Модификация гуманитарных наук: глобальные вызовы цифровой революции

Актуальность исследования обусловлена тем, что глобальные вызовы цифровой революции так или иначе обостряют динамические проблемы, которые стоят перед гуманитарными науками. Эти вызовы «модифицируют» социокультурные контексты, существенно меняя и «карты власти», и экономические реалии, а также традиции и нормы. Тем самым оказывает воздействие на духовное бытие человека и человечества в целом на очередном этапе эпохи перемен. Идет процесс обновления ведущих институциональных дискурсов, что усиливает риски, а с ними и пути их преодоления, усложняя прогнозирование и экспертизу сценариев будущего гуманитарных наук.

Цель исследования – выявить основные параметры новых парадигм и концепций, которые влияют на изменения исследовательской и управленческой перспективы, а также актуализировать специфическую роль гуманитаристики и культурных институтов, ответственных за формирование общественного сознания и социализации личности в цифровую эпоху. Сущность гуманитаристики осмысливается авторами как совокупность гуманитарных наук, дополненных новыми социокультурными технологиями.

Исследование носит междисциплинарный характер, основываясь на теоретических аспектах и материалах разных наук (культурной антропологии, философии, культурологии, semiотики, социологии) и объединяет в себе общенародные, философские и культурологические методы, среди которых особое значение имеют культурно-исторический и социально-аналитический методы, а также метод кросс-культурного анализа. При этом интегральный подход является для авторов методологическим основанием анализа обозначенных проблем, позволяя рассмотреть весь комплекс взаимосвязей между глобальной медиасферой, обществом и личностью, что существенно влияет на эволюцию гуманитарных наук.

Проведенное исследование дает возможность рассмотреть потенциал диджитальной гуманитаристики в системе социальных наук, их междисциплинарного развития и усиления в историко-культурной перспективе. В результате выявляется миссия гуманитарной подготовки специалистов, определяющей систему ценностей и смыслов как основы общества смарт-будущего. Авторы доказывают, что идет процесс формирования новых социокультурных практик информационно-коммуникативного характера, создающих качественно измененные характеристики развивающегося социума в цифровых сетях, где по-иному воспринимается свобода индивида, его культурная самоидентификация и возможности самореализации в виртуальных средах. Исследуя разные стили коммуникации в период цифровой революции, авторы выделяют такие ее особенности как независимость, эмоциональная и интеллектуальная открытость, ориентация на инновации, конструирование новых интеллектуальных возможностей индивида в интернет-пространстве – всего того, что способствует формированию идентичности, самоуважения и самоценности, толерантности, глобальной ориентированности, социальной и гражданской ответственности. Это доказывает, что в XXI веке гуманитаристика обретает новые качества трансдисциплинарности и новый идеологический статус, позволяя изучать и исследовать бытие человека в кардинально меняющейся картине мира.
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Ссылка для цитирования:
The relevance of the research is conditioned by the fact that the global challenges of the digital revolution aggravate the dynamic problems faced by the humanities in one way or another. These challenges “modify” the socio-cultural contexts, amending significantly “power maps” and economic realities, as well as traditions and norms, thus influencing the spiritual existence of man and humanity as such at a regular stage of epochal changes. The process of renewal of major institutional discourses is underway, which increases the risks and respectively the ways of their overcoming, complicating the forecasts and expertise of scenarios for the future of the humanities.

The purpose of the research is to identify the basic parameters of new paradigms and concepts that influence the change in research and management prospects, as well as to actualise the specific role of humanitaristics and cultural institutions responsible for the process of formation of social consciousness and individual socialisation at the digital age. The essence of humanitaristics is conceptualised by the authors as a set of humanities supplemented by new sociocultural technologies.

The research has an interdisciplinary character and is based on theoretical aspects and materials of different sciences (cultural anthropology, philosophy, culturology, semiotics, and sociology); it combines general scientific, philosophical, and culturological methods, among which cultural/historical and social/analytical methods, as well as cross-cultural analysis, are of particular importance. At the same time, the integral approach is viewed by the authors as the methodological basis for the analysis of the specified problems, since it allows a researcher to consider the whole complex of interrelations between the global media sphere, society, and the individual, which influences the evolution of the humanities significantly.

The undertaken study provides an opportunity to consider the potential of digital humanitaristics in the system of social sciences, their interdisciplinary development and enhancement in the historical and cultural perspective. As a result, the mission of specialists’ humanitaristic training is identified, which defines the system of values and purports as a basis of the smart-future society. The authors assert that new sociocultural practices of informative/communicative character are being formed, creating qualitatively changed characteristics of the developing society in digital networks, where an individual’s freedom, cultural self-identification, and opportunities for self-realisation in a virtual environment are perceived differently. Exploring different communication styles in the digital revolution period, the authors highlight such features as its independence, emotional and intellectual openness, focus on innovations, and formation of new intellectual capabilities of the individual in the Internet space – the factors that contribute to the formation of identity, self-esteem and intrinsic values, tolerance, global orientation, social and civic responsibility. This proves that humanitaristics in the 21st century is acquiring new qualities of transdisciplinarity and a new ideological status making it possible to explore human existence in the cardinaly changing global landscape.
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Introduction

Actualising the problems of existence and the prospects of the humanities, the authors focus on the technological “breakthroughs” that enable one to see the risks of cultural expansion caused by nano-bio-cognitive technologies of super-developed countries that displace national/cultural identification from the system of fundamental values.

The research is based on the materials of UNESCO’s international initiatives, the analysis of various approaches of Russian and foreign scholars to the problem of digitalisation and its impact on the educational system and people’s everyday life. The UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity stated, as early as the beginning of the new millennium, that “cyberspace” not only is a medium for the existence and dissemination of information, but also represents a means for communication and exchange of views. The wealth of information on the Internet about different cultures and values allows the individual, while remaining a bearer of own culture, to present it to other people and, in turn, to learn about other cultures and be influenced by them. This is why one of the most important challenges of the digital age is the need “to find a balance between protection of authors’ ethnic and economic rights and preservation of public access to literary works, scientific achievements and works of art, as well as to cultural services” [11, p. 11].

UNESCO’s contributions have repeatedly noted that “advances in digital communications, artificial intelligence and biotechnologies hold great potential, while the ethical, legal and managerial aspects of their application raise serious concern in light of the fact that forward-looking innovations and technological changes have not always contributed to the prosperity of humankind”. The UNESCO Futures of Education initiative seeks to review how education and knowledge can contribute to the common good in the future – up to the year 2050 and further. It states that “knowledge and learning are the most precious renewable resources available to humanity. They are the tools to respond to challenges and invent due alternatives. Yet, education does more than respond to the changing world, it transforms the world” [44].

It is also worth highlighting that UNESCO interprets the future as a space for democratic models that are linked to the past and present, but are not limited to them. It relies on a purposeful, scientifically grounded analysis of trends that helps to identify potential problems and opportunities [ibid]. Researchers’ and practitioners’ attempts to harmonise technological “breakthroughs” with humanistic values of societal development are becoming a subject of discussions in Russian academic communities – on the pages of professional publications and in scientific debates. For instance, in 2019 alone, the country hosted three sentinel scholarly forums dedicated to these issues. In particular, the proceedings of the conference The Information Age. New Paradigms of Culture and Education held at Ural Federal University named after B.N. Yeltsin make it possible to get acquainted with the analysis of conceptual provisions of modern humanities, pointing at their interdisciplinary nature [5]. The content of the collective monograph Versatility of the Human Capital: Cultural and Social Bases prepared by the Department of UNESCO at the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, following the conference addressing the mentioned subject, reveals the theoretical and applied aspects
of human capital in the focus of social and humanitarian dimensions which allow revealing its multifaceted and multidimensional nature [13]. The papers and materials of the Second Moiseev Readings held at Moscow University for the Humanities provide an opportunity to view the modern culture as a factor of Russia’s national security [10].

In the course of reflexive discussion of humanitaristic development prospects, experts and representatives of different scientific schools inevitably find themselves to be the bearers of one of the “impermeable” systems substantiating the history advancement source and the ways of overcoming its challenges. In these terms, they define the paradigm shift as a change in the actual basis of scientific and philosophical views closely related to the transformation of the main problems that are vital at a particular historical stage of societal development. It is also relevant that the discursive differences in scientific paradigms are followed by a shift in research and management prospects.

In this regard, it is expedient to refer to Arnold Toynbee who proved in his seminal work A Study of History that the civilisations which were not able to accept the challenge and provide a well-reasoned response to it were doomed to demise and consequent withdrawal from the historical arena [18, pp. 10–11].

The scenarios of the future substantiated by many researchers and realised in 50- and 100-year development programmes show that a new geological epoch, the Anthropocene, has come, in which man becomes the key dominant determining the future of the civilisation.

At the same time, the humanistic paradigm itself, according to Howard Rheingold, can be regarded as a search for lost “knowledge capable of protecting the society from the disruptive effect of the environment” or as “an innovation aimed at structuring the information chaos resulting from abrupt, non-replenished break with traditions” [16, p. 45].

However, the more intensively the digital technology is developing, the more obvious it becomes that the arising problems are of socio-cultural nature. Meanwhile, modern society has proved to be unprepared for such a dramatic technological leap; it has not sufficient time to adapt to new digital opportunities.

That is why, proceeding from the above, the present research aims to analyse the humanities modification process as a result of the global challenges of the digital revolution that has constructed the realities specific of the entire world in the 21st century.

Materials and methods

Since the study is of interdisciplinary nature, drawing on materials from various humanities (cultural anthropology, philosophy, culturology, semiotics, sociology), it combines general scientific, philosophical, and culturological methods. At the same time, the integral (synergetic) approach is used by the authors as a methodological basis for the analysis of the posed problem, thus enabling them to consider the whole complex of interconnections between the global media sphere (a kind of consequence of the digital revolution) influencing the development of humanities, the society, and the individual, as well as the multiplicity of trajectories of human spiritual existence in the digital epoch.

The humanistic approach makes it possible to perceive and analyse the humanities as a means and a measure of “human production”, without revealing the mechanisms of production as such, but focusing on the efficiency of socio-cultural institutions.
The axiological (or spiritual/meaningful) approach proceeds from the treatment of humanities as a system of norms and values, knowledge, emotions, and human volition. The activity approach is based on the treatment of humanities as a system of organisation and development of human activity.

Among the general theoretical research approaches, the authors use the methods of analysis, synthesis, and generalisation. The cultural/historical method enabled the authors to consider, relying on the works of prominent representatives of various humanities (Astafieva, Bauman, Galkin, and others), the media sphere as a special cultural space and a source of social development during which the individual acquires spiritual experience by adapting to a new historical and media-specific reality. Meanwhile, the method of cross-cultural analysis helps to trace the changes in an individual’s psychology conditioned by many socio-cultural factors.

The socio-analytical method enabled the authors to explore the process of internetisation of public and individual mentality in the epoch of the digital revolution and to prove the enormous influence of Internet culture on identity formation and vital activity of contemporary man, including his national/cultural identification.

The research was based on the following methodological principles:
- objectivity, which allowed the authors to consider the discourse of the humanities on the basis of reliable historical facts and results of topical scholarly research published in reputable journals;
- systemic character in elucidating the integrity of humanitaristics as an object of study, as a system of representation of a holistic picture of the world through the evaluation of phenomena and processes (in their interrelationship, discrepancy, and development);
- historicism in the analysis of a particular phenomenon and in retrospection of its historical development;
- the principle of the dialectical unity of historical, socio-cultural, and logical methods of research.

Results

The contemporary international-level research in the field of humanities shows an obvious process of interdisciplinary “diffusion of ideas”. The focus is increasingly shifting to the study of external factors: on the one hand, one can observe the climate and biosphere change, nuclear waste disposal, environmental pollution, overproduction of goods and services, and mass migration of population; on the other hand – the development of latest digital technologies, globalisation of economic processes, advanced space exploration, the power of artificial intelligence and information, segmentation of the society, shrinkage of labour markets, etc.

The analysis of the media sphere from the perspective of technological determinism of the society as a “network society with creative economy” is becoming a priority area of academic work [7]. It is the digital concept based on the theories of Daniel Bell, Alvin Toffler, and Erich Fromm, aimed at the study of post-industrial society as a society of global governance, which makes humanistic concepts of science relevant. The individual, as an
object and subject of history, is increasingly becoming a subject of a scientific dilemma: will he or she submit to artificial intelligence, or Human intelligence will win? The relevance of studying human social existence was confirmed by Zygmunt Bauman: “Individualisation is destiny, not an object of choice” [2, p. 41].

It is no coincidence that a number of researchers note the “manipulative potential” of the technogenic trend, pointing to the convergence of analogue and digital worlds where man acquires his “other” being, where the value of “reality” gradually shifts towards “virtuality”, enhancing the ephemerality of existence as such. The process of man’s transformation is intensified, and the latter becomes an increasingly controlled and computer-programmed subject.

According to Tyapin, “The considerable manipulative potential of the technogenic trend lies both in technologies themselves and in operating their subject matter as ideologemes. As to the first aspect, one can assert confidently that the technological trend stimulates the ongoing process of man’s transformation into a manageable and fully controlled technological being. As to the second aspect, it would be correct to assert that the ecstasy, bordering on nonsense, regarding the so-called NBICS convergence, cryptocurrencies, etc. makes it possible, firstly, to divert the humanity’s attention from the global problems and contradictions, to ‘forget’ about the growing technical and economic gap, about economic, political and cultural expansion of super-developed countries, exploitation of natural and human resources of the Earth by them, and, secondly, to finally displace national and cultural identification, patriotism, concern for others, metaphysical search for the meaning of life from the system of fundamental values” [20, p. 32].

In this regard, one cannot but recall the idea of Academician Moiseev that the society and the biosphere are in the zone of “turbulent relations with increasing risks of aggravation and catastrophic consequences”, facing the ecological crisis, which includes, among other things, the human crisis problem. That is why it is so important today to focus on the need to stop “this exacerbation without violating the basic precepts that mankind was forming as early as from the Paleolithic age”; it is important “to restructure our mentality, change the scale of values, solve the problems of family regulation”, learn to solve and implement solutions together [14, p. 57]. It is for these reasons, according to Moiseev, that “the 21st century must necessarily become a century of humanitarian knowledge, a century of culture” [Ibid].

That is why – Kostina notes – “the preservation of culture from external expansion, from alien models of development, from erosion of cultural and genetic bonds of the nation, from other goals and values is a strategic task of the state, being aimed to ensure the national security” [10, p. 16].

When forecasting and modelling the future of science in the context of global processes and problems, it is important to pay attention to the prospects of humanistic knowledge, in the first place. What will the culture of science and that of the scientist be like? What status will philosophy, cultural anthropology, culturology, and philology have in the system of scientific knowledge? “The humanities,” argues Epshtein, “are not just a mirror in which we see ourselves; they are a sort of “magic crystal” which refracts human resources and multiple options of the future. Humanitaristics should be worthy of its subject – a human being who is the creator of all sciences but who perceives himself as a creator only in respect of the humanities” [24, p. 13]. This is why, at the beginning of the new millennium, the concepts of
dialogue, including intercultural dialogue, are gaining popularity in the modern humanities and in the system of international relations. As noted by Dudchik, there have been many attempts in philosophy to conceptualise the dialogue and to explain its ontological, ethical, and other aspects. The fact is that the history of philosophy deals with the problems of plurality of philosophical systems, discourses, and traditions; in these terms, the dialogue is an interesting and significant transition to new forms in humanitaristics in terms of the interrelation of different national cultures [32, p. 542].

In this context, an important question is how the smart future is being explored and forecasted today – this issue was raised by the authors of the collective monograph “The Information Age. New Paradigms of Culture and Education” [5]. Let us agree with the justification, asserted by reputable culturologists, philosophers, and sociologists, of “transit methodology used for studying the actual culture (culture of the present) aimed not just at comprehending the organised, conscious/rational society and its universal structures, but at securing its fundamental variability, relativity and contextuality of actions in the conditions of instability and principal diversity of sociocultural reality” [Ibid, p. 23].

It is logical to argue that not only the “Big Science” but also the humanities should be dominated by meanings and values above all – that is, humanistic ones rather than rigidly focused on monetisation, colonisation of new territories and resources, trends that are gaining momentum. Many researchers in the West believed at the turn of the 21st century that the digital revolution was capable of creating a space of freedom from ideological and sociocultural constraints, enabling the development of “multiple identity” [22].

However, the practice of anonymity and multiple identity was strongly criticised by researchers and practitioners of the Internet culture, in particular by Kevin Kelly, editor of Wired and Silicon Valley theorist. One of the provisions stated by him became a kind of manifesto [35]. The founders of a number of Internet social platforms, such as Mark Zuckerberg (Facebook) and Eric Schmidt (Google), also proved to be the opponents of the idea of “multiplicity”. This situation was explained by Jan Van Dijk: “Platform owners have a direct interest in imposing a single online identity for achieving maximum transparency – not only because they want to know who their users are, but also because the advertisers want to have ‘truthful’ information about their users” [30].

The future of the cultural and civilisational world, which people construct themselves, is the priority field of the humanities. The fundamental values of this World are cultural norms pertaining to national identity and at the same time addressing diversity, which move forward and energise the world around, pushing its limits to the level of the modern cultural-civilisational paradigm. In this context, the notion of “socio-cultural identity” in the sphere of humanities acquires new characteristics and meanings.

Humanitaristics also highlights the problem of “filling in” and proper use of one’s spare time which becomes available due to the digitalisation of routine processes and reduction of work hours. Man’s opportunities for creative self-realisation in art and science are expanding, not only tangibly but also in the “distant-world” conditions – online. The humanities and cultural institutions are responsible for the quality of people’s free time. The arguments of researchers who assert that increasing the share of one’s leisure time can and, in principle, “should be used as a cultural initiative aimed, among other things, at improving the comfort of one’s living environment” are convincing [17, p. 128].
Yet one more factor of modernity should be noted. Today, the new media environment has led to a paradigm shift in people’s concept of reality, changing, as Drozdova states, “public space and communities, functional modes and mechanisms of the private sphere through the creation of new communication methods based on digital mediation. In a mediatised culture, the boundaries between the public and the private are fundamentally altered, creating a new mode of visibility for social cultures and subcultures” [31, p. 441].

In this regard, when constructing future scenarios, it is important to study, as noted by Rebecca Bryant and Daniel Knight, people’s “temporal orientations – reference points” that shape one’s actions at present time, making it possible to harmonise the comprehension of these reference points in the near and distant future [27].

A special role in the system of sciences is assigned to digital humanitaristics, as well as to interdisciplinary development of the humanities which will definitely grow in the future [8]. Digital humanitaristics increasingly records the fact of dynamic changeability and adaptation of traditional cultural institutions to the modern conditions of new media reality. This situation is analysed by Kim J. Barbour and Philip David Marshall [26], Jan Van Dijk [30], Douglas Rushkoff [41], and other scholars in their research presenting not only the idea of “virtual reality” and “cyberspace” but also a general concept of digital culture as a new paradigm of the information society.

Some researchers associate the phenomenon of digital culture with traditional objects of culture and art presented through the means of information and communication technologies; their concept includes electronic archives and libraries, virtual museums, multimedia reconstruction of monuments, semantic networks on the Internet, etc. The others state that it represents, above all, a qualitatively new socio-anthropological reality, which is something more than just instrumental use of technical resources: a fundamentally different digital sphere of human socio-cultural activity or a cultural reality of digital space acquiring new forms of communicative impact on man.

Some other researchers are also right, arguing that a modern social institution of culture, such as a digital library or a virtual museum, represents not just a repository of artefacts or a collection of graphic images reproduced on the computer, but a new Internet environment to which an individual grows accustomed. This means that electronic (digital) culture can be viewed as “a set of social institutes organised on the basis of modern information and communication technologies with the purpose to promote the logic of digital society based on electronic economy, politics, education and culture” [8, pp. 218–219].

Galkin gives the following definition of digital culture in his article published in the International Journal Of Network Culture Research “Russian Cultural Studies”: “It includes artefacts and symbolic structures based on digital coding as well as its universal technical realisation, totally incorporated into the institutional system and contributing to the preservation of certain values, fixed mentally and creating autodetermination forms” [3, p. 12]. At the same time, the author notes that digital culture is formed at several levels: material (things, gadgets, technological systems), symbolic (signs, languages, forms of communication), social (institutions, functions, associations), mental (cognitive schemes, identity, stereotypes), and axiological [Ibid].

This interpretation of digital or electronic culture emphasises the fact of factual establishment of the information society, the digital sphere of communication, and means
not only the use of new technologies but also the appearance of new opportunities for all spheres of the society in terms of expression and functioning, along with the changes in certain social relations, values, norms, and behavioural stereotypes.

**Discussion**

It follows from the analysis of the research results that the most debatable issues are those of digital humanitaristics and the prospects of digital culture. The thing is that modern technological knowledge forms an essential part of culture, being embedded in its new rituals and norms. Certain forecasts are true – on the increasing role of media culture and information values, on the actual art of media sphere management, the transformation of information into everyday knowledge, as well as continual renewal of communicative experience of everyday life. In this regard, the arguments justifying the emergence of “digital design culture” are true [5, 67]; the latter suggests that knowledge management should be integrated with new social media applications, educational video games, artificial intelligence functions, robotics, computer art and design, and a new generation of digital gadgets.

This is accounted for by the fact that the mediatisation of society has led to “rebooting” of the basic parameters of media consumption and has changed the semiotic conventions: information itself is becoming adapted to technical conditions of its transmission and reception. It is not by chance that Lev Manovich, having developed such notions as “media aesthetics” and “post-media aesthetics,” points to the increasing role of software and interface functions to be viewed as “physics of interaction” of the consumer with the new media, which becomes the core of new social and aesthetic relations in contemporary communication [12; 37]. Moreover, the fact that the users of social networks generate their own content and own versions of communication, to add to existing professional developments, is a new phenomenon of media reality [6; 23].

The everyday cultural practices of the 21st century have significantly altered the structure of contemporary media management and still are rapidly changing. They not only bring new concepts into its vocabulary (“blockchain”, “smart contracts”, “digital cities”, “virtual cultural space”, etc.), along with new methods of designing startups and managerial decisions based on fundamentally different online platforms, innovative information/communication spheres of distribution and exchange of “services/benefits” but also highlight the ethical collisions of the changing economic system. At the same time, the transformation of the “gift economy” (according to Howard Rheingold [16]) into modern digital formats of “like economy” becomes natural, which artfully conceals (according to Alexander Dolgin) the marketing tools involving consumers in “digital capitalism” [4].

The electronic trends form cultural action plans and online communities that complement civil society institutions. Presenting information in social networks, people open new online spaces for obtaining knowledge, as well as forms of symbolic exchange, which can yield economic and cultural benefits and new communicative platforms [Ibid]. The issue of individual and collective cultural practices and behaviour models based on a new hierarchy of values is becoming particularly relevant in the social-humanitaristic knowledge of the last two decades. “Risk forecasting”, staged trust and vulnerability
of freedom in the information society are indicative of the transition to a society with new characteristics – “normal anomie”. In such societies, norms that appear to be static self-replicating attitudes acquire characteristics of mobility, flexibility, and uncertainty. New virtual environments become a “norm of modern lifestyle – internetisation and mediatisation, marking a drift towards boundless freedom, often devoid of moral discourses”, note the authors of the monograph “Normal Anomie” in Russia and in the Modern World [15, pp. 254–255]. This means that “digital consumption of cultural content dictates new norms of the distanced world” [23, p. 160].

Combining different approaches to studying digital culture in the context of the new quality of cognising existence, as well as principally new forms of communication, it should be stated that this phenomenon can be defined as a “new type of transformational culture” conditioned, according to Astafieva and Razlogov, by “the development of the modern stage of electronic communications and expressed in the formation of new axiological and symbolic space providing due conditions for the establishment of new cultural practices and forms of human activity as well as due ways of personal identification, legal regulation of the society and the logic of economic diversity” [1].

While the general theory of culture in the digital age is refining its subject, structural/functional characteristics, and methodological tools, “applied culturology” is actively asserting itself, with its interdisciplinary and integrative potential opening new opportunities for comprehending the resources and risks of the electronic type of culture [Ibid].

This involves upstreaming the study of strategic priorities of global culture, digital transformation of the society, algorithms of formation, preservation, and use of digital cultural content, addressing the issues of digitisation of cultural heritage and memory, integration of electronic versions of traditional cultural institutions into the dynamically changing socio-cultural space, handling the issues of genesis of installations, new multimedia forms of artistic creativity [37].

The processes of mediatisation and internetisation of culture take a special place in humanitaristics, since the socio-cultural role and strategy of the Internet is increasing in the conditions of universal digitalisation, when people receive information and knowledge in fundamentally different formats than before. According to Kolin and Ursul, the modern digital age is developing owing to the need for information, while media technologies and networks become not just a subject of cognition but also a prerequisite for the very possibility of cognition, the condition for existence and cultural self-identification of man [10].

The “Internet Galaxy” – writes Manuel Castells – “is a new communication environment. And since communication is the essence of human activity all spheres of social life are subject to change. The new social form – network society – is spreading across the planet in all diversity of its varieties, demonstrating significant differences as to the consequences of this process for people’s lives, depending on historical, cultural and institutional factors” [7, p. 315]. While stating that “the Internet is a technology of liberation”, Castells at the same time notes that “it can give free rein to powerful forces of repression of those uninformed, it can facilitate segregation of values depreciated by the conquerors” [Ibid]. That is why, according to the researcher, a new system of education is needed, based not only on digital communication but also on new aspects of humanitaristics [28].
this regard, one of the most urgent problems of the information society is efficient use of the creative potential of media education [36] and digitalisation of the educational environment, which is becoming “a factor of personal and professional self-identification of students” [19, p. 422]. In these terms, the formation of media competence is the cornerstone of electronic education [38; 40]. This involves, according to Saman Talib, “a pedagogy of social media that uses the interdisciplinary approach to teaching multimodal digital literacy” [43].

Indeed, the use of social media as pedagogical tools at secondary and higher educational institutions attracts the attention of researchers working in the sphere of various humanities. Many essays on media education not only point to the fact that the Internet and smartphones have influenced the quality of education worldwide owing to different forms of interaction in the sphere of communications but also note their negative impact. The analysis of various sources, including literature, shows that many educators note increased destructive Internet addiction in adolescents and young people, manifested in the sphere of communication and leisure (online games, online shopping, etc.). Moreover, this situation aggravated during the COVID-19 pandemic which has escalated the debate around the problem [33; 34; 42].

However, the mediatisation of the society has not only influenced the modernisation of the educational system by offering new approaches to media education for individuals but also transformed the communicative culture of the society, significantly influencing the theory and practice of modern journalism, strengthening its media communication aspects, and developing the basics of “infographics”, “media aesthetics”, and other systems of the semiotic sphere [25; 29].

Thus, the concept of digital humanitaristics involving the use of computer-aided text analysis, big data processing, digital mapping, and 3D-modelling in historical, linguistic, culturological, and philosophical research is actively entering the modern sociocultural space. Smart institutions are beginning not only to integrate scientific information flows but also act as a coordinating structure for humanitarian research and design practices, including online interaction of scholars. That is, they become not only custodians of cultural and historical heritage but also providers of scientific communication, centres for organisation and dissemination of knowledge and digital literacy. This ground gives rise to new scientific and practical disciplines, such as Digital Humanitaristics, Digital Aesthetics, Digital Journalism, Digital Economics, etc. The logic of changes in cognitive processes under the influence of the new digital environment is also becoming a relevant research area.

Nevertheless, one should recognise the convincing position of those researchers who assert that humanitaristics, including modern pedagogy, faces many challenges in the context of the rapid development of the digital world. The solution to these challenges will determine “the direction of human evolution” and will show “whether the humanities will be able to reverse the trend of unconditional domination of artificial intelligence and development of algorithms to end in uncontrolled development field” [21, p. 576]. Man in the 21st century as well must remain a Human, not a robot. This largely depends on his spirituality and his worldview which cannot take shape without humanistic knowledge. This means that humanitaristics remains an important component of both scientific research and the whole system of personality formation.
Conclusions

Summarising the results of the study, the following should be noted.

1. The efforts towards the modification of humanitaristics have aggregated a number of academic disciplines into a single media science in the globalised world and have intensified the cultural and educational international exchange.

2. In doing so, the international cultural exchange highlights the importance of protecting the spiritual heritage received worldwide from previous generations and aims to realise the values and scientific achievements constituting the “cultural core” of what can be passed on to subsequent civilisations.

3. One of the global problems of this time – humanisation of social life – requires mankind to reconsider the content and status of sciences involved in the reproduction of its spiritual potential.

First and foremost, this applies to general humanities and socio-economic disciplines that realise important educational functions making it possible to form a humanistic worldview based on universal human values which are indispensable for building a positive image of the future.

4. In these circumstances, not only professional training but also the humanisation of education as a whole (both higher and secondary) is particularly relevant.

5. Regrettably, one may observe today a tendency to oust the humanities and social-cycle disciplines from the universities’ educational programmes and scientific research areas, although they have been the framework of science about man for many centuries, reflecting the system of spiritual values and purports constituting the basis for existence and development of the society.

6. This is why it is particularly important in the long run to revise the views on the importance of different humanities, socio-cultural, and artistic practices with the purpose to enrich spiritual reproduction and ensure the formation of the comprehensively developed harmonious personality.
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