

O.T. Arinova*

*Karaganda University of the name of academician E.A. Buketov, Karaganda, Kazakhstan
(e-mail:arinova.kargu@gmail.com)*

On the Problem of philosophical understanding of virtual reality.

The article provides a philosophical and historical analysis of the phenomenon of virtual reality from the standpoint of socio-cultural typology; an attempt is made to identify the specifics of the functioning of alienated reality, to show trends, changes and their features. The features of the philosophical reflection of G. Anders and J. Baudrillard in their relation to the otherness of virtual reality are considered. The article focuses on the identification and reflection of the forms of human alienation in virtual reality. The author of the article pointed out the problems and factors of the loss of individuality, the dominance of virtual communication, and the simplification of personal life. Through the methodological distinction between the concepts of “knowledge” and “information”, the position of the author of the article is presented, according to which the perception of information by a modern person is a phenomenon that is distinguished by ambiguity, reality, specificity of manifestations and is fixed in the concept of “information reality”. The article provides a brief methodological review of the ontological, epistemological, axiological problems of this new kind of reality from the standpoint of philosophy. The scientific position of the author of the article, according to some conclusions, is consistent with post-non-classical philosophy: the recognition of the idea of virtual existence and virtual reality as a special type of worldview, a new reality.

Keywords: philosophy, phenomenon, virtual reality, culture, dehumanization, society, alienation, information society, trends, values.

Introduction

“When the world comes to us, instead of us coming to it, then we are no longer this world, but are only happy consumers” [1]. The relevance of this statement by G. Anders in the work (essay) “Obsolescence of Man” / “Die Antiquiertheit des Menschen” is still obvious, since this world also comes to us, it is worth turning on the TV or accessing the Internet, the only question is whether we are “happy consumers”. We can be considered happy only from the position that the available sources of information, as a rule, are our property, and this gives us a sense of satisfaction from the possession of the subject and its capabilities. The first source of mass introduction of mankind to the virtual world was television, later – the Internet and other gadgets. To the question of what makes us happy in this information world: the information and the pictures that they give us no longer give happiness, but have become a habit. It should be noted that during the recent global pandemic, this habit is increasingly being replaced by the Internet and streaming giants (Netflix, etc.). Only in the 20th century did computers appear and the starting point of the phenomenon that we know today as “information societies” began. Informatization initially arose exclusively for the transmission, storage and use of information, however, over time, the function of creation, which was perceived as additional in this series, began to prevail and turned into an imperative of social development in less than a hundred years. Today, information resources have the status of strategic resources. Information is today, in the 21st century, the main object of study of many sciences, including philosophy. And, perhaps, it is philosophy that still stands on humanistic positions in solving those social problems for the sake of which computerization was called to life. Therefore, it is very interesting and methodologically important to review the main philosophical and ideological approaches to the phenomenon of virtual reality.

Günther Anders, in his well-known essay “The Obsolescence of Man”, one of the first authors, gives us a rather pessimistic conclusion that television, which was created as a means for the “happiness” of a person, (like any other means) has long ceased to be only a means (here is just one of the associations in this context: this is the idea that in their affections “first a person drinks wine, then wine drinks wine, and then wine drinks a person”, as Chinese wisdom says). And this fully applies to the delusion of man, that man himself controls what he himself created, invented. At the same time, imperceptibly, there is a transition first to the level of parity relations with its “creation” (whether real or virtual), and then to the stage when this alienated

* Corresponding author’s e-mail: arinova.kargu@gmail.com

entity begins to dominate its creator. Or another association: the English writer R. Stevenson in the novel "The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde" shows the same transition from control and management of his creation to submission to him and even death from him and along with him.

Summarizing different opinions, this approach should be called an anthropological and philosophical, and humanistic approach. It was this anthropological approach that was considered dominant by the founder of cybernetics, Norbert Wiener, who in his work "Cybernetics and Society" gave the following definition of information: "information is a designation of the content received from the outside world in the process of our adaptation to it and the adaptation of our senses to it" [2]. Thus, information is directly connected with us, people, and outside of us, outside of human consciousness – there is no information. In the 21st century, it has already become obvious that artificial intelligence does without a person and his consciousness in terms of the processes of obtaining and transforming information. Knowledge has a different nature compared to information and requires the construction of fundamentally new processing systems. The main feature of knowledge that distinguishes it from information is the ability to generate new knowledge. Knowledge and information are entities of different nature. There is another important "contra" argument in relation to the anthropological approach: the subject field of information cannot be limited to the "man-man" paradigm, since there is also genetic information of living nature, the exchange of signals in the world of flora and fauna, between cells, between man and artificial objects created by him, etc. That is why, among the ontological problems of modern philosophy, the problems of understanding the social, cultural, intellectual problems of the development of modern man, the state and prospects of his worldview are considered. The range of epistemological problems of modern philosophy in the context of information reality includes, first of all, the problem of the relationship between human intelligence and artificial intelligence. The phenomenon of artificial intelligence is not included in the topic of this article, however, the author considers it important to clarify that this concept is a metaphor for a whole complex direction of many areas of modern knowledge: from the creation of knowledge systems and dialogue in computers (which was the original idea of cybernetics) to imitation computer-assisted creative process of intelligence and automation of purposeful behavior of robots. By the way, we should not forget that the same N. Wiener in his other work "The Creator and the Golem" warned people against voluntary submission to "machines", because machines are "free from human limitations in terms of accuracy and speed" [3].

The axiological problem is another very important aspect in the study of virtual reality, since today it is obvious that the glorification of the mind, the assertion of the infinity of human knowledge as a guarantee of progress and the implementation of humanistic ideals, is being revised and tested. Reassessment and loss of the former meaning of the mind, the idea of "knowledge is power!" with the achievements of science, it is increasingly recognized as the creation of new ideas and ways of deceiving a person, as well as the creation of something that does not help a person become better, more humane, closer to each other, but only increases the alienation between people, and makes a person a slave to technology and deprives a person of individuality. Perhaps we are witnessing the emergence of the existence of a "one-dimensional man": this is how Herbert Marcuse showed modern man in the world of machines, a man who has lost his individuality and does not live by his own rules, but obeys general rules. That is, all people have become a special mass and have lost their individuality. At the same time, there is a rapid development of technology, the world has become universal, we are surrounded by the same things, we live in the same houses, we are told and shown the same thing, etc. Therefore, in our opinion, the philosophy of existentialism appeared and its founder S. Kierkegaard, one of the first philosophers, drew attention to a person, his real feelings, moods, experiences. The philosopher expresses sympathy for the person, makes an attempt to restore the integrity of the person, to destroy alienation. Kierkegaard spoke of "the hopeless tragedy of human existence" in this growing absurdity. And today we see an increase in the absurdity of this world that surrounds us: the simultaneity of the events of war and peace, the global pandemic, etc. And labor, professional activity is the loss of identity by a person, "separation (alienation) of a person and business" [4], which he is engaged in, as a result of which "the value of labor itself is lost" and the value of "selling one's labor" comes to the fore.

Today we have witnessed a rethinking of our usual values – understanding of science as a guarantee of progress, since new achievements in science, the accumulation of technologies lead to the destruction of nature and man. Philosophy from the point of view of the worldview also raises questions about why and where this or that discovery of sciences will be applied? For the good or for the harm of man? Is the great writer L.N. Tolstoy, according to whom "Of all the sciences that a person should know, the main science is how to live, doing as little evil as possible and as much good as possible?" [5]. Here is the opinion of the outstanding genetic scientist, academician Josef Riman, who for many years headed the National Academy of the

Czech Republic: “For the overwhelming mass of people, science becomes something intangible and therefore not very necessary”. The famous French virologist Pierre Grabar believes that “Unfortunately, the spirit of Pasteur is gradually disappearing. The youth, of which there are so many at the institute, do not think about preserving the old traditions. I'm talking about the tradition of academic, in-depth research, about work aimed at finding high scientific truth. The rhythm of life has accelerated, young people are in a hurry, they think very practically. They are assertive, purely business people» [6]. There is a well-known phrase by Ernest Rutherford that “a scientist should not serve science and mammon at the same time”, but at the same time, humanity has repeatedly witnessed that science is neither good nor evil, it is probably impossible to apply ordinary norms to science morals.

Research methods

To analyze the complex, multidimensional and dynamic situation regarding the perception of virtual reality in the modern world, the author of the article involved various sources of information, took a systematic approach to the consideration of various socio-philosophical concepts and scientific judgments on the perception and interpretation of the phenomenon of the information society. The consequence of the globalization of informatization processes in modern society has been a change in the content of our knowledge about the world, and the ways of obtaining, reproducing and transmitting it, which, ultimately, significantly affects the internal structures of the individual.

The article provides a review analysis that showed the presence of a spectrum of fundamentally new problems of virtual reality that require scientific research and philosophical reflection: polypositionality in relation to any event (own interpretation and from many other points of view), polysemy (personal self-identification and indifference of the individual to his objective being), in corporeality of objectivity (virtual reality is modeled in accordance with the needs of a bodily and existential nature and creates possible manifestations of human duality). Relevance, autonomy, interactivity, their generation by both human intelligence and artificial intelligence are highlighted as the main functions of virtual reality.

The conclusion is made about the fundamental change in the nature of human labor as a social consequence of the Informatization of society. Based on the analysis, an attempt was made to make social forecasts for the development of the information society.

The use of the comparative method made it possible to compare the opinions of various scientists on the issues of understanding virtual reality, to carry out a conceptual understanding of the problem and to express a proposal on the trends in the development of information technologies, the importance of a systematic approach, and building a model of social development.

Discussion

The thought of G. Anders that “If it (a virtual phantom, note of the author of the article) comes to us as an image, then it is half-present, half-absent, that is, it is a ghost” [1, 56]. It is difficult to disagree with the fact that this conclusion is still relevant. Today, digital television is a phantom, a new and different reality, like the Internet and mobile applications, in a word, virtual reality. In the history of philosophy, the ancient Greeks understood the concept of “phantom” as a ghost, an image. Television, which Anders originally wrote about, today coexists and is supplemented (if not replaced) by the Internet, is present in our lives and fragmentary, that is, semi-present and therefore semi-absent, we turn on and / or turn off the TV at any moment, then let in, then we exclude these images and this figurative reality from our lives. But at the same time, we have been integrating these images into our lives for a long time, they are present in us and we have to paraphrase A. Chekhov to improve through “squeezing a slave out of oneself drop by drop” [7], that is, to get rid of ghosts, which are our shortcomings and delusions. Here is what G. Anders wrote about this: “Without any struggle between the ghost and reality, the ghost won at the moment when the TV was brought into the house. He came, showed and conquered. The walls immediately became ghostly, family ties were broken, personal life perished” [1; 112].

Very true in philosophical reflection is the conclusion of G. Anders in “negative anthropology” that “If we can let him into the house (turn on) or let him out (turn off) at our will, then this is a manifestation of divine power” [1,120]. We already, indeed, decide for ourselves which television channel to turn on, what to refuse, what to choose, and we completely hold the buttons and information consoles in our hands. This makes us the holders of “divine power”. We have an illusion, a delusion, and this property of a person was accurately expressed by the great poet A.S. Pushkin: “But pretend, this look can express everything so wonderfully! Oh, it's not difficult to deceive me, I myself am glad to be deceived! [8]. He said it in a different

context, but we can interpret it that way. Or another biblical association: "... you will begin to see clearly and you yourself will become like gods – you will know good and evil!" [9]. So we think that we already know, that is, we know, and are able to distinguish between good and evil, holding remote controls from our TVs or digital gadgets in our hands and "dominating" information.

Being physically on the other, silent side of the TV screen or the Internet in smartphones, iPhones, tablets, etc., we are doomed, in philosophical terms, to be alienated from virtual reality. Not being able to express our attitude, give our assessment and correct something, influence, decide, participate, we are not free. Anders writes that man "thus pays for selling himself, his freedom. If the world turns to us, and we are silent, because we are condemned to be silent, then this means that we are not free" [1; 128]. In the context of "negative anthropology" [10; 134], lack of freedom – in the impossibility of influencing and changing, obviously turns us, people, into – idle onlookers–, that is, idlers watching TV. In comparison, for example, with radio as an audio source and other similar sources (for now I'm only talking about music, performances) that leave the "work" to the imagination, conjecture, completing images, even singing and singing along (speaking of music and songs), television gives ready-made pictures, in color, sound, form, space, etc. And there is no need to speculate, finish building, or finish anything.

The deprivation of individuality, uniqueness and originality of each person, turns even a person into a commodity. After all, who are media people, "stars" of show and television business, celebrity? As paradoxical as it sounds, goods, because they either "sell" themselves, enter into contracts as presenters and receive royalties, that is, the paid cost of themselves, or advertise other goods. The expressions "such and such is the face of our TV channel, our products, our brand" and so on have already become familiar. Anders, correlating the mass and the individual, writes that "Mass production for the mass man was gaining momentum more and more. Millions of listeners were served the same "food for thought". At the same time, they were addressed as indefinite beings – "people of the masses" and this characteristic property was assigned to each, or rather, the absence of all kinds of properties. A type of mass hermit arose. Each of them, cut off from the outside world, sits, one like the other, at home. But not in order to abandon the world, but in order, God forbid, not to miss anything that happens in it. Everyone becomes, as it were, a homemaker, albeit in a very special way, since his work – the transformation of himself into a mass man through the consumption of a mass commodity – takes place during leisure [1; 134].

This is related to the phenomenon of post-truth, which can be understood in our age of informatization, and as "descriptions of circumstances in which objective facts are less important in the formation of public opinion than appeal to the emotions and personal beliefs of people" (Oxford English Dictionary, 2016). The thematic spread of modern television clearly illustrates this, suffice it to say about the television presentation of local conflicts, political events, norms accepted by societies, etc. We are talking about "shifters" in the cause-and-effect relationships of presentation and coverage of events. In 1997, the film "The Tail Wags the Dog" / Wag The Dog / USA was shot indicative in this sense. Accurate statement. Especially when we are told about politically significant social events and use post-truth, which leads to the fact that the reproduction changes the original from which it originated. Anders wrote that "The fact that for us, radio listeners and TV viewers, the world no longer appears as the external world in which we live, but as our world, is already natural for us. Including for me. There is an idealistic element in this "for me", because "idealistic" means the world in me, in us. If the term "idealistic" is alarming, it is only because it denotes the existence of a person in common parlance, but here it denotes a situation in which the metamorphosis of the world is that I have what is created technically. When radio and television open a window to the world, they turn their consumers around the world into "idealists" [1; 89].

And at the same time, Anders does not claim the truth of his reasoning and conclusions, he just says that he is trying to resolve the contradictions found, to find answers and a way out. This allows us today to look for examples and draw analogies, to try to find some answers. I think that we become idealists in television existence (as well as in Internet existence) because by appropriating this virtual world, a reproduction of events, we not only alienate ourselves from the real events themselves, from their eyewitnesses (Anders very interestingly talks about the loss of authority by humanity in face of travelers, eyewitnesses of events, etc.), but also from real selves, since we become part of a mass of people, and at the same time we are alone at home, alone. Perhaps this dichotomy should be understood as that we, as it were, individually consume and consume mass products and at the same time contribute to their mass character, and the reproduction of reproduction can only produce reproduction. However, is everything so pessimistic and negative in the ontology of our being today?

It is worth agreeing with the opinion that computers, the Internet and iPhones are already both phenomena and part of social life. Moreover, they constitute a directly separate reality in which people, we, communicate, store, transmit information, in fact, we live in this new digital world. Probably, we can confidently talk about the virtual existence of all of us, in any case, during the global pandemic. I think that being itself, and space, and time, and the meaning of life – have become different in this reality. Everything is being rethought, and philosophers are talking about new existences, taking into account such a factor as the World Wide Web (World Wide Web /WWW/Internet), which has existed for a little over thirty years. Today we can say that the world has become networked, that the network or the Internet has become a special world in which human existence is carried out. Where does our day start today? From iPhones, smartphones, computers and the Internet, with the words “Did you see yesterday on Instagram, Facebook, Telegram?”, which means that events are first reflected there and only then comprehended. If at all, they make sense. After all, very often, all comprehension comes down to a set of hashtags and comments on the principle “whoever spoke first, the “truth” follows”.

I think that the psychology of people, humanity is changing. And the purpose for which the World Wide Web was created – to globalize the world, fragmented and divided by borders, that is, to connect people spatially and in time, has played a cruel joke on humanity: we have become mobile, we are in an endless stream of messaging, we are impetuous. But we have become impersonal, we reveal ourselves in this “network world” under “nicknames” and hashtags, “avatars” and “icons”. We are and we are not the total alienation of man in virtual reality. People are afraid to miss something, not to “fast”, to fall behind. Financial markets have long moved online, leisure activities have moved online, you can work remotely and via the Internet, and so on and so forth. During the global coronavirus pandemic, after almost two years of communication using computers, iPhones, smartphones via Zoom, Microsoft Teams, when a person was reproduced, his appearance, voice, intonation, we are now experiencing a strange feeling during direct, “live” communication: it turns out that we are not only “talking heads” in the screen of a laptop, iPhone, but whole beings – people. Even the perception of a person by a person has become different, transformed. Philosophical understanding of this phenomenon, through a comparison of the points of view of J. Baudrillard and G. Anders, according to E.M. Spirova, allows us to conclude that “the choice in favor of artificial intelligence has already been made. And the only thing that protects the world from extinction is the dual nature of man. Normal human existence always exists in dependence or resistance of its model, in constant challenge, in opposing energy... If duality leaves a person, then... the existing world will be replaced by a world of technology without a person. The conclusions of J. Baudrillard are consonant with the ideas of G. Anders. A person can save himself and not disappear from this world only if he does not lose his own humanity, albeit an imperfect natural uniqueness. Simplifying himself to a technical object, a person himself denies himself the right to exist [10; 140]. It is no coincidence that the expression “brains in a barrel” appeared, the emergence of which is associated with the name of the American philosopher Hilary Putnam and which expresses skepticism regarding a person’s confidence in the reality of his existence. And this idea excited the minds of mankind long before the bestseller of the film industry – “The Matrix”, since the 20s of the XX century, when the first fantastic story on this topic by the Soviet author A. Belyaev “Professor Dowell's Head” was published (later, in the 80s years, a feature film was made based on this story), and in the 60s the film “The Brain That Wouldn't Die” was released in the USA. The idea of these fantasy novels is understandable and leaves in memory an ambiguous and disturbing feeling due to a terrible and inhuman experiment on people, when, without asking their permission and wanting to discover a method of immortality, they transplant the heads of people doomed to death onto other people's healthy bodies with other people's memories, and they live only as heads, feeding on some special solution. According to Putnam, man (and mankind) may not suspect that he exists only in the form of “brains in a barrel” [11], and we understand that Putnam's statement is an intellectual provocation, he is trying to reach out to humanity, which is increasingly immersed in this “barrel”, closer to the situation of the “Matrix”, and it seems that he does not even really mind that a super-smart computer, a certain Matrix, ruled his life. And not even life, but the feeling and feeling of this life. How was it in The Matrix? There is one moment that is striking: when the Matrix says that at first people were given feelings of grief, suffering, and then they were unhappy, and then the Matrix finalized the program and began to send impulses of happiness and pleasure to people connected to it, and everything worked out like this that people are now happy in this reality that doesn't really exist. That is, people do not need reality, because it is unpredictable, tragic, dangerous and finite. What else is Putnam talking about? About how cognition is possible at all, because the fact that all sciences began with – with Rene Descartes statement “I think, therefore I exist”, which became a support in the world of the unknown – is called into question in our era, the era of infor-

mation reality. Descartes emphasizes the idea of his existence as a reality and proof of such existence, and from here he concludes that what becomes the object of my thinking is real. And Putnam raises the question that thinking is possible without physical existence, which takes sensations from reality, and this very reality can be impulses of artificial (computer) intelligence. That powerful breakthrough that humanity made in the 20th century, this rapid development of technology, made it possible to make the world universal, including for us – stereotyped and mass. The advent of television and the Internet has exacerbated this phenomenon, because we receive identical information. What are we now and where is our individuality? We may have become the “one-dimensional people” philosopher Herbert Marcuse warned about because we live in a one-dimensional world. It seems that this is also happening because a huge flow of information is pouring out on all of us and this information needs to be simply perceived every day, processed (at least somehow), and this takes away our independence of thinking. Is there a way out of the “one-dimensional reality” to overcome the “one-dimensionality of man?” I think that yes, there is, and it lies in relying on the very mind that all philosophers have been talking about throughout the history of human thought: a person must learn to compare, compare different points of view and different sources of information, try to develop his own position, without repeating other people's thoughts and words, probably, to refuse or, more precisely, to be able to periodically refuse some mass sources of information, communicate more with living people, listen and hear different opinions. The situation with the global pandemic still needs to be understood, but we can already note two opposite development trends that it has generated: on the one hand, the pandemic has returned us to each other, to paper books, to live communication, to walks and to nature, which we surround. On the other hand, the pandemic and quarantine have totally drawn us into remote digital technologies. There is something to think about and something to rethink.

Conclusion

In the context of this article, the author constantly recalled the wise words of S. Freud that “The task of making a person happy was not part of the plan for creating the world.” And in this regard, it is necessary to single out and analyze the most disturbing trends in global Informatization for humanity, including the problem of selecting reliable information and the problem of adapting people to the environment of the information society. And here again we are faced with a reassessment and loss of the former meaning of such values as trust in information and the authority of information sources. What is meant by reliability of information? Reliability of information – something that shows the quality of information, reflects its completeness and accuracy, has such features as intelligibility of written and oral speech, the absence of false or in any way distorted information, a small possibility of erroneous use of information units, including symbols, bits, figures, etc. In other words, reliability is characterized by the undistortedness of information, the authenticity of information and the adequacy of the methods by which it was obtained. And now we live in a world of unreliable information and its conscious, deliberate, thoughtful distortion. Why is this extremely important and why does it have a value, meaning of which has been revised in the 21st century? Because decisions are based on information! It is philosophy that draws our attention to the factor of information sources, their authority and, therefore, perception as a value. These sources are: individuals who, due to their authority or position, have access to such information that is of interest to various kinds of mass media; the documents; real environment; virtual environment; printed publications (textbooks, books, encyclopedias, etc.); sites on the Internet, portals, pages, etc. There was a division of sources into competent and incompetent. For example, authorized representatives of official structures of government and state institutions here should be exactly the competent sources for us of objective and accurate information, complete information, i.e., reliable. However, they can be falsified, unreliable. Therefore, today to receive information does not mean to trust it completely or at least with a high degree of probability. This is exactly what we are seeing today. The significance of authorities has been lost, including in the person of the authors of the 19th and 20th centuries, both politicians and great figures of culture, philosophy, and science. And this, in many respects, was facilitated by the modern information space, which plunges us into some kind of bottomless ocean of tiktokers, instagrams, and so on. Reading and thinking about the thoughts and works of Tolstoy, Chekhov, Dostoevsky, Faulkner, Dickens, Balzac, etc. is work, time, and you open an iPhone, a smartphone, the Internet and – everything is ready, without burdening yourself and me, somehow they sing, teach something, broadcast something. And most importantly, they fill the entire information space. The question “What will the 21st century give up?” has become relevant for our time. And, for example, the famous historian Yuval Noah Harari answers this way: “The best advice I could give is to invest in your own adaptability. All your investments – learning this or that skill, for example, programming – are a lottery. You don't know for

sure if this or that skill will be useful to you, but in times of chaos, you will definitely need emotional resilience, the ability to survive all these changes. I don't know of any university that teaches this." [12].

Summing up the considered methodological approaches: both the Cartesian position "Cogito ergo sum", Anders' "negative anthropology", and Putnam's "brain in a vat", we come to a number of conclusions. The meaning of Rene Descartes' statement is not to doubt one's existence (being) due to the presence of a thought about this existence. And I will immediately continue the previous thought: after all, even the thought that I may not exist is already proof, according to Descartes, that I exist. If I am not, then there will be no thought of me. And since there is a thought about me and my existence, then I am. And the more I talk about this statement of Descartes, the more I understand that perhaps he anticipated somewhere both the ideas of the Matrix and "brains in a vat", because, according to the logic of Descartes, we are not talking about my obligatory body, my thoughts are enough and this is the proof of my existence. Perhaps Descartes did not identify knowledge and being, in the sense that knowledge is untrue, changeable, because I perceive my body and my existence as a person, very subjectively, it often fails me, does not suit me, even irritates me, but thoughts, they are arranged differently: perhaps that is why new images of a person and his body, and his images in literature, painting, music, etc., arise from this source. If we continue this thought, then first comes a thought, an idea, and then the word as an embodiment and other embodiments. And about the body, the poet Osip Mandelstam asked: "Given a body, what should I do with it? So single and so mine..." Or William Shakespeare in "Romeo and Juliet" says through Juliet: " 'Tis but thy name that is my enemy; Thou art thyself, though not a Montague. What's Montague? It is nor hand, nor foot, Nor arm, nor face, nor any other part Belonging to a man. O, be some other name! What's in a name? That which we call a rose By any other name would smell as sweet!"

It seems that the philosophical ideas of Rene Descartes are not accidentally considered the beginning of modern sciences, the affirmation of sciences, scientific knowledge. For when he affirms, "I think, therefore I am", he moves away from taking something on faith, as was the case in the Christian religion, from believing in authorities, traditions and customs. Pushkin once wrote in *Godunov*: "Great in custom is strength! A custom for people is a scourge or a bridle", saying that this loyalty and blind adherence to traditions and customs, without adjustments and revisions, without accepting the new, is a dead end for the mind, for thinking. And the famous Socratic "I know that I know nothing" is also a challenge to this blind following, for which Socrates was executed, because he dared to question the inviolability of the old faith and authorities. It is possible that in this new worldview situation for humanity, our reference to Descartes is methodologically and worldview correct: in addition to the priority of thought, the Cartesian raises for humanity, first of all, the question of the openness of knowledge. And provided that the priority of the individual is preserved as the most important moral principle of the emerging information civilization, humanity should not be pessimistic about the further course of its history: according to Y. Masuda from the Japan Institute of the Information Society, new information technologies will entail fundamental changes in the value orientations of people to take into account interests of all mankind and modern society will turn into a polycentric global society based on collectivism and competition.

Список литературы

- 1 Гюнтер Андерс. Устарелость человека: сб. «Мир как фантом и матрица» / Андерс Гюнтер. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://old.kinoart.ru/archive/2005/02/n2-article10>.
- 2 Винер Норберт. Кибернетика и общество: сб. / Н. Винер. — М.: AST, 2019. — 288 с.
- 3 Винер Норберт. Творец и Голем / Н. Винер; пер. М. Арон, Р. Фесенко. — М.: AST, 2018. — 292 с.
- 4 Фромм Эрих. Человек для себя / Эрих Фромм. — М.: AST, 2018. — 320 с.
- 5 Толстой Л.Н. Полн. собр. соч. — Т. 64 / Л.Н. Толстой. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://rossasia.sibro.ru/voshod/article/31838>.
- 6 Выдающиеся ученые о познании. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://iknigi.net/avtor-kollektiv-avtorov/132167-vydauschieyua-uchenye-o-poznani-kollektiv-avtorov/read/page-5.html>.
- 7 Чехов А.П. Письмо к издателю и журналисту А.Ф. Суворину (7 января 1889 г.) / А.П. Чехов // Полное собрание сочинений и писем: [В 30 т]. — Т. 3. Письма, октябрь 1888—декабрь 1889 г. — М.: Наука, 1976. — С. 131–133. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <http://chegov-lit.ru/chegov/letters/1888-1889/letter-579.htm>.
- 8 Пушкин А.С. Признание / А.С. Пушкин. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <http://pushkin-lit.ru/pushkin/stihi/stih-494.htm>.
- 9 Библия. Бытие 3:5:22. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://allbible.info/bible/sinodal/ge/3/>.

10 Спирова Е.М. «Негативная антропология» Гюнтера Андерса, или Кризис прометеевского проекта / Е.М. Спирова // Вестн. Калмык. ун-та. — 2020. — №4 (48). — С. 134–143.

11 Германова В.А. Понятие «виртуальная реальность» в философском знании / В.А. Германова // Вестн. Ставропол. ун-та. — 2009. — № 5. — С. 215–221.

12 Юваль Ной Харари. Sapiens. Краткая история человечества. / Харари Ной Юваль. — [Электронный ресурс] — Режим доступа: https://librebook.me/sapiens_kratkaia_istoriia_chelovechestva/vol2/2/.

О.Т. Аринова

Виртуалды шындықты философиялық түсіну мәселесі бойынша

Мақалада әлеуметтік-мәдени типология тұрғысынан виртуалды шындық құбылысына философиялық және тарихи талдау жүргізілген, шындықты жатсынудың жұмыс істеу өзгешелігі, өзгеру тенденциялары және олардың көріну ерекшеліктері айқындалған. Г. Андерс пен Дж. Бодрийярдың виртуалды шындықтың пайда болуына қатысты философиялық рефлексиясының ерекшеліктері қарастырылған. Виртуалды шындықта адамды жатсыну формаларын анықтауға және рефлексиялауға баса назар аударылған. Жеке тұлғаны жоғалту, виртуалды қарым-қатынастың үстемдігі, жеке өмірді жеңілдету мәселелері мен факторлары көрсетілген. Білім мен ақпараттың жалпы әдістемелік айырмашылығы арқылы мақала авторының ұстанымы көрсетілген, оған сәйкес қазіргі адамның ақпаратты қабылдауы, яғни «ақпараттық шындық» түсінігінде бекітілген оның жан-жақтылығымен, шынайылығымен, көріністерінің ерекшелігімен ерекшеленетін құбылыс болып табылады. Философия тұрғысынан шындықтың осы жаңа түрінің онтологиялық, гносеологиялық, аксиологиялық мәселелеріне қысқаша әдістемелік шолу берілген. Мақала авторының бірқатар тұжырымдардағы ғылыми ұстанымы виртуалды болмыс пен виртуалды шындық идеясын дүниетанымның ерекше түрі, жаңа шындық ретінде танудағы постклассикалық емес философияға сәйкес келеді.

Кілт сөздер: философия, құбылыс, виртуалды шындық, мәдениет, азғындану, қоғам, жатсыну, ақпараттық қоғам, тенденциялар, құндылықтар.

О.Т. Аринова

К проблеме философского осмысления виртуальной реальности

В статье проведен философско-исторический анализ феномена виртуальной реальности с позиций социокультурной типологии, выявления специфики функционирования отчужденной реальности, тенденций изменения и особенностей их проявления. Рассмотрены особенности философской рефлексии Г. Андерса и Ж. Бодрийяра в их отношении к инобытию виртуальной реальности. Сделан акцент на выявлении и рефлексии форм отчуждения человека в виртуальной реальности. Указаны проблемы и факторы потери индивидуальности, доминирования виртуального общения, упрощения личного бытия. Посредством общеметодологического различения знания и информации представлена позиция автора статьи, согласно которой восприятие информации современным человеком есть феномен, который отличается многоплановостью, реальностью, спецификой своих проявлений, что фиксируется в понятии «информационная реальность». Дан краткий методологический обзор онтологических, гносеологических, аксиологических проблем этого нового вида реальности с позиции философии. Научная позиция автора статьи в ряде выводов согласуется с постнеклассической философией в признании идеи виртуального существования и виртуальной реальности в качестве особого типа мировоззрения, новой реальности.

Ключевые слова: философия, феномен, виртуальная реальность, культура, дегуманизация, общество, отчужденность, информационное общество, тенденции, ценности.

References

- 1 Giunter, Anders. Ustarelost cheloveka: sbornik «Mir kak fantom i matritsa» [Human obsolescence. Collection “The World as a Phantom and Matrix”]. Retrieved from: <https://old.kinoart.ru/archive/2005/02/n2-article10> [in Russian].
- 2 Wiener, Norbert. (2019). Kibernetika i obshchestvo: sbornik [Cybernetics and society: collection]. Moscow: AST [in Russian].
- 3 Wiener, Norbert. (2018). Tvorets i Golem [Creator and Golem] (M. Aron, R. Fesenko Transl.). Moscow: AST [in Russian].
- 4 Fromm, Erikh. (2018). Chelovek dlia sebja [Man for himself]. Moscow: AST [in Russian].

5 Tolstoy, L.N. Polnyi sbornik sochinenii [Complete collection of essays]. Vol. 64. Retrieved from: <https://rossasia.sibro.ru/voshod/article/31838> [in Russian].

6 Vydaiushchiesia uchenye o poznanii [Outstanding scientists about cognition]. Retrieved from: <https://iknigi.net/avtor-kollektiv-avtorov/132167-vydayuschiesya-uchenye-o-poznanii-kollektiv-avtorov/read/page-5.html> [in Russian].

7 Chekhov, A.P. (1976). Pismo k izdateliu i zhurnalistu A.F. Suvorinu (7 yanvaria 1889 g.) [Letter to the publisher and journalist A.F. Suvorin (January 7, 1889)]. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem [V 30 t.]. Tom 3. Pisma, oktiabr 1888–dekabr 1889 godov — Complete collection of works and letters [in 30 volumes]. Volume 3. Letters, October 1888–December 1889*. Moscow: Nauka. Retrieved from: <http://chehov-lit.ru/chehov/letters/1888-1889/letter-579.htm> [in Russian].

8 Pushkin, A.S. Priznanie [Confession]. Retrieved from: <http://pushkin-lit.ru/pushkin/stihi/stih-494.htm> [in Russian].

9 Bibliia. Bytie 3:5:22. [Bible. Genesis 3:5:22.]. Retrieved from: <https://allbible.info/bible/sinodal/ge/3/> [in Russian].

10 Spirova, E.M. (2020). «Negativnaia antropologija» Giuntera Andersa, ili Krizis prometeevskogo proekta [“Negative Anthropology” by Günther Anders or the Crisis of the Promethean Project]. *Vestnik Kalmykского universiteta — Bulletin of the Kalmyk University*, 4(48), 134–143 [in Russian].

11 Germanova, V.A. (2009). Poniatie «virtualnaia realnost» v filosofskom znanii [The concept of “virtual reality” in philosophical knowledge]. *Vestnik Stavropolskogo universiteta — Bulletin of Stavropol University*, 5, 215–221 [in Russian].

12 Yuval, Noah Harari. Sapiens. Kratkaia istoriia chelovechestva [Sapiens. Brief history of mankind]. Retrieved from: https://librebook.me/sapiens_kratkaia_istoriia_chelovechestva/vol 2/2/ [in Russian].

Букетов университет