УДК 101.2
DOI 10.17726/phillT.2019.1.16.6

Ландшафт российской цифровой философии: обзор дискуссии[1]

Чеклецов Вадим Викторович,
кандидат философских наук,
факультет философии и социологии ЮЗГУ,
Курск, Россия

chekletsov@gmail.com

Аршинов Владимир Иванович,
доктор философских наук, ИФ РАН,
Москва, Россия

varshinov@mail.ru

Аннотация. Статья основана на дискуссии в русскоязычном сегменте специалистов по философии цифровых технологий и смежных областей. Была поставлена задача собрать список философских проблем цифрового мира, выработать подходы к их классификации. Полученные вопросы были сгруппированы по нескольким принципам: цифровое измерение традиционных областей философии (цифровая онтология, эпистемология, антропология, социальная философия и т.д.), философские проблемы отдельных крупных трендов цифровых технологий (ИИ, Интернета Вещей, Виртуальной и Дополненной Реальности, Видеоигр и т.д.), отношение к уровням сложности (киберфизический, кибербиологический, киберсоциальный), использование философских методологий, основных инструментов продукции и распространения философских текстов и некоторые другие.

Ключевые слова: цифровая философия; цифровизация; философия технологий; социальная оценка техники.

[1] Публикация подготовлена при поддержке Гранта РНФ № 19-18-00504 «Социотехнические ландшафты цифровой реальности: онтологические матрицы, этико-аксиологические регулятивы, дорожные карты и информационная поддержка управленческих решений».

Landscape of Russian digital philosophy problems: Discussion overview[1]

Chekletsov Vadim V. [a],
Philosophy Department, South-West State University, Kursk, Russia
chekletsov@gmail.com

Arshinov Vladimir I. [b]
Interdisciplinary problems of technological development, Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia
varshinov@mail.ru

Abstract. The article is based on the round table[2] (9 April 2019, Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow). The main topic of the round table timed to International Internet of Things Day (IoT Day) was «Digital Philosophy Millennium Problems» by analogy with David Gilbert/Clay Institute mathematical Millennium Problems list. Presentations and discussion have been made by more than twenty academic researchers from different fields of philosophy and non-academic digital professionals (engineers, designers, programmers, managers, businessmen). After the round table we have conducted a survey by email and social networks with more than one hundred Russian speaking researchers (from humanitarian and technical side). Also, we gather opinions by open facebook channel for digital specialists and general public from Russia and abroad. In result we have generalized philosophical problems, concerning digitalization and made some methodological work for these issues classification and reflection.

Keywords: digital philosophy; sociotechnical problems; internet of things; philosophy of science and technology; technology assessment; STS.

[1] Publication was prepared with financial aid of Russian Science Fund grant, project № 19-18-00504 «Sociotechnical landscapes of digital reality: ontological matrices, ethical and axiological regulations, road maps and information support of management decisions»

[2] Video available on https://youtu.be/WmglTvgDjZY.

Introduction

Vadim Chekletsov, PhD, Executive Director of the Russian IoT center

Our round table is timed to International Internet of Things Day (www.iotday.org). In Russia we have organized this event for the eighth time. Topics of past IoT Days were often specific. For example, one year on the conference around Internet of Things for digital precise agriculture the participant from Timiryazev Agricultural Academy showed our philosophers body sensors for piggies. It was actually funny and nonusual for this place (Institute of Philosophy). Themes of such conferences in other years were convergence of Internet of Things with blockchain technologies and AI, big data, e-health, Industry 4.0, Internet of bionanothings[1], IoT security, safety and sustainable development. This year we decided to take into consideration a very broad theme to highlight general landscape of philosophical problems of interest to Russian academic and nonacademic philosophical community. Let's introduce a scientific secretary of our meeting, Ulyana Strugovscikova-Bichkova, PhD, sector of interdisciplinary problems of scientific and technological development of Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences.

Vladimir Arshinov, D. Sc, sector of interdisciplinary problems of scientific and technological development of Russian Academy of Sciences

I'll say a few words about new Umwelts digital design, Life Worlds as a new multi-perspective landscape, and opportunities for their (communication) connectedness. In answering this question, I will confine myself to mentioning the so-called «topological turn «that is taking place in contemporary socio-humanitarian studies. There were such concepts (research directions) as social topology, topology of culture. And even earlier, in the mid-30s of the last century, Kurt Levin proclaimed topological psychology. In the recent double issue of «THEORY, CULTURE, SOCIETY», which is almost 350 pages long and is entitled «Topologies of Culture», the leitmotif is «culture is becoming topological». And further: «the influence of the topological approach in social and cultural theory is enormous. Topological ideas are a source of inspiration, encompassing many social Sciences, including philosophy, sociology, political science, anthropology, geography and Economics.»

[1] See for example I. F. Akyildiz; M. Pierobon; S. Balasubramaniam; Y. Koucheryavy. Internet of bio-nano-things. URL: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/7060516.

In particular, it is noted that «topological ideas help break down the view that technology and society occupy different areas by introducing instead a heterogeneous assemblage (Assembly) that heterogeneously combined (composed) social, technical, and natural entities» (Latour). Needless to say, culture in many ways becomes topological due to the variety of semiotic glues that arise, in turn, due to the formation of digital reality, changing (again) in turn (recursively) and the very ways of human (yet) thinking.

Speakers

Next speakers were: Vladimir Budanov, head of sector of Interdisciplinary problems of technological development, Institute of Philosophy. Russian Academy of Sciences; Irina Aseeva, head of Philosophy Department, South-West State University, Kursk, Russia; Olga Popova, D. Sc, head of the sector of humanitarian expertise and bioethics of Russian Academy of Sciences; Elena Gavrilina, PhD, associate Professor of Bauman Technical University; Efim Ostrovsky, Virtual Metropolis Project; Elena Aster, venture producer, MIPT; Julia Sineokaya, D. Sc, vice head of Institute of Philosophy, head of the sector of history of Western philosophy; Yekaterina Yadova, PhD, Moscow Business School; Nikita Konopaltsev, Digital Problems Department of Institute For Dialogue Of Civilizations; Elena Grebenshchikova, D. Sc, Head of the center for scientific and information research on science, education and technology INION RAS; Yuri Cherniy, PhD, head of the center for the study of Informatics INION RAS; Evgeny Bykov, HSE school of philosophy; Alexandra Argamakova, Ph D., the sector of social epistemology IPH RAS; Alexander Sokolov, D. Sc, Professor of Ryazan State University$ Roman Belyaletdinov, Ph D., the sector of humanitarian expertise and bioethics$ Taras Kretyuk, Soundscape Lab$ Elena Yaroslavtseva, PhD, IPH RAS$ Anton Titov, Head of CryptoBI in TX Advisory$ Alexandra Kasakova, PhD, Bauman Technical University.

Then followed questions to speakers from guests[1] and free discussion.

(Video available on https://youtu.be/WmglTvgDjZY)

[1] Mantova Alexandra, Giro Alexander, Afanasenko Pavel, Shlykova Olga, Bashilov Georgy, Fei Maria, Solano Nelson, Makarov Stanislav, Senatorov Yuri, Khangareeva Alina, Ostrovskaya Svetlana, Kosov Ivan, Lyubetskaya Marina, Lyubetsky Nikolay, Zabalueva Alexandra, McFly Nik, Gavrilov Alexander, Ivanov Dmitry, Ananiev Vasiliy. Prokophuk Georgiy, Fillipov Andrey

Approaches to problems classification

All gained philosophical questions around digital problems were ordered in several ways. One is classification by a particular field of digital technologies: philosophical issues of Artificial Intelligence, Autonomic Vehicles, Internet of Things, Augmented and Virtual Reality, Video Games, digital manufacturing, smart cities, ehealth etc. Another way is to highlight classical philosophical directions in digital tech perspective: digital ontology, epistemology, ethical and legal anthropology, cultural and social studies, semiotics, logic problems, research and development politics, interdisciplinary problems, communication theory. Third way based on levels of «3C» reality: cyberphysical, cyberbiological and cybersocial. In addition, we think about philosophical methodologies (phenomenological, analytical, constructivist, comparativist etc.) transformation in digital era, about new digital ways of philosophizing per se and new philosophical actors.

Most widespread problems in Russian philosophical community are media culture, media hygiene, digital education, clip like consciousness, world/digital rapture, evolution of truth in the era of big data, communication with AI.

I. Classical philosophical directions in digital tech perspective

Digital ontology and metaphysics

Is a nature of our Universe fundamentally digital? Digital physics fundamentals. Multiplicity of ontologies, their consistence, coexistence and communication. Digital object statuses. Nature of Network. Object oriented ontology. Digital cosmology and teleology. Digital immortality. Quantum digital reality (nonlocality and entanglement, complementarity and uncertainty principles, observer inclusion).

Digital epistemology

Teleepistemology real-virtual relation referential problem: how to prove or false real objects and events digital representations? How to understand a nature of big data hidden patterns – are they related more to a studied processes or to information system own features? Digital semantics and categorizations. Digital signs and tags. Discrete/continual in digital world. New analog: connectivity, processuality. Categorization. Search engines, news feeds and messengers information bubbles.

Digital anthropology

Changes of perception, mentality and communication in the digital age. Identification and identity. Body/Avatar relations. Virtual love and sex with other humans or robots. Digital health. Life tracking. Cyber-Umwelts of humans, posthumans, animals, plants, insects and microorganisms. Digital common senses and common places. Digital, mental and physical disabilities. Neurodiversity.

Digital social philosophy

Interfaces design. Emergence of collective subjects new forms. Distributed ledgers and smart contracts for sustainable society. New forms of digital social spaces. Violence in social networks. Digital precariat, netocracy and sharing economy. Hybrid landscapes. Choices and orientation in multiverse of systems and networks. Hackers ideology. Open source, open code. Digital communism.

Digital culture

Arts and humanities digital transformations. Media culture, ethics and norms. Digital subcultures. Non-anthropocentric approaches (things, plants, animals turn). Digital ethnographic studies. Digital feminism. Education and chilhood.

Legal problems

Rights and freedoms in the Net. Data transparency. Body bio- and health data regulations. Open science and tech data. Identification and control. Artificial subjects, digital collectives and smart objects agencies.

Cybersemiotics

Signs, icons and tags for humans and machines. Quantum semiotics. Semiotic junctures for digital sociotechnical systems. Augmented and virtual reality semiotics.

Interdisciplinary problems

Interdisciplinary transfer of results and methodologies from biological sciences to the design of Industry 4.0 complex systems. Cultural studies around archaic consciousness for a new digital «magic», animistic media reality. Alchemy studies for digital manufacturing. Quantum theory for digital systems.

R&D politics studies

Safety and sustainability of R&Ds. Open databases. Transparency of data flows (observing of observers). Freedoms and rights of digital Identifications. Consequences of global digital geopolitics (lows of Internet restrictions in different countries). Personal scoring problems.

II. Philosophical issues of some particular digital technologies

Artificial Intelligence

Autonomous vehicles agency and responsibility. Is General AI possible? AI perception, feelings and qualia. Love and sex with robots.

Internet of Things

Is the unified language of things possible? Interoperability and communication between different standards and protocols. Universal ontological categorization. Identification and identity. Observing observers, controlled transparency. What has to be disconnected?

Augmented Reality

Layer choose. Attention control. Metageografic ethics and privacy. Safety of crowd dynamics.

Smart Cities

City of control vs. City of trust. Digital ecology. Decentralized societies.

Digital manufacturing

Human/machine needs balance (abundance economy planning with basic income). Open data. Digital object ontological status.

Ehealth

Safety of biodata. Sufficiency of AI and telepresence care. Transformation of precautionary medicine. Insurance ethics.

Distributed ledgers (blockchain etc.)

Principles of decentralized societies sustainable development.

Smart contracts

Management without managers. Companies without humans.

Social networks

Digital stigma. Profiles of dead persons. Cyberbulling.

Identification

How to make integral ID for person without accentuation on one side (biological or social)?

Videogames

Physical/Virtual, Social/Virtual coevolution. Identity and experience. Freedom.

Artificial life

Can we create completely autonomic evolution which complexity is equal or higher than biological one?

III. Levels of «3C» reality

Cyberphysical, Cyberbiological, Cybersocial

IV. Philosophical approaches transformation in digital era

Phenomenological, Analytical, Constructivist, Comparativist, others.

V. Ways of philosophizing

Features of youtube philosophy, facebook philosophy, messengers philosophy, instagram and snapchat philosophy. Is coding, digital art performances or indie games creating new philosophical action?

VI. New philosophical actors

How and for what AI, neuronetworks, artificial life agents, videogames components, raising animals etc. will create their own philosophical views? Philosophy of digital entangled collective subjects.

VII. Beyond beyond

World without philosophy. Something radically new.

Additions

When we are asking non academic people about main philosophical question of digital era, most of them say the following: What kind of things fundamentally can not be digitalized? Soul? Love? Sense?

In our way the anthropological and socio-philosophical perspective of the digital technologies is the formation of new forms of intersubjective, subject-object and inter-object communications. To revalue ratios of the material/virtual. In particular, the need to rethink (including in ethical and legal field) definitions, rules of functioning, value systems and boundaries of responsibility emerging new types of collective subjects – both with and without human intervention.

Smart city design shows how openness and involvement of the publicity in the development and social assessment of technologies can make innovative solutions more human-centered. The concept of «wise

city» was introduced, in which such characteristics of smart cities as energy, transport, etc. efficiency are complemented by socio-cultural, historical, semantic dimensions of urban landscapes. Highlighted experience of neurodiversity in teams of technologies advanced studies. The case of trends in the development of modern ID technologies and the economy of decentralized manufacturing in the context of the inclusion of people with special needs is considered. It is concluded that the new urban technosocial body is not as material as process. Processuality as a key property of the network node objects, when the identity of the subsystem is determined not by the frozen morphology, structure of the actor, but by the complexity and richness of connections with other identities. Decentralized communication is able to solve the difficult problem of identification of human personality, including people with special needs, in a complex urban environment.