

Veryaskina A. N.

RUSSIAN MENTALITY UNDER MODERN TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION

Abstract: The article introduces a system of interrelated requirements for the mentality of modern society, which promotes the development of the frame “science - technology - industry” and removes social risks. A comparative analysis of the "ideal" mentality, essential features of the Russian mentality and real mentality of the Russian society is carried out in order to identify degrees of conformity to the objective requirements of the modern technological revolution. Implementation of these requirements is concurred by the mentality that expresses the desire for freedom in organic combination with the ability to limit individualism, to combine with other people on the basis of environmental, social and political imperatives. The Russian mentality that traditionally helped to preserve the ethnic group in complex natural – geographical and geopolitical conditions, meets the requirements of the modern technological revolution at the deepest level that is of essence. Enhancement of the current gap between the real mentality of the modern Russian population and the essential features of the Russian mentality does not meet the objective needs of the scientific technical development and can lead to serious consequences.

Key words: “ideal” mentality; real mentality of the society; the Russian mentality; stereotypes system; values system; modern technological revolution.

The concept of “mentality” has been actively used in the western scientific idea since the XIX century and still have not recognized expanded definition. Among the variety of interpretations of this concept four basic approaches can be singled out.

Representatives of the first one interpret the mentality through such opposing categories as “unconscious” (L. Levy - Bruhl, L. Febvre, M. Bloch) – “conscious” (V. G. Belous). The desire to link the essence of mentality with the categories of faith (G. Boutou) or knowledge (O. G. Oexsle) is typical for the authors of the second group.

These essential characteristics of mentality as “contemplation” – “activity” are in the focus of the third direction of research. The current interpretation of mentality as the prism through which a person perceives the world (G. Boutoul) is quite atypical. Most authors (I. K. Pantin, A. P. Ogurtsov, V. Strogetsky, L. A. Zelenov, I. V. Mostovaya, A. P. Skorik) underline the active role of mentality.

Finally, according to the authors attributed by us to the fourth group “sustainability” – “variability” of mentality should be considered as the key characteristic. Awareness of mentality as the privileged field of “time of long duration“ (F. Braudel) implies that the Russian mentality

maintains its basic features up until today. Opponents of the described point of view claim that the former Russian mentality is destroyed and the new one is not formed.

To create an expanded definition of the “mentality” concept, in our opinion, it is necessary to distinguish the following provisions.

The mentality is a system of thinking stereotypes, sensuous and emotional reactions and behavior that are naturally interconnected on the basis of a single entity. The system of stereotypes is based on the system of values which are shaped by the objective conditions of existence of mentality subject. At a particular moment of social life a number of systems can be identified, each of them refers to a specific subject (individual, integrally understandable society, ethnic group, social group). If the task of researchers is to analyze the mentality of representatives of a generation or to analyze the mentalities of different social groups in the given historical moment, in this case it is necessary to consider stereotypes in terms of their mass distribution.

For characteristic of the the mentality of the ethnos the ability to provide its keeping has the primary meaning in different situations, at different historical stages of development. As a rule, this system of stereotypes is the most common for representatives of the ethnos and sufficiently resistant over time. However, the real mentality of the society may disagree with the mentality of the ethnos.

The mentality expresses the relationship between the individual and collective on the basis of human activity, its analysis may include the aspect of “personality-transpersonal”, “personality – society” and “interpersonal” aspect.

The mentality analysis seems actual in terms of compliance of its stereotypes and values with the requirements of modern technological revolution, the content of which makes up qualitative transformation of the frame “science - technology – production”.

Consider the essence of these transformations.

The first qualitative transformation occurs in science. It involves outputting of scientific knowledge beyond that part of the objectively existing reality in the frame of which the human body is formed and which is accessible to human perceptual knowledge.

According to V. S. Stepin specifics of the fourth global scientific revolution is the implementation of comprehensive research programs on the development of historically developing systems characterized by synergistic effects, essential irreversibility of processes. Particular attention is paid to natural complexes including a person as a component: objects of global ecology, biotechnology (mainly genetic engineering), the “man-machine” systems (including difficult information complexes and artificial intelligence systems), biomedical objects [7].

The second change related to the content of modern technological revolution lies in the emergence of a qualitatively new technology undertaking the function of the universal logical thinking specially designed for the processing of information and decision-making, “replacing” the

human brain and able to act any better than him [9]. Thus, in the development of technology there is the same tendency as in the development of science: the person's overflow beyond the region commensurate with himself. It can be traced in the growth of the information sphere, it is reflected in moving to digital storage methods, information processing and growing requirements to its quality and safety, the creation of intelligent systems and informopolises [2, p.11].

The third qualitative transformation is performed in the interaction of science and technology. It lies in “leader change” frame in conjunction with “science – technology” system with the advance of science than technology. Scientific knowledge is not just used in manufacturing and technology, but pave the way for their progressive development. The role of the “drilling” function of science (B. M. Kedrov) is so great that unless pre-cognitive activity would be impossible the emergence of nuclear energy, cybernetics, electronics, space exploration, bionics and others.

The fourth transformation is closely related to the previous ones, it takes place in the sphere of production. The changes occurring in science and technology today allow a person to get out of the direct production process, leaving behind the most important functions: general management, setting goals and objectives, general control of technology, its design, the choice of optimal solutions among the complete set of alternatives proposed by a computer, predicting outcomes, meaningful interpretation of the data obtained, development of new schemes and strategies for action.

The essence of these changes is the person's going beyond his proportionate part of the world, beyond the ordinary human experience. It manifests itself in a historically developing systems that are objects of postnonclassical science in processes of function transfer of universal logical thinking to technology and the human going out of the direct technological process. Movement beyond the “human world” has led to the development of forces capable of destroying all flesh controlled by human only by means of technical intermediaries. Provision of scientific and technological changes on the basis of social, political, ecological imperatives of our time, not least depends on the characteristics of the mentality of society.

Refer to the analysis of the “ideal” mentality in terms of the implementation of the technological revolution demands.

The first such requirement can be considered as the creation of conditions for development of prospective directions of science and technology without regard to the momentary efficiency and material gain. Consequently, the mentality should be characterized by predominance of spiritual over material values, by a sense of involvement to the fate of this society and the whole mankind (aspect of “personality – transpersonal”).

Furthermore, creation of conditions for application of scientific discoveries in production suggests an appropriate understanding of human labor activity and its social evaluation. The

mentality considered in the aspect of “person – society” should possess predominance of moral stimuli to labor over the material (the latter are not excluded, but they obey to the first). This feature gets its logical continuation in the understanding of social justice as the correspondence between individual's services to the society and social assessment of this individual while providing him the opportunity to realize his abilities.

Finally, observed in science and technology overrange of the man's proportionate part of the world requires a weakening of confrontation, convergence of interests of different social groups, nations, states. The mentality adequate to this requirement must involve certain features that characterize interpersonal relationships of individuals: patience, ability to understand the peculiarities of other cultures, respect the interests of other social groups, the coordination of positions, the primacy of strategic public interests.

Even brief description allows to see the similarity of listed features with the essential features of the Russian mentality identified by past and present philosophers. Basic features of mentality, ensuring the existence of the Russian ethnos on unprotected by natural boundaries of Eurasia, were to objectively express the desire for the free development of human as the goal, combined with the need to ensure the unity of the will and actions of many people. This dialectical contradiction is the basis of the essence of the Russian mentality [6, p.14]. In the aspect of “personality-transpersonal” it appears in spirituality. At the interpersonal level it appears in collectivism. Finally, the most important feature of the mentality that characterizes the relationship between the individual and society, is the state [3, pp.83-86; 8].

To what extent are the basic values of the Russian mentality viable at the moment? Refer to the experimental studies (“European Social Survey”, “Our Values Today”, “Valuable orientations of modern youth”, etc.). It should be noted that the specificity of the basic values of the Russian can show only large-scale cross-cultural studies. A historical analysis of the causes of defined set of values and resolution of conflicts arising from the interpretation of research results separated by a large time interval is needed.

Some data do not confirm the patience, a greater tradition and sacrifice (compared with the West) attributed to the Russian mentality. 51% of the respondents stand for collective actions and 49% stand for purely individual [1, pp.38-44]. Basic features of the mentality are less expressed among young people (only 9% of young Russians apply to the collectivist type of the mentality). There is a growing importance of “selfish values” (“power-wealth”, “Hedonism”, “achievement”) implemented through the prism of utilitarianism and pragmatism.

At the same time the mass consciousness clearly divides spheres of the material and spiritual, conceptually distinguishing the efforts directed on the physical existence and selfless

spiritual creation. Installation of mass consciousness on the saving role of the state retains the perception of the “I” in the unity of the motherland fates, power, personifying the empire [5, pp. 173-179]. “Universalism” and “benevolence” opposing “selfish values” are on the second and the third significance place [4, p.56].

The growing contradictions between the real mentality of the modern Russian population and the system of the Russian mentality can lead to serious consequences. The Russian mentality as a system of thought and behavior stereotypes can ensure the preservation of the ethnos in conditions that have not fundamentally changed since its formation. Often viewed as a sample features of the Western culture people mentality (individualism, achievement and consumer orientation) which have met the requirements of the first industrial revolution, today do not correspond in full to the needs of scientific and technological development. The Russian Government policy should be aimed at the study of the Russian mentality and reliance on its basic features in the process of transformations implementation due to the objective requirements of the technological revolution present stage.

REFERENCES

1. Andreev A. L. Value and worldview aspects of social inequality // SOCIS. – 2007. – Vol. 9. – P.38-44. (In Russian)
2. Dergacheva E. A. From technogenic society to social and technical and natural globalization // Srednerusskij vestnik obshhestvennyh nauk, 2010. – Vol. 4. – P.7-13. (In Russian)
3. Kuryacheva A. N. Russian mentality under modern technological revolution: methodological aspects: 09.00.11. Abstract of thesis cand. of philos. sci. – N. Novgorod, 2000. - 193 p. (In Russian)
4. Magun V., Rudnev M. Life values of the Russian population: similarities and differences in comparison with other European countries // Vestnik obshchestvennogo mneniya. Dannye. Analiz, Diskussii. – 2008. – №1(93). – P. 33-58. (In Russian)
5. Savruckaya E. P. Value orientations of the youth in the context of the State youth politics of Nizhny Novgorod region // Region v period modernizacii: strategii razvitiya: Materialy mezhdunarodnoy nauchno – prakticheskoy konferencii, 20.04.2012. – N. Novgorod: Izd-vo NISOC, 2012. – P.173-179. (In Russian)
6. Shulyndin B. P. Russian mentality and the state system // Gosudarstvennoe ustroystvo i narod. Dialog mirovozzreniy. Materialy mezhdunarodnogo simpoziuma. – N. Novgorod: Izd-vo VVAGS, 1997. – P.12-18. (In Russian)

7. Stepin V. S. Stepin V. S. Scientific rationality in technogenic culture: types and historical evolution // Voprosy Filosofii. – 2012. – Vol 5. – P. 18-25. (In Russian)
8. Veryaskina A. N. Modern technological revolution and society // Sovremennye problemy nauki i obrazovaniya. – 2013. – № 2; URL: <http://www.science-education.ru/108-8967> (26.04.2013). (In Russian)
9. Veryaskina A.N. Teaching Humanities in the conditions of the modern technological revolution // Perspektivy nauki i obrazovaniya. 2014 – №1(7) — URL: http://pnojournalfiles.wordpress.com/2014/02/pdf_1401161.pdf (07.02.2014). (In Russian)