. It creates a new form of culture that builds from elements from the real world and the digital space. Since the beginning of the 21st century, one can see a lot of definitions of digital culture in research literature. For example, we can give one of them: "'Digital culture' ('digitized culture', 'digital encoding of cultural identity', 'digital codification/unification', and similar verbal markers, one way or another, connecting at the 'syntagmatic level' to a prescribed digital sign, that performs the some 'arche' function) is a new strange phenomenon in all its aspects and requires to find correct lines of research in thought, word, action and even more so in final verdicts" [9].

One of the indications of the digital culture is the existence of a digital or networked society. Researcher E. E. Yelkina identifies the main features of such a society: "the increasing influence of the Internet and mass media on the formation of institutional network structures of social communications in all fields of public life; the presence of hybrid forms of management and political control; virtualization of social communications, increasing political tension and instability" [10]. According to the Global Digital 2023 report for 2023, it is noted that 64.4 % of the world's population has Internet access, in Russia the number of Internet users is 88.2 % of the total population of Russia. Social networks are used by 4.76 billion people, which is approximately 60 % of the total world population. In Russia, this figure is 73.3 %. The majority of users call for the Internet to search for information (57.8 %), for relations with friends and family (53.7 %), to follow the news and current events (50.9 %) and to watch videos, TV series, or movies (49.7 %) [11].

To create a digital 'new world' it needs the restructuring of cultural values and relationships. Society should create new cultural subsystems that would allow it to function in the stated conditions. Today, in the transition period, digital culture can be seen as a branch, where the cultural subsystems are communication technologies that create the possibility of embedding a person in digital technological relations. The tested and promoted project of a controlled transition to digital reality is formulated as the *Society 5.0* strategy[1]. The Internet, mobile communications, smart sensors, robots, AI, and big data are changing the worldview, public thinking, social values, institutional and legislative bases, methods of national and industrial management, and life aspirations of society, gently interfering in the personal life of each person. However, the socio-economic changes in different countries are similar they realize at different times, but their successful implementation depends on the socio-cultural conditions built in the post-industrial period. The developers of all these strategies note an important feature of each project is nationwide [12, p. 83].

[1] "Internet Plus" and "Made in China 2025" in China, "RIE 2020" in Singapore, "Do It" in India, etc.

Spiritual and artistic cultures have more complex structures and less change then material one because a thing in culture can be an economic concept, a form of an exchange commodity, and culturological, based on its measure of utility. "A useful thing is the original form of existence of a thing in culture" [13, p. 5–12]. Thus the special strategy *'Internet of Things'* has been developed for digital material culture, which will identify people with the material world of things from the physical and the virtual worlds. The mutual integration of material values of the physical and virtual worlds will create an integrated material culture, which will function with the help of AI. The alliance of two spheres of material culture "physical culture" and "technical activity" (according to Russian philosopher and culturologist M. S. Kagan) makes it possible to transform the "bodily structure into a cultural one", combining it with a certain functioning thing (gadget). Thus, the human body becomes an integral part of the material world, as even "remaining a biological object it acquires cultural and (technological) qualities" [13, p. 195]. Having the human body, a person will not be able to abandon the physical world so he will adjust himself to the emerging realities. If a body is a thing its enhancement process is commonplace for the modern world. It is obvious that in the digital culture transformation of things or bodies is a normal situation. It is about the human genetic code, creating a hybrid form and so on. Today neither society nor state are unequipped to face such reality. Society is open to the project *Baby Design* as a changing of looks but no personality.

Already today, economic strategies of digital optimization motivate many people to be more mobile and adapt faster to changing realities at home and work. The usual social aspects are integrated into the digital environment: communication, attitude, art, etc. At the same time, it is noted by some researchers that the management system that solves social and ethical problems in the new digital reality works inefficiently because there is no clear understanding of the social and ethical consequences of digitalization [14]. At the same time, people are getting an uncomfortable feeling in the context of constant changes changes. The main personality measure is stress tolerance which has become a prerequisite of normal existence in the transition period.

Priority socio-economic strategies of new society projects are integrated into subsystems of digital culture. Based on previous cultural models, we can assume, they will make to remodel things into functioning tools for the digital space, cyber machines, new household improvements, special tools, etc. This will create new approaches to the culture of work within the framework of digitalization. The focus on 'the maximum life comfort'. it will create prerequisites for the appearance of additional free time through the distance work model and the replacement of hard work by robots. Those value constants developed for professional ethics at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries will shift towards the ability to interact with AI, which will become an intermediary between people in the process of communication and professional interaction. Rather, it will be the ethics of the culture of interaction with AI and various platform systems, and robots. For example, the participation of AI in the medical care of Russian healthcare is already being discussed today.

The problems of demography continue to be relevant because medicine and pharmacology have been hard at work on the correction of clock genes and had good results. They consider that people will live up to about 100 years in the next two or three decades. This situation will change society's worldview to the gerontology culture. The utopian desire of eternal youth should become the value of quality of life. Today, society tolerantly refers to different forms of bodies. For example, the public 'Body Positive' trend stands for the right

to accept your body and the bodies of other people as they are, regardless of physical abilities, size, gender, race, or appearance, without looking back at fashion or public opinion. This is a way to reconcile everyone with differences in age, gender, and nation.

Analyzing the premises and problems in the formation of digital culture, Russian philosophers mark some methodological approaches to its development par example, humanitarian and technocratic. For this study it may take a look at the humanitarian approach, which "focuses on ideological and ontological issues in connection with the expansion of digitalization processes in culture; accompanied by the transformation of values, images of reality, changes in the nature of communications and behavioral models" [10]. We cannot denote this approach as a model, in spite of the efforts of researches working in the interdisciplinary anthropological fields to study the modern world view of the digital culture. Obviously, all these changes reflect on not only the value system, established cultural images, as ideals and communication patterns of behavior but also a man. However, the humanitarian approach will be incomplete without the assistance of anthropological research in medicine, physiology, psychology and so on.

Conclusion

Digital culture inherits the experience of previous cultural traditions. It is seen by modern scientists as a dangerous nanosphere, where, perhaps, there is no place for a person because of instantaneous changes. Research by biologists and anthropologists has shown that a person cannot give up his natural essence because he is dependent on the natural environment and retains his instincts. They may be dormant and not manifest in us as long as we are improving culturally and spiritually. However, not everyone strives for self-improvement. Most people on earth do not need a digital world, because there is no nature and no opportunity to fulfill their natural purpose. But for those who want to overcome time and their biological limitations, the digital world gives them a chance to realize their creative potential. The digital world requires the formation of a new digital culture from those who intend to exist there.

References

1. Solonin, J. N. and Kagan, M. S. (eds) (2005), *Cultural Studies*, Moscow: Iurait Publ. (In Russian)

2. Rickert, G. (1998), *Sciences of Natural and Sciences of Cultural*, Moscow: Respublika Publ. (In Russian)

Benjamin, W. (2021), Hermann Cohen, From ethics of pure will, in: *Toward the Critique of Violence: A Critical Edition*. Redwood City, California: Stanford University Press, pp. 161–167.

4. Lorenz, K. (2016), 8 deadly sins of civilized mankind, in: *The reverse side of the mirror: collection of works,* transl. from it. and preface by Fet, A. I.; ed. by Gladkiy, A. V.; notes by Fet, A. I. and Gladkiy, A. V., Nyköping (Sweden): Philosophical arkiv, pp. 17–94. (In Russian)

5. Wilson, O. E. (2012), *On Human Nature*, Harvard University Press.

6. Fet, A. I. (2015), *Instinct and Social behavior*, Rehoboth: American Research Press. (In Russian)

7. Castels, M. (2000), *The Information Age: economics, society and culture*, transl. from English, ed. by Shkaratan, O. I., Moscow: HSE Publishing House. (In Russian)

8. Khazieva, N., Khaziev, A. and Klyushina, E. (2018), Digital Society: The Experience of the Philosophical Understanding of a Problem, *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 347–353. (In Russian)

9. Prokudin, D. I. and Sokolov, I. G. (2013), "Digital culture" VS "Analog culture", *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Philosophy and Conflict Studies*, vol. 17, iss. 4, p. 83–91. (In Russian)

10. Yelkina, E. E. (2018), Digital culture in a Networked society: a socio-philosophical analysis, *Culture and technologies.* Available at: http://cat.ifmo.ru/index.php/ru/2018/v3-i3/153 (accessed: 25.02.2024). (In Russian)

11. Kemp, S. (2023), *Digital 2023: Global overview report*. Available at: https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2023-global-overview-report (accessed: 17.07.2023). (In Russian)
12. Sunami, A. N. (2023) Ethics of "Digital Society": New Conflict or New Balance, *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Philosophy and Conflict Studies*, 2023, vol. 39, iss. 3, pp. 544–556. (In Russian)
13. Barrett, J. (2015), *The last invention of mankind: Artificial intelligence and the end of the era of Homo sapiens*, Moscow: Alpina non-fiction Publ. (In Russian)
14. Ivanov, A. V. (2021), Social and ethical problems of digitalization, in: *Integration of science, education, society, production and economy: Sbornik nauchnykh statei po materialam Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii* (Ufa, 19 ianvaria 2021 g.), Ufa: Vestnik nauki Publ., pp. 213–218. (In Russian)

Received: December 3, 2023
Accepted: April 26, 2024

Authors' information:

Tatiana V. Kovaleva — PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor; t.kovaleva@spbu.ru
Valeriia A. Kovaleva Kircicek — Postgraduate Student; valeria.kovaleva9419@gmail.com

Философские и антропологические взгляды на понимание формирования цифровой культуры*

Т. В. Ковалева, В. А. Ковалева Кирчичек

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет,
Российская Федерация, 199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9

Для цитирования: *Kovaleva T. V., Kovaleva Kircicek V. A.* Philosophical and Anthropological Views on Understanding the Formation of Digital Culture // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Философия и конфликтология. 2024. Т. 40. Вып. 2. С. 331–340.
https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu17.2024.213

Статья посвящена научному осмыслению цифровой культуры. Основная цель статьи — исследовать различные подходы к пониманию современной культуры и обозначить ее отличительные особенности. Мы определили приоритетность следующих задач: рассмотреть философские и биолого-антропологические взгляды на роль и место культуры в жизни общества и человека на рубеже XX и XXI вв.; проанализировать некоторые подходы в исследовании цифровой культуры. С одной стороны, мы обозначили идеи неокантианцев, которые считали, что понять природу и сферы человеческой жизни можно только через (культурные) ценности, которые могут создать доказательную базу значимости культуры посредством изучения этики и самих ценностей. С другой стороны, мы исследовали биолого-антропологические взгляды К. Лоренца, Э. Уилсона и А. Фета на культуру. Российский ученый Абрам Фет, основываясь на опыте Лоренца и Уилсона, пришел к выводу, что ««культура" относится не к индивиду, а только к некоторому сообществу людей и означает особый образ жизни этого сообщества, установившиеся в нем навыки и способы поведения, понятия и способы мышления, передаваемые по традиции из поколения в поколение… человек — животное с двумя системами наследственности — генетической и культурной» («Инстинкт и социальное поведение»). Итак, основываясь на двух представленных выше двух научных подходах, можно лучше понять пути к изучению цифровой культуры и проанализировать проблемные зоны трансформации социокультурного уклада современного общества. Мы

* Данная статья выполнена в рамках гранта РНФ 23-28-00220 «Трансформация морального сознания «цифрового общества»: новые стратегии и риски».

находимся в самом начале переходного периода в формировании новых культурных отношений. Очевидно, цифровой мир сложен и противоречив. Он требует от нас создания высокоразвитой духовной культуры для нашего дальнейшего существования.

Ключевые слова: цифровая культура, неокантианство, цифровое общество, биолого-антропологические взгляды на культуру.

Статья поступила в редакцию 3 декабря 2023 г.;
рекомендована к печати 26 апреля 2024 г.

Контактная информация:

Ковалева Татьяна Викторовна — канд. филос. наук, доц.; t.kovaleva@spbu.ru
Ковалева Кирчичек Валерия Алексеевна — аспирант; valeria.kovaleva9419@gmail.com