



How to cite: Shakun, N. (2022). Anthropological dilemmas of information society development modern stage in the context of globalisation challenges. *Futurity Philosophy*, 1(3), 52-63.
<https://doi.org/10.57125/FP.2022.09.30.04>

Anthropological dilemmas of information society development modern stage in the context of globalisation challenges

Nataliia Shakun

Ph.D. in Philosophy Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences, Chernihiv Polytechnic National University, street Shevchenko, 95, Chernihiv, Ukraine 14035, shakunn@ukr.net, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2761-9965>

Received: August 7, 2022 | **Accepted:** September 24, 2022 | **Published:** September 30, 2022

Abstract: Aims: The purpose of the article is to highlight the anthropological dilemmas of contemporary philosophy related to the establishment of the information society. The global, local, and individual dimensions of informatization are projected onto modern human, which leads to his/her new positioning in the scientific and worldview picture of the world. The task of scientific research is to concretise the anthropological dilemmas of our time that are caused by information and technological transformations in society, namely: autonomy-dependence, traditionalism-innovation, and security-risk. **Methodology:** When the key research question is a dilemma, the most appropriate methodological philosophical approach is the dialectic one. It is based on the search for the truth of knowledge or conditions of development through contradictions and confrontations. At the same time, the entire arsenal of general scientific methods is also mostly oriented towards the dialectical format of research, actualising elements of comparative analysis, comparison, and modelling in the person interpretation in the current information and technological space. **Results:** The results of the article determine the dominance of pragmatic dimensions of efficiency in almost all anthropological dichotomies proposed in the study. Information and technology form a digital holistic system where the elimination of human-dimensional elements from the existential, epistemological, and axiological segments of the worldview paradigm of our time is initiated. **Scientific Novelty:** The scientific novelty of the study emphasises that classical anthropological constants such as autonomy, security, style, and traditions acquire

contradictory characteristics in the permanent information and digital process of society development. Conclusion: Philosophy, by maintaining a constant methodological balance at the level of: contradiction-unity, makes another (in the cultural and historical dimension) attempt to resolve the problem of human positioning in the context of the dynamic development of a new type (in this case, a global information and technological) society.

Keywords: social philosophy, worldview paradigm, modern scientific picture of the world, anthropological dichotomy, information society, globalization, information, and technological era.

Introduction

Cultural and historical progress has shaped the corresponding types of society. Since the time of scientific and technological progress, 4 stages of social development have been distinguished. Industries 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, and 4.0 clearly defined the roles of each of the elements of the world order. Anthropological topics were the dominant theme in all periods, subordinating other elements in one way or another. Under such conditions, anthropological dilemmas were of a purely internal human nature. However, the intensity of globalisation processes has gradually integrated the external factor into anthropological contradictions, intensifying them in real time, while giving hope for their resolution in the future.

The information factor has actually become the driving force behind the individual and social transformations of our time. Kodirov (2021) defines information as a factor of historical competition. Such a philosophical understanding of the role of a new worldview element creates a number of dilemmas that people face. The contradictions are ontological, cognitive, and value-based, covering all areas of individual and social development. The contradictions surrounding human existence have always been relevant in different cultural and historical epochs. The modern information age brought forward new tools that fuel these contradictions, giving new meanings to anthropological dilemmas. The information age of the twenty-first century is permeated with anthropological guidelines of competitiveness and creativity, which are the basis for the society's development (Malik, 2019).

Given the total impact of information technology on social development, the issue of influence and control over information is becoming more relevant (Ayodele, 2020). However, modern civilization is increasingly immersed in realities where humans are unable to fully regulate the system they have created. This state of affairs significantly deepens anthropological contradictions that take on new manifestations and are fuelled by the interactivity of digital space.

Research Problem

The research problem of the article is focused on anthropological contradictions specifications that are characteristic of the modern information society. Among the fundamental anthropological dilemmas, the study selects certain elements of the philosophical and anthropological discourse that has been most influenced by information technology transformations, namely: autonomy-dependence, tradition-innovation, and security-risk. The anthropological issues of autonomy, security, style, and traditions in the cultural and historical context have received new components of influence in the form of the information technology format. The information society is dynamically developing, striking with its scale and transience, which requires new approaches from the scientific and philosophical community to position the role of the human and the status of all anthropological concepts in the worldview paradigm.

Research Focus

The focus of the study characterises the process of projecting new scientific and ideological guidelines of an information technology nature onto a person. In fact, anthropological dilemmas have

not changed, remaining fundamental human problems for many centuries. However, the socio-cultural space where anthropological dilemmas acquire new features that require philosophical and scientific interpretation has dramatically changed.

Research Aim and Research Questions

The purpose of this research is to provide a philosophical interpretation of anthropological contradictions that take on new meanings in modern information society. Anthropological dilemmas are in nature individual, social, and global and determine the human elements of civilizational development. The objective of the study is to highlight the following components of philosophical and anthropological dilemmas of the information society:

- existential aspects of anthropological contradictions caused by fundamental shifts in the interpretation of the human status (intellectual, physiological), which is centered in the information technology space;
- gnoseological elements of anthropological dilemmas fuelled by innovative information-technological transformations of human cognitive activity in the modern scientific paradigm;
- axiological principles of anthropological contradictions, which receive new guidelines based on the information and technological interpretation of the standardisation of material and spiritual values.

Literature Review/Theoretical Overview

During the twentieth century, philosophical and anthropological ideas occupied an important niche in the philosophical and scientific discourse. The question of human was no longer considered linearly but with pronounced conceptual problems of not only existential but also practical (cognitive and value) nature. The American anthropological school proposed a systematic approach to philosophical anthropology (Maskovsky, 2013). The advantage of such a philosophical and anthropological interpretation is the format of integrity in which anthropological dilemmas are considered. That is, when considering the issue of autonomy, the problems of dependence are automatically actualised; the concept of anthropological security immediately raises the issue of risks for humans.

Jasanoff (2021) emphasises the role of the information technology factor in the process of debunking the idea of human exclusivity in the world order. It is pointed out that the anthropocentric principles characteristic of the positivist model of science and philosophy deepened the contradictions of anthropological dichotomies. When human dominance is removed from the basis of the worldview paradigm, a new process of philosophical and anthropological discourse begins, which consists in interpreting the coexistence of the human with other elements of the world order. In this context, anthropological contradictions are positioned in a completely different way. Contemporary philosophical and anthropological research “is aimed at finding alternative frameworks of thinking to anthropocentrism (new materialism, speculative realism, process ontology)” (Petrykivska, 2021).

Chernilo (2021), in his study on the anthropological risks of the future, identifies not just one globalisation process that encompasses modern society, but a number of globalisation effects that directly change the course of civilizational progress. One of these fundamental elements of a global nature is information development, which determines the level of intensity of anthropological contradictions in scientific or philosophical life. Along with the philosophy of science or the philosophy of technology, a new branch of philosophy is being established - the philosophy of information (Sicart, 2019). The dynamism and scale of information and technological development creates the need for new philosophical tools that will reinterpret anthropological contradictions, which are also increasing in

number. Therefore, philosophy's response to the growth of anthropological problems of the information society should be symmetrical.

Scientific research emphasises the need to rethink the inherited content of human experience (Sokolovskiy et al., 2021). The reason for this change in philosophical and interpretive activity is the new information principles of building a modern society. It is obvious that the old philosophical and anthropological positioning in philosophy is impossible. If scientific and technological progress, which became the basis for the formation of Society 4.0 with the supremacy of human elements, Society 5.0, which is in the process of formation, is gradually moving away from these guidelines. As a result, the philosophical and anthropological topics are completely transformed.

Information technologies belonging to Industry 4.0 have become fundamental mechanisms for socio-philosophical research in the modern science (Aquilani et al., 2020). Sattorovich (2020) emphasises that every cultural and historical phenomenon (whether a process or a phenomenon) modifies the social development. The information society can undoubtedly be interpreted as a socio-cultural phenomenon. This status of information (which is significantly reinforced by another phenomenon of technolisation) leads to its ability to carry out fundamental transformations in society.

Research Methodology

General Background

A number of general scientific and general philosophical methods were used in the study. Among the scientific and practical methodologies, it is worth highlighting the analysis (the primarily comparative analysis). This approach makes it possible to consider the status of the information technology factor on both sides of the anthropological dilemma. Modelling with the help of forecasting allows predicting the ability of the society of the future not only to state anthropological contradictions but also to effectively resolve them. Philosophical and scientific methods allow exploring and understanding anthropological dichotomy nature. Particularly, phenomenology interprets philosophical and anthropological contradictions on behalf of the first person (i.e., a person) (Pedersen, 2020). This methodological format allows interpreting the information impact on individual and social consciousness. Ultimately, information technologies transform not only external elements but also modify the role and status of a person in the system of the socio-cultural paradigm.

Philosophy defines structuralism as one of the methods of overcoming the problematic nature of anthropological dilemmas (Doja, 2020). Information technology is capable of expressing human elements (Neyrat, 2022). This ability contributes to the possibility of systematic analysis of anthropological structures by information systems. If considering the prospects of anthropological philosophical ideas in the context of informatization and technolisation, the concept of a transhumanist attempt to improve the human being, which consists in the modernisation of the human body and mind (and ideally the soul), comes to the fore (Benedikter, 2020).

The information society of the future will try to actualise interdisciplinary discourse in solving anthropological problems (Rotger et al., 2019). If nowadays interdisciplinary connections are mostly used in certain knowledge clusters, in the future, due to information development, this methodological approach will be expanded in order to include the interaction of humanities, natural sciences, and technology. Although the current study does not use interdisciplinarity to solve anthropological dilemmas, it is noted that this approach is the future of philosophical and anthropological discourse.

Data Analysis

The basis of multiculturalism in modern civilization is the formation of intercultural bases, for which information and digital technologies are the only source (Watts et al., 2022). The scientific data is an important strategic resource in the age of big data (Henneberg et al., 2021). Effective management and widespread dissemination are key ways able to increase the value of scientific data resources. Thanks to information and digital technologies, new opportunities for philosophical and anthropological discourse are emerging. Particularly, in the issue of human freedom, it is already possible not only to regulate the principles of autonomy from the outside world but also to monitor their observance and monitor transformations.

It is worth noting that the information society actualises the algorithmisation of all processes that take place in it (Goldberg, 2019). If earlier the source of information and knowledge for anthropological dilemmas was naturally spontaneous or human-organised elements, now automated data collection algorithms are being offered. Thus, information technology resources are being reoriented from a purely auxiliary tool to an independent format for studying the anthropological contradictions of our time.

Research Results

The results of the study point to a new model of philosophical understanding of anthropological dilemmas in modern information society. The new paradigm involves the interpretation of philosophical contradictions in the context of information technology resources use that significantly deepen the ability to understand the nature of the anthropological dilemma. The information that becomes the basis of knowledge and competencies allows for a more objective assessment of the various manifestations of anthropological guidelines for a modern person, society, or civilization as a whole.

Melnyk et al. (2022) emphasise that the humanistic paradigm has not been reoriented. The information society has somewhat transformed humanistic constants, which has led to a change in the content of anthropological dilemmas. Information society 4.0 has received new tools for human research. Artificial intelligence or 3D images of the human body are the most striking examples of the fact that the consideration of physiological or intellectual qualities of a person is considered not in the traditional format, but in terms of modelling the human essence (Smith & Hirst, 2019). The socio-cultural manifestation of modern information and digital technologies is expressed in the impact on democracy, human rights, freedom of choice, etc. Under such conditions, the quantitative indicators of anthropological dilemmas will only increase. At the same time, the level of resolution of existing anthropological contradictions will also increase, as information and technology allow getting answers to questions that have not yet been resolved by science. The role of society is to protect people from losing their humanity (Shirley, 2020). For anthropological contradictions, this purpose is relevant, as it allows the formation of certain reference dimensions that become a guide for potential dichotomous confrontations.

The impact of information technology tools is in the form of a combination of collection, dissemination, and processing of information flows (Dattatreyan & Marrero-Guillamón, 2019). Such information preparation determines the balance in anthropological dilemmas. Thanks to the integrity of information, a person is aware of the problems of the concept of freedom, cultural traditions, security issues, and other.

The results of the study are highlighted in the most common philosophical and anthropological dilemmas of the information society (see Table 1).

Table 1

Features of modern anthropological dilemmas in the information age

Contemporary philosophy anthropological dilemmas	The impact of the information technology factor on modern human dichotomies
autonomy-dependence	information and technologies have an ambiguous human-dimensional positioning since they simultaneously provide people with opportunities both to acquire the status of autonomous being and form practical and everyday prerequisites for dependence on sociocultural laws
safety-risk	the modern information society multiplies quantitative and qualitative indicators of anthropological contradictions, that, in turn, determine the principles of human security and the threats it faces
traditionalism-innovation	the correlation between tradition and innovation is a key human problem of the information society since the ICT segment introduces an imbalance in the fundamental anthropological socio-cultural attitudes

Source: author's own development

The anthropological dilemma of autonomy and dependence of the human dimension is traditional for any cultural and historical epoch and all the factors that accompanied it. Information has become a prerequisite for the formation of both a new format and a new content of human elements. Globalisation has become a prerequisite for the creation of global citizenship and a multicultural environment (Torres & Bosio, 2020). An anthropologically oriented environment is inferior to socially oriented elements, losing its autonomy.

The cultural universalisation (deepened by total informatization) of the global world at the turn of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries gave rise to cosmopolitanism, which, in addition to cultural, also received a philosophical interpretation (Werbner, 2020). The formation of the concept of a "world citizen" has somehow influenced the autonomy-dependence relationship for the modern man. The levelling of cultural self-identification has negatively affected the principles of human independence from external social factors. While cultural studies examine the consequences of such a transformation, philosophy investigates the cause and nature of such a socio-anthropological reorientation.

In the modern world, an important issue is devoted to the mechanisms of influence and protection of cultural identity (Anheier, 2020). For philosophical and anthropological discourse, this issue is important in the context of interpreting anthropological dilemmas. Particularly, the ratio of human autonomy and dependence directly depends on the degree of cultural self-determination. Information plays a key role in this process, as a person who has knowledge has a much better chance of self-identification. ICTs are a mechanism for the development of self-organising processes that are potentially able to provide the desired human autonomy even in today's dynamic global world.

Garvey (2019), considering the practical application of the artificial element in his work, determines the level of technology's impact on human autonomy in the modern world. A simple pragmatic answer to a rather complex question is given: the use of artificial intelligence in the commercial segment makes people more dependent, while the use of AI in projects aimed at creating public goods ensures human autonomy from external social or global influences.

Information technology tools are a new practice-oriented space where the concepts of "security" and "threats" form their anthropological evidence. Wang & Wu (2020) point out that "security is a central dimension of contemporary discussions on human health, loss prevention, environmental protection, sustainability, and cleaner production". Floridi (2020) sees the prospects of civilization in combining the "blue colour" of technology with the "green colour of ecology". This approach is intended to solve the problem of priority in human transformative activity. Almost all cultural and historical achievements of humans determine their impact (minimal or maximum) on the environment. This is how the key issue for the existential existence of a person is formed - the issue of security. If a person harmonises the conditions of coexistence with the outside world (nature, space, the Universe), a safe environment is provided for the further development of man and civilization.

The information technology segment has repeatedly acted as a factor that potentially (for the global civilization dimension) and actually (in individual and social manifestations) becomes a threat to security. The issue of security is traditionally considered a fundamental problem of social development. In all previous social formations, mechanisms were developed to regulate relations between people and states and to establish socio-cultural safeguards against global risks that posed an existential threat. Modern society 4.0 actively involves information resources in the system of preventive tools designed to prevent existential crises (Aldabbas et al., 2020). At the same time, technologies are developing so rapidly that the problem of the uncontrolled ICT segment is becoming more and more relevant. As a result, society has faced a paradoxical situation of anthropological security. Information technology tools ensure the security of individuals and society at the practical and every day (in the philosophical sense - value) level but are a threat in the global (philosophical and existential) dimension.

In general, the information age of the twenty-first century is characterised by the multidimensionality of all processes, so the pluralism (rather than the usual dualism) of anthropological dilemmas is not unusual in the modern worldview paradigm. The successes of the information society are bordered and alternated with threats arising from the introduction of innovative technologies (Sobirova, 2022).

The study emphasises that ICT resources have not only a practice-oriented impact on anthropological dimensions but also a theoretical and ideological one. Particularly, the principle of "freshness" of information in the human-dimensional problems of modern society is noted (Abd-Elmagid et al., 2019). Information updates the data virtually online that contributes to the dynamism of considering anthropological contradictions. For example, the dilemma of the relationship between tradition and innovation under stable socio-cultural conditions determines the dominance of fundamental human principles. When information support for innovative development is involved, this trend becomes a priority in the worldview paradigm.

Postmodernism in modern philosophy was somewhat ahead of its time, as the ideas of destroying the traditional foundations of human existence were considered futuristic prospects at the end of the twentieth century (Berglund, 2007). The real innovative force that led to global transformations in human life and the functioning of society was the information technology space. In fact, postmodern principles have described everything that is happening now in the socio-cultural environment. The anthropological dilemma of tradition and innovation in the information society has an obvious priority

of the innovation component. Information and technology are in fact an example of a radical transformation of epistemological attitudes. And in the case of the axiological cluster, ICT resources play the role of tools that enable transformations and changes. Tataru (2019) emphasises the need to preserve the fundamental “human” while actively introducing innovative elements.

The scientific and ideological landscape of the modern world is permeated with universality (Muratova, 2022). Under such conditions, the unique status of the human being disappears, giving way to the dynamism of processes and the changeability of the leadership of these processes. In the classical formulation and interpretation of anthropological dilemmas, the decisive role has always been reserved for the individual. This led to the total subjectivisation of the anthropologisation process, which did not contribute to their objectivity. The information society balances the subject-object characteristics of anthropological confrontations.

Discussion

Philosophical and anthropological dilemmas, despite their epistemological and axiological priority, also have an existential character. Bazaluk (2020) argues that “the essence of human is revealed as areal existentialism that require further rethinking and clarification”. The modern information society blurs the boundaries between ontologisation and anthropologisation, combining human-dimensional topics. If earlier the discussion of anthropological dilemmas was purely human in nature now external factors that are successfully integrated into the humanities and sciences discourse.

If considering anthropological dilemmas in the sociocultural dimension, the modern information and technological society 4.0 is an arena for their actualisation, and the future synergistically organised society 5.0 should become a platform for their solution. It is noted that the constant renewal of society occurs, among other things, due to dialectical anthropologically oriented factors that contribute to development. At the same time, society 5.0 must restore the sustainability of civilizational dimensions for their further development (Narvaez Rojas et al., 2021). This idea hides a discrepancy, which is that the information society is essentially dynamic and nonlinear, and under such conditions it is impossible to achieve the level of desired sustainability. The way out of this situation is the ideas of self-organisation and interdisciplinarity proposed by the synergistic approach to solving anthropological dilemmas.

The anthropological issues of human autonomy, security, style, and traditions identified in the study require new philosophical and methodological approaches to address them. The classical dialectical confrontation can only exacerbate contradictions in modern society since current pluralistic worldview beliefs are unlikely to reveal the truth of one of the components of the anthropological contradiction. If considering the synergistic approach, then the information and technological resource that provides all the conditions for self-organising processes and regulates interdisciplinary relations comes to the fore. Therefore, anthropological dilemmas have a better chance of adopting a coherent position in the synergistic paradigm of science and philosophy.

The key point in the philosophical understanding of the anthropological dilemmas of the modern information society is the clarity of the problematic. The philosophical community does not reject anthropological dilemmas at all; on the contrary, it considers them a prerequisite for development conditions or a source of knowledge truth. At the same time, all the related components of anthropological contradictions are closely analysed by scientific and philosophical discourse. In this context, the information society is the most significant irritant of human aspects.

Levin & Mamlok (2021) point out the anthropological transformations that take place in the information society, namely:

- the disappearance of the difference between the real and virtual (digital) worlds;
- levelling the differences between natural processes and phenomena and cultural artefacts that are united by common anthropological principles;
- transition from information deficit to its surplus and the reverse processes related to threats to the acquisition of true knowledge and competencies.

Therefore, the key philosophical problem is not the anthropological dilemmas themselves, but the factors that shape their content and format. In today's world, information and technology have become dominant practical, every day, and theoretical, and worldview components. Among philosophical ideas, there is no consensus on the impact of ICT elements on the anthropological dimension. On the one hand, the information technology arsenal significantly expands human potential. Consequently, ICTs are the main source of threats to humans, society, and civilization as a whole.

Hornborg (2021) emphasises that modern society will be guided by “post-dualistic” approaches in the short term. This means moving away (gradually or rapidly, depending on the socio-cultural conditions of civilization's development) from dichotomies and contradictions of any kind. Anthropological dilemmas will not be an exception in this process. This opinion is quite controversial since the rejection of the dialectical factor of development requires a full-fledged replacement for it. Unfortunately, so far neither science nor philosophy has been able to offer an alternative way to actualise civilizational progress. The interdisciplinary and self-organising synergistic methodology is proposed by its creators as an element of coexistence with dialectical principles, but not as a substitute for them. In this context, the role of the information factor becomes even more unclear and controversial:

- On the one hand, the information technology potential is designed to provide the necessary knowledge to resolve existing anthropological contradictions;
- On the other hand, information is proposed as a factor that will level anthropological contradictions, completely eliminating them from the agenda of scientific and philosophical discourse.

Conclusions and Implications

Thus, philosophical and anthropological issues in the modern information society face new challenges:

- The large-scale globalisation processes have contributed to the deepening of anthropological contradictions, as the linear understanding of the nature and essence of man is replaced by non-linear guidelines that determine new priorities in human issues.
- The information society has expanded the base of knowledge, ideas, and principles according to which philosophical and anthropological dilemmas are interpreted.
- The existential characteristics of anthropological problems of our time are the transformation of the essential characteristics of a person, which are realised through the introduction of information technology mechanisms (artificial intelligence, virtual reality).
- Gnoseological activity to solve philosophical-anthropological dilemmas is increasingly oriented to the methodological cluster of science and technology, which significantly enhances the ability to collect, process, disseminate, and analyse information and knowledge.
- Axiological principles that regulate material and spiritual value aspects of philosophical and anthropological dilemmas use ICT elements as benchmarks.
- Philosophical and anthropological dilemmas that are most relevant in the information society can be distinguished in the context of the following contradictions: traditionalism-innovation, security-risk, and autonomy-dependence.

References

- Abd-Elmagid, M. A., Pappas, N., & Dhillon, H. S. (2019). On the role of age of information in the internet of things. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 57(12), 72–77. doi:10.1109/mcom.001.1900041
- Aldabbas, M., Xie, X., Teufel, T., & Teufel, S. (2020). Future Security Challenges for Smart Societies: Overview from Technical and Societal Perspectives. *International Conference on Smart Grid and Clean Energy Technologies (ICSGCE)* (pp. 103–111). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSGCE49177.2020.9275630>
- Anheier, H. (2020). Cultures, Values, and Identities: What Are the Issues? *Global Perspectives*, 1(1), 11755. <https://doi.org/10.1525/001c.11755>
- Aquilani, B., Piccarozzi, M., Abbate, T., & Codini, A. (2020). The role of open innovation and value co-creation in the challenging transition from Industry 4.0 to society 5.0: Toward a theoretical framework. *Sustainability*, 12(21), 8943. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12218943>
- Ayodele, O. (2020). The new information feudalism: Africa's relationship with the global information society. *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 27(1), 67–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10220461.2020.1750470>
- Bazaluk, O. A. (2020). The anthropologization of dasein-psyche's being by methods of neurophilosophy. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*, (18), 7–19. <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i18.221297>
- Benedikter, R. (2020). Technology: the new God? Techno-metaphysics and homo deus: contemporary attempts towards a radical perspective on the digital change of religion In Isetti, G., Innerhofer, E., Pechlaner, H., de Rachewiltz, M. (Eds.), *Religion in the Age of Digitalization: From New Media to Spiritual Machines*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367809225>
- Berglund, E. (2007). Information Society Finnish-style, or an Anthropological View of the Modern. In Edwards, J., Harvey, P., Wade, P. (Eds.), *Anthropology and Science: Epistemologies in Practice*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003135524>
- Chernilo, D. (2021). One globalisation or many? Risk society in the age of the Anthropocene. *Journal of Sociology (Melbourne, Vic.)*, 57(1), 12–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783321997563>
- Dattatreyan, E. G., & Marrero-Guillamón, I. (2019). Introduction: Multimodal anthropology and the politics of invention: Multimodal anthropologies. *American Anthropologist*, 121(1), 220–228. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13183>
- Doja, A. (2020). Lévi-Strauss's heroic anthropology facing contemporary problems of the modern world. *Reviews in Anthropology*, 49(1–2), 4–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00938157.2020.1794140>
- Floridi, L. (2020). The Green and the blue: A new political ontology for a mature information society. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3831094>
- Garvey, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence and Japan's fifth generation: The information society, neoliberalism, and alternative modernities. *Pacific Historical Review*, 88(4), 619–658. <https://doi.org/10.1525/phr.2019.88.4.619>

- Goldberg, D. T. (2019). Coding time. *Critical Times*, 2(3), 353–369. <https://doi.org/10.1215/26410478-7862517>
- Henneberg, J., Schuhknecht, F., Reutter, P., Brast, N., & Spichtinger, P. (2021). Northlight: Declarative and Optimized Analysis of Atmospheric Datasets in SparkSQL. *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Scientific and Statistical Database Management* (pp. 1-12). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3538712.3538715>
- Hornborg, A. (2021). Objects don't have desires: Toward an anthropology of technology beyond anthropomorphism. *American Anthropologist*, 123(4), 753–766. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.13628>
- Jasanoff, S. (2021). Humility in the anthropocene. *Globalizations*, 18(6), 839–853. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2020.1859743>
- Kodirov, N. M. (2021). Current issues of formation of information culture in youth. *Philosophical Readings*, 4, 2971–2976. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5770626>
- Korniienko, P. S., Plakhotnik, O. V., Blinova, H. O., Dzeiko, Z. O., & Dubov, G. O. (2023). Contemporary challenges and the rule of law in the digital age. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique*, 36(2), 991–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-022-09963-w>
- Kurt, R. (2019). Industry 4.0 in terms of industrial relations and its impacts on labour life. *Procedia Computer Science*, 158, 590–601. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2019.09.093>
- Levin, I., & Mamlok, D. (2021). Culture and society in the digital age. *Information (Basel)*, 12(2), 68. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info12020068>
- Malik, A. (2019). Creating Competitive Advantage through Source Basic Capital Strategic Humanity in the Industrial Age 4.0. *International Research Journal of Advanced Engineering and Science*, 4(1), 209–215. Retrieved May 13, 2022, from <http://irjaes.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/IRJAES-V4N1P195Y19.pdf>
- Maskovsky, J. (2013). *Critical Anthropologies of the United States*. In Carrier, J. G., Gewertz, D. B. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Sociocultural Anthropology*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003086987>
- Melnyk, O., Shakun, N., Herasymenko, O., Nitchenko, A., & Kolievatov, O. (2022). Theoretical and methodological aspects of the humanistic reorientation of modern society. *Wisdom*, 22(2), 59–67. <https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v22i2.756>
- Muratova, D. (2022). Positive and negative aspects of the transformation of the human mind in the development of modern man-made civilization. *Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal*, 3(6), 173–178. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/9FWES>
- Narvaez Rojas, C., Alomia Peñafiel, G. A., Loaiza Buitrago, D. F., & Tavera Romero, C. A. (2021). Society 5.0: A Japanese concept for a superintelligent society. *Sustainability*, 13(12), 6567. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126567>
- Neyrat, F. (2022). Cosmos and technology (dasein's planetary condition). *Foundations of Science*, 27(3), 1049–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10699-020-09753-2>

- Pedersen, M. A. (2020). Anthropological epochés: Phenomenology and the ontological turn. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 50(6), 610–646. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0048393120917969>
- Petrykivska, O. (2021). The Human Position in Urban Space. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, 27(27), 135–144. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/27/1>
- Rotger, N., Roig-Sanz, D., & Puxan-Oliva, M. (2019). Introduction: towards a cross-disciplinary history of the global in the humanities and the social sciences. *Journal of Global History*, 14(3), 325–334. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1740022819000147>
- Sattorovich, J. U. (2020). Intercultural communication: concept, essence and theories of intercultural communication. *International Journal on Integrated Education*, 3(11), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.31149/ijie.v3i11.812>
- Shirley, T. C. (2020). Objective values in the information age: Preserving humanity with C.s. lewis' abolition of Man. *Humanities Bulletin*, 3(1), 209–215. <http://journals.lapub.co.uk/index.php/HB/article/view/1534>
- Sicart, M. (2019). Play in the information age. *Philosophy & Technology*, 32(3), 517–534. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-018-0311-9>
- Smith, S. E., & Hirst, C. S. (2019). 3D Data in Human Remains Disciplines: The Ethical Challenges. In Squires, K., Errickson, D., Márquez-Grant, N. (Eds.), *Ethical Approaches to Human Remains*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32926-6_14
- Sobirova, M. (2022). The success of the information age and problems. *American Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development*, 11, 111–115. Retrieved from <http://www.ajird.journalspark.org/index.php/ajird/article/view/410>
- Sokolovskyi, O., Kobetiak, A., Melnychuk, M., & Chaplinska, O. (2021). Reconstruction of the religious paradigm in the modern globalized world. *Wisdom*, 18(2), 153–160. <https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v18i2.467>
- Tataru, C. (2019). Human resources in the digital age. A manager's realities and perspectives. *Revista de Management Comparat Internațional*, 20(4), 473–480. <https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=1021427>
- Torres, C. A., & Bosio, E. (2020). Global citizenship education at the crossroads: Globalization, global commons, common good, and critical consciousness. *Prospects*, 48(3–4), 99–113. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-019-09458-w>
- Wang, B., & Wu, C. (2020). Safety informatics as a new, promising and sustainable area of safety science in the information age. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 252(119852), 119852. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119852>
- Watts, J., Jackson, J. C., Arnison, C., Hamerslag, E. M., Shaver, J. H., & Purzycki, B. G. (2022). Building quantitative cross-cultural databases from ethnographic records: Promise, problems and principles. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 56(1), 62–94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/106939712111065720>
- Werbner, P. (2020). Introduction: Towards a New Cosmopolitan Anthropology. In Werbner, P. (Ed.), *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism: Rooted, Feminist and Vernacular Perspectives*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003084617>