

SCTCMG 2019

International Scientific Conference «Social and Cultural Transformations in the Context of Modern Globalism»

COMMUNICATION AND ROLE OF MAN IN MODERN SOCIETY

Larisa Perevozchikova (a)*, Mikhail Chernikov (b), Evgeniya Avdeenko (c), Ksenya
Nazarenko (d)

*Corresponding author

(a) Voronezh State Technical University, 84, 20 years of October Street , Voronezh, Russia
perevozch@vgasu.vrn.ru

(b) Voronezh State Technical University, 84, 20 years of October Street, Voronezh, Russia
mv.chernikov@gmail.com

(c) Voronezh State Technical University, 84, 20 years of October Street, Voronezh, Russia
jjaane@yandex.ru

(d) Voronezh State Technical University, 84, 20 years of October Street, Voronezh, Russia
petrenkoksenia@vgasu.vrn.ru

Abstract

The article shows the role of man in modern society and analyzes the problem of personal communication. A special place in the study is given to the vital needs of individuals. The article provides a definition of social responsibility in human behavior, which is the content of the basic principles of human social responsibility as a person, allowing revealing the concept of social communication as a multifaceted phenomenon that fills the corresponding historical period with particularly relevant content. Today, compared with the past, the unity of mankind has increased, the existence of which dictates its own requirements for the individual, certain social groups, society and states. Various transformations have created a problem of social responsibility. It becomes obvious that humanity can not benefit from the process of internalization of civil society, gradually emerging global problems are practically not solved. All these philosophical judgments are described in this article. It is shown that today in Russian society there is a crisis of the structure of traditional basic values, due to the increasing influence of European civilization. This means expanding freedom, independence, initiative, on the one hand, and on the other, insufficient responsibility of citizens for their personal actions, desire to shift responsibility from the state to certain categories of the population.

© 2019 Published by Future Academy www.FutureAcademy.org.UK

Keywords: Society, state, person, information, philosophy.



1. Introduction

Modern society is an objective condition of human existence. The objective social context of being of a modern person is created by his life activity mediated by the use of modern technologies. Their role in the life of both the individual and society as a whole is marked by the expansion of the spectrum of mediation. The total penetration of technical progress into all spheres of society's life initiates the transformation of established social relations, which also implies the transformation of the social type itself. However, the connection between technical and social is not one-sided: the existing type of sociality also in turn has a direct impact on the technical being. This is reflected in the fact that society sets the socially acceptable framework for the operation of technologies. The interrelation of technical and social creates a complex, multifaceted problem of their correlation (Ashmarov, 2009).

The shift of emphasis towards the anthropogenic type of sociality as a potential source of civilizational risks urgently requires philosophers to carefully, deeply and responsibly study modern society. However, the humanitarian and philosophical discourse on issues related to equipment and technology is in itself insufficient. It is necessary to take into account that in society at least there are two more significant discourses: technocratic and natural science. And the dialogue between representatives of all these types of discourses is especially important in the present epoch of global changes taking place against the background of a rapid change in technological civilization, the current stage of development of which is expressed in the introduction of man to industrial society (Berdyayev, 1990).

2. Problem Statement

The article solves a problem that allows revealing the fact that modern society has a number of socio-cultural characteristics that influence the formation of a personality and thereby determine the specificity of the personality of a modern person. The social structure of modern society is characterized by the destruction of stable social relations, atomization and mass character. The lack of "personal" communication between people leads to the formation of a personality of a new type - a closed individual, which is included in social relations only in the form of work or rest, and therefore socio-economic factors mainly determine his life. In this situation, the cultural sphere is also built using economic principles and is not dominant in the development of society (Gaidenko & Davydov, 1991).

That is why modern society should become a distributor of mass culture, which is characterized by integrity and strengthens the social and living space of a person. In addition, we note that the nature of social information has changed, now it is built on a model of advertising, that is, these are short semantic blocks containing some elementary content.

3. Research Questions

The problem of the role of man in society was posed in ancient and eastern historical and philosophical science. In the European tradition, these are mainly the opinions of such scholars as Herodotus, Thucydides, Plutarch, Guy Suetonius Tranquill, Guy Sallustius Crisp, Quint, who were historians at the empirical level. Scientists analyzed the activities of specific historical characters (Creuse, Themistocles, Pericles, Alexander the Great, Guy Julius Caesar, Nero) and revealed errors that these people made. Here,

theoretical questions were raised: what is the place of government in the political hierarchy; are they independent individuals in history (Thucydides) or "toys" of external forces (Herodotus) (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1997).

In the Middle Ages, the traditions established in antiquity continued to develop in the works of various thinkers. However, their search for a solution to the problem of the role of man in public life took place on a different ideological basis: under the significant influence of Christian theology. Here, at a new level, ideas of the influence of supernatural forces on the lives of people, including "great personalities", were reproduced. At the same time, some medieval historians continued to solve the problem of the role of man in the historical process from secular positions. They revealed serious shortcomings in the activities of specific rulers, indicated ways to correct them. A positive aspect of this approach was the use of the comparative analysis method, which made it possible to compare the actions of historical figures of the present and the past. As an example of this tendency, it is advisable to cite the works of Procopius of Caesarea (6th century), who in his work *The Secret History* not only criticized the actions of the Byzantine Emperor Justinian, but also revealed their similarities and differences from the actions of other rulers of the Roman Empire (Ilyin, 1992).

Villarduen, who lived in the 13th century, like many ancient thinkers, identified the personality of the ruler and the state he led. It should be noted that the problem of the role of personality in philosophy was realized in the Middle Ages not only from theological or empirical, but also from theoretical points of view. The scientist Jordan put forward the hypothesis that the actions of the rulers are always the result of historical events.

Thus, in the Middle Ages, thinkers intensively sought solutions to the problem of the role of man in society, both within the framework of theology and beyond.

In the 18th century, philosophers were interested in another question: how to make the ruler "enlightened"? Since the thesis about the most important role of the ruler in history was not in doubt, therefore they were looking for ways to improve it morally. In the XVIII - XIX centuries the problem of the role of the individual occupies a special place among the questions posed in philosophy. As a result, two opposing concepts were formed in philosophy. Some thinkers denied or minimized the role of the individual in society, put his actions in a tough dependence on external material or ideal factors. Other on the contrary, recognized this as a maximum, up to voluntarism. Discussions of supporters and opponents of these positions are still ongoing (Kantor, 1997).

At the beginning of the 20th century in Russia, at the theoretical level, the problem of the role of the individual attracted the attention of leading scientists. After 1917, for ideological and political reasons, this problem was considered mainly in accordance with the Marxist approach. In the late 1980s - early 1990s the problem of the role of personality is reinterpreted basing on new methodological positions. Some works even proclaim the thesis of the decisive influence of certain people (V. I. Lenin, I. Stalin) (Krasilshchikov, 1988).

Then interest in this topic in philosophical literature decreases. Selected works on this topic are now published. Some are predominantly empirical, fixing the perception of rulers in the mass consciousness of Russians in different historical periods. Others reveal the role of man in society on the basis of various methodological approaches: general systems theory, synergetics.

4. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the research is to identify the role of a person's personality, which is a system of social and spiritual properties of the individual, where genetics is based on natural inclinations, is individually formed and manifested in various activities and social relations; personality includes psychological, social and cultural subsystems. The psychological subsystem of the personality includes its internal structure and the processes occurring in it. The social subsystem determines the status-role characteristics of the personality and the nature of its interaction with society. The cultural subsystem includes the content of the personality, which consists of significant symbols, values, norms, etc. (Markuze, 1994).

5. Research Methods

The theoretical and methodological basis of the research is based on a combination of interpretive and critical paradigms. The first paradigm allows certain phenomena and transformations to be found in the historical process and to link them with social and philosophical concepts formed in social theories. The second paradigm uses the theory of Weber, which involves the transition of different states to a more progressive development of society. Cultural, social, gender methods are used to identify typical personality traits that are formed by society at a certain stage of development.

The critical paradigm corresponds to the prevailing social reality, which exposed a number of negative aspects of the general spread of consumer ideals. The Marxist theory is used, revealing the methods, which show the principles of consumer ideology and reveal the interests of bourgeois elites.

6. Findings

Characteristics of the integrity and fragmentation of the personality depend on the socio-cultural conditions in which the personality develops and acts. In addition, the process of socialization of the individual has changed in modern society. Traditional institutions of socialization have lost their meaning or transformed, ceasing to perform their functions. New institutions of socialization (mass media and the Internet) are streams of unstructured and contradictory information and, therefore, cannot contribute to the formation of a holistic picture of the world. In addition, new institutions of socialization are technologically mediated and, therefore, do not represent personality conditions for existential communication, and any other person or phenomenon appears in them in an abstract, artificially constructed form. Consequently, the fragmentation of the modern personality is due to the very socio-cultural structure of modern society. And this is the main paradox of modernity. For successful adaptation and activity in modern society, personality requires such qualities as activity, independence, ability to plan one's actions, etc. The prerequisite for finding all these qualities is the integrity of the individual, but at the same time, the conditions of socialization and being in the current conditions do not allow to form this integrity (Polyakova, 1990).

Thus, in the new technological conditions, prerequisites should be created for a normal, adequate human existence, i.e. a correspondence has been reached between the technical development of society and the conditions for the full-fledged formation and existence of the individual at present, social and cultural

institutions do not ensure this compliance. Being essentially the creatures of the past, "pre-information" era, they cannot cope with the "challenges" of time.

The fundamental characteristic of personality is its integrity. The problem of the integrity of the individual was first posed within the framework of Russian religious philosophy. Domestic thinkers developed an understanding of the integrity of the individual as "wholeness", i.e. the harmonious unity of all internal aspects and the external activity of the individual, which is not actually achievable, but sets an ideal to be pursued. Developing the ideas proposed by the Russian religious philosophy, we concluded that the integrity of the personality is a unity of worldview orientations, manifested in the autonomy of the personality, its responsibility for its actions, reflexivity, self-esteem, openness. At the same time, the antipode of the concept of "integral personality" is the concept of "fragmentary personality", i.e. a person whose elements conflict with each other and do not constitute a coherent picture of the world (Merezhkovsky, 1991).

7. Conclusion

Today, only Western countries have entered the post-industrial stage of social development, but it would be wrong to assume that the problems analyzed in this article are the prerogative of these countries only. Thanks to globalization, the whole world in one way or another influences the processes taking place in the depths of a post-industrial society.

Therefore, speaking of a person in society, analyzing the characteristics of his existence, exploring the problems he faces in the new millennium, we, by and large, describe ourselves. However, one should not forget that modern society is an objective development process based on its own identity. Therefore it is necessary not only to recognize oneself in the emerging image of a person of a new era, but also to try to give an answer how a person influences the changes taking place.

References

- Ashmarov, I. A. (2009). "Man" in the history of economic studies. *Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo tekhnicheskogo universiteta. Bulletin of the Voronezh State Technical University*, 5(1), 26–29.
- Berdyayev, H. A. (1990). *The Origins and Meaning of Russian Communism*. Moscow.
- Gaidenko, P. P., & Davydov, Y. N. (1991). *History and rationality. Sociology of M. Weber and the Weberian Renaissance*. Moscow.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. V. (1997). *The Dialectic of the Enlightenment. Philosophical fragments*. Moscow.
- Ilyin, I. A. (1992). *Our Objectives: The Historical Fate and Future of Russia. Articles 1948–1954*. Rarog.
- Kantor, V. K. (1997). *There is a European power. Russia: the hard way to civilization. Historiosophical essays*. Moscow: ROSSPEN.
- Krasilshchikov, V. A. (1988). *After the past century. The development of Russia in the XX century. In terms of world upgrades*. Moscow: ROSSPEN.
- Markuze, G. (1994). *One-dimensional man. The study of the ideology of a developed industrial society*. Moscow: REFL-book.
- Merezhkovsky, D. S. (1991). *In the still waters: Articles and studies of different years*. Moscow: Soviet writer.
- Polyakova, N. L. (1990). *From a labor society to an information society: Western ideology on changing the social role of labor*. Moscow: Nauka.