

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEW COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES: ITS HUMAN RIGHTS EDUCATION CHALLENGES IN THE CURRENT CENTURY

ENRIQUE NIETO SOTELO¹

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

The main problem, caused by this new technology are social-cultural implications, is that the current way in which are used those technologies, has impacted the classical values promoted by the human rights. The cyber technology is not only a social and revolutionary technique, but also implies flashbacks on themes like social equality, tolerance, liberty, and justice. First, it is necessary to deepen on the cultural implications of these processes, considering its positive and negative aspects (about the perspective of human rights). The purpose is to explore possible new questions and answers to respond these complex problems. That's why, it could be a good solution to face successfully this situation, to develop and promote a new way to understand and teach the human rights perspective.

KEYWORDS

Human Rights. News technologies of communication. Human-cultural consequences. Systemic irrationality. Digital demean. Ecocide.

I

Approach to the problem and methodological perspective:

“The man is historical in its being same (E. NICOL). It is to be in process. If something allows understanding the ontological nature of man are the categories of possibility, to be in power, contingency. It leads to non - being in its own being; so, but it may be otherwise. The animal, on the other hand, is what it is; It has a defined. Inherent in being human in-determination factor is nothing more than his freedom (...). Only man can human being and in-human; only the can deny its being or affirm it, never default, and unlimited ways. With your freedom, you can ascend or descend to the lower forms of existence (PICO DELLA MIRANDOLA viewed). The free status opens the eternal alternative” (GONZALEZ, 2005: 102-103).

¹ Bachelor's degree and master's degree in Sociology by the University National Autonomy of Mexico (UNAM), Specialization in human Rights by the Institute of Human Rights (Faculty of law) in the Universidad Complutense (Madrid, Spain); PhD candidate in social sciences from the Universidad Autonomy Metropolitana (UAM-Xochimilco). He has been teaching at the Bachelor's degree in sociology and Director of the **journal sociological Act** at the Facultad de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales, UNAM; teaching in the UAM-Iztapalapa (Department of Sociology). He is currently a Professor - researcher at the Universidad Pedagógica Nacional (UPN-city of Mexico/Ajusco), Area diversity and interculturality, teaching the courses of socio-environmental problems, human rights, peace education, Sociology of human rights.

INTRODUCTION

New multimedia communication, in re - routing of the already traditional Media (film, TV, radio), based on the new digital technologies are decisively influencing social and cultural interactions when less of the West and the elites of non-Western countries, which are part of the cultural hegemony of the present-day capitalism. Practically are very few social spaces and regions of the world, public and private, which have not penetrated and influenced.

In this latest cultural transformation of the second decade of the 21st century, put in question the dominant actors interested politically and economically in that direction (transnational corporations), presented as inevitable, remaining ancient freedoms and human rights, conquered over the centuries by mankind (today estimated that the oldest traces of humanity back to 300 thousand years ago). Human rights are threatened, unwound by the power of market mechanisms, criteria of profitability and the pragmatic utility.

Facing this direction technocratic, rational-instrumental, dehumanized, unidirectional of globalization, driven by these regressive cultural changes, fundamental rights, like the right to information and to knowledge, cultural diversity, must hold and resist.

These threats to fundamental rights require a vigorous defense, since until now there is no any contrapose by the sectors most weak and vulnerable in society (the majority of the world's population of more than 7 billion humans), voiceless and invisible, unconnected, mediated too, of the benefits of cultural, educational and technological development.

This problem adds stately - new-liberalism and deregulatory policies, imposed since the eighties of the last century in the global society. At the same time, Imperial and subsidiary or peripheral States use the NTC as massive instruments monitoring their own citizens (political opponents) and friendly Governments and adversaries (cyber-espionage), under the pretext of the fight against terrorism and organized crime.

New habits, beliefs and social practices, ways of apprehending and des-apprehender, children and young people, contrary to fundamental rights, such as social trendsetters, monolithic, fundamentalist, in the market, and behaviors such as a Autism, narcissism, necrophilia, cyber bullying, the impoverishment of language, digital addictions, intolerance; that promotes this cultural market, give account of the close link between technology and ideology.

The global cultural space becomes a battle field. Intolerance, inequality social, educational, cultural, economic, political, the private appropriation of the knowledge are the background geopolitics and military the conquest of productivity and economic growth, social equity and sustainability, supported by new technologies. An instrumental vision of the “rationality” and the calculation of capital, opposes the critical reason, ecology, environmental conservation (human health and the planet), the solidarity, the biological and cultural diversity, as an essential part of the right to life of all species, the right to information, the defense of public goods, the common good, democracy, tolerance, pluralism, freedom of information, the socialization of knowledge (as opposed to its private appropriation).

Particularly education on human rights (when values higher), can be a powerful guiding compass, before the loss of the “sense” and the “significations” (“values”) virtual cyber-space and the mega data, ordered by the big electronic corporations and the model of irrational consumption alienated, media, imposed with the arrest warrant

uncritical from a large number of social actors, including the educational. This is vital to make continuous critical reviews of the new hegemonic model technologic-cybernetic and dehumanizing, of signs pragmatic and irrational, and promote pluralistic and democratic directions to own globalization, focused currently on economic values and interests and profits of capitalism transnational.

These are some of the questions that we can do from the perspective of human rights. Their ethical principles inspiring, such as *dignity, freedom, fraternity, autonomy and privacy of persons* (children, young people, adults), will continue to be moral values “superiors” for new “generations”, against anti-social behavior (cyber-addiction, autism, necrophilia, narcissism) and other (dementia) psychopathology and social pathologies that are conducive to the NTC uncritical applications.

II

In the second decade of the 21st century, the scientific and technological revolution (applied science), presents *progressions and regressions*, lights and shadows, contradictions, between a fragmented, complex, creative scientific thought purposes “humanist”, and on the other hand, use of scientific advances and knowledge purposes “destructives”, militaristic domination of peoples, cultures and destruction of biodiversity (commercial use).

A scientific practice without awareness, and epistemologically fragmented (explained by MORIN). Natural and social sciences, in turn, have contributed, more quickly the first, its services, economic productivity and economic growth without environmental sustainability (economic fundamentalism). A chasm separates scientific advances, most jobs as arm integrated capital (BRAVERMAN) and the State primary, barbarian, of a range of social, no solidareis, unequal, unjust relations, violate human rights, in different coordinates of the world, West and East, North and South, between groups, social classes, ethnicities and cultures, gender and age.

It is also true, that a part of the natural and social scientific knowledge has paid off, beyond the fragmentation of knowledge, towards a thought dialectical, complex, creative, eco-friendly, providing solutions, which often are not taken into account by the international power relations, which control the global destination. In such a way that there may be theoretical-practical solution proposals, that they are not considered by power remains unanswered, since agents that do not respond to the interests of social class of dominant groups.

For example, the difficulty of altering consumption patterns irrational systemic scale planetary. It is clear that the progress of science during the 20th century and the first decades of the 21st century, we have been given light on the origins and evolution of the universe (quantum *Astrophysics*), breaking traditional paradigms of modern physics; knowledge of the human genome and other species, as part of the biological-genetically evolution of life (biodiversity); *ecology* as interdisciplinary science, has shown us the enormous struggle, cooperation, organization, dependency, co-dependency between living beings, broadening the knowledge of the ecosystem, as a living, particularly complex and fragile body, at the same time.

The social sciences have been reorganized, rethinking their ideological, cognitive, epistemological assumptions about the historicity of the knowledge of the social reality and their “myopias”, subjectivity, - objectivity, rationality - irracinality of the knowledge (WEBER; BAGÚ).

Homo sapiens, has become, not only a subject characterized by the potential use of reason, but also a “subject” attached to the dictates of the “unconscious”, with drives aimed to (life) Eros or Thanatos (death), discovery largely developed by FREUD². We can also look with more candor, human barbarism of the twentieth century, the century of disaster and war, from the perspective of the homo *sapiens-demens* (MORIN); or *homo-videns* (SARTORI), the latter, a being that it has left from “think”, because of the new technologies of the self (FOUCAULT), and paralyzed with new communication technologies of the 21st century, with new forms of mass control and market, consciousness, into a single, totalitarian, dogmatic, thought closed, linear, one-dimensional, mono-cerebral.

The process of rationalization (disenchantment / rational adaptation of means) modern, whose origins were discovered by Max WEBER, in “the Ethic Protestant and the Spirit of the capitalism”, as a process specifically “Occidental”, based on the rational organization of work and rational, preceding morality “burgess” law, has led us throughout the 19th and 20th century various revolutions, industrial-technological. In them, science became, be an outer arm of capital and productivity, for increase of the

² The theoretical influence of S. Freud, founder of *psychoanalysis*, occurs practically in many fields of the social sciences (Sociology, Politics, and Anthropology), Arts and Humanities (literature, music, painting, etc.) throughout the 20th century. For the subject that concerns us, the social and cultural consequences of the NTC from the perspective of human rights, (specifically in its pitfalls: how to overcome violence and war, xenophobia, racism, human destructiveness?) in this second decade of the 21st century, and to the understanding of our time, are particularly valuable contributions to the **analysis of culture** (“*Totem and Taboo*”, 1912; “*Beyond the Pleasure Principle*”, 1920; “*Group Psychology and the Analysis of Ego*”, 1921; “*The Future of an Illusion*”, 1927; “*Civilization and its Discontents*”, 1930), principle among other many works of “social” nature and culture (cf. RUITENBEEK, 1978: 13-14). By the mid-20th century, J. LACAN, in France, proposed a return to Freud, starting from the “speech of Rome” (26-27/9/1953):

“(…) One of the constant concerns of Lacan was having worked on the restoration of the Freudian originality of the experience of the unconscious under the slogan of one as bold as the following hypothesis: the unconscious is structured like a language. May even be considered that this is the fundamental assumptions of all the theoretical elaboration Lacanian, if only because that proposition presupposes as it embodies the sense of return to Freud to Lacan did not expressly recommend since the beginning of his teaching” (Cfr. DOR, 2000: 19 and ss.)

E. FROMM, takes up the relationship between the instincts of life and death (Eros/Thanatos) Freudian with biophilia (love of life) and necrophilia, compulsion to death, which separates disintegrates, destroys the living structure:

“(…) the ethical biophilia has its principles of good and evil. The good is everything favors the life and evil is whatever serves to death. The good is reverence for life, all that exalts life, growth and development. And evil is all that drowns the life, reduces it, stripped it (...). Destructiveness is not parallel to the biophilia but its alternative. The love of life or love to death are the fundamental choice that confronts every human being. Necrophilia is and increases to the extent that truncates the development of biophilia. The man is biologically equipped with the ability to give it biophilia, but psychologically has the potential to necrophilia as a workaround.

The psychological need for the development of necrophilia as a result of the paralysis must be understood in relation to the existential situation of man (...). If man cannot create anything or move anyone, if you cannot break their total narcissism and its isolation prison, only you can rid of the sense of vital impotence and nothing asserting himself in the Act of annihilate life which is unable to create. Does not require great effort, patience and care; destroy everything what is needed are strong arms, a knife or a gun” (FROMM, 1970: 361-362).

New questions arise with the scientific and technical capacity of the second decade of the 21st century, with respect to the human creative capacity (or destructive) in fields as diverse as biogenetics, development of weapons of mass destruction, robotics, the artificial intelligence. The problem lies specifically in the field of human rights, “perverse” of some subjects (common criminals or heads of State), which are considered above the law (positive, natural, religious), the standard, morality, especially “destructives”, as many “pathologic” cases in the social and individual history.

exploitation of the work, not its decline or “elimination” (MARX), in arm “intern” of it, not only in the field of technology (BRAVERMAN), but also in the educational superior, with the encouragement of careers and professions, universities, technological, scientific and applied, research institutes, public and private Centers, for such purpose (productive transformation without equity social, unsustainable, environmentally).

There is a dialectical, complex, interaction between the process of humanization (ENGELS) and work. The technology, from the stone to the cyber age, has molded the human culture-societal and has also produced intergeneration’s, retroactivities (BAGÚ) between the subject and the culture and society, transforming them quantitatively and qualitatively, through the social space-time.

The human brain has not been unchanging throughout this interaction (plasticity), from the evolution of language and human intelligence, until the cyber society. However, against these “evolutions”, the “technological society” had their regressions, among them, you will discover facets necrophilia’s (FROMM) and process of dehumanization, in the field of cellular, personal communications, “pathologies”, “perversions” a high content “narcissist”, particularly among young people (Millenniums), which has led to the extreme a tendency already pointed out by HOBBAWM, individualism and extreme selfishness, already present, in its origins, in the bourgeois liberal ideology. This trend, which is contrary to the moral values of human rights, contradicts social solidarity, fraternity, empathy, cooperation, global citizenship, environmental sustainability.

This selfishness stands as obstacle, sometimes impassable, to the collective improvement of the “perverse” contemporary social reality, towards a global democracy, favoring the dominant powers, interested in maintaining the status quo immutable (economic productivity without social equity), with irrational and unsustainable consumption patterns (for example the widespread use of plastics, petroleum, the planned obsolescence).

III

Currently different tendencies, the “hops” regarding various social sectors place ideologically in technologies in general and the communication will outline in particular. First, should mention, that the “technologies”, are not ideologically “neutral”, have the intention, “use”, “purpose”, (formal and informal) objectives.

As mentioned previously, for big transnational capital, technology becomes a productivity increase, in an internal arm of the same, calculation of capital, in instrumental rationality (adaptation means/ends), for the increase of the profit, without ethical considerations of the “social good”, of the “common good”, or “social justice”, or the environmental sustainability.

At the same time, an idyllic view of the promises of technology, applied science, underpins the “elimination” of human exploitation, through the modernization, but it is a promise “fuse”, as noted by MARX in *Das Kapital* (volume I), in the second industrial revolution, where productivity and the exploitation of labor multiplied, to replace the work of hundreds of factory workers by the introduction of textile machinery, in the second half of the 19th century England. At the same time, the Fabian Socialists were destroying machines which eliminated jobs.

In its evolution, the technological revolution in communication and transport, result of scientific advances, has been one of the major advances of the twentieth century, by shortening the distances and times, around the globe.

Today, the primary sense of globalization is just that, a rapid, unprecedented social space-time approach. Although it must be said, is not the same the borders for capital transfer and elites, which for the working population and peasant, which imposing walls and impassable borders, except in some regions, such as the European Community, classes and social groups that began its demographic decline of how accelerated in the second half of the 20th century (HOBBSAWM), in various parts of the world.

“Universalism today imposed objectively is the relationship of capital that goes global. It produces its opposite on the political and ideological levels. Why the determining current trend is the decoupling between economic liberalism and democracy, which finds its expression in the prevailing neoliberalism (...) and later: political universalism that has fallen into crisis with the ‘world order’ of the 20th century and the State requires a redefinition of content from which the traditional meaning, coined by the estate-national framework - bourgeois of freedom, equality, democracy and human rights is determined again.

Certainly delicate and difficult discussions about it require political forms of praxis and organization exceeding the estate-nation framework, incidentally regarding both its institutional structure and its territorial delimitation. He always insufficient existence of democratic rights, social securities and political freedoms found historically linked precisely to this form of capitalist-burgees State constitutes a political dilemma that does not support simple solution formulas. Requires a policy that both nationally and internationally, within the State and with it, is directed at the same time against him” (HIRSH, 1996: 46/49; our emphasis).

This explains why the proximity of spacial-geographic produced by the process of globalization (geographical universalism) accompanied by increased the localisms and differentiations (localisms, particularisms), as well as intolerance and racism, attributable also **insufficiently universal progress in education and culture in human rights**. In this way, *mundialization* (French equivalent of globalization), is not exactly a Community policy or ideology, but rather a spontaneous community (existential), according to TURNER (see LAIDI, 1997: 18). It is noteworthy, that the guidelines of this process of globalization, dictate them enterprises transnational, multilateral agencies, and the prevailing economic values, imposed the mechanisms of the “market”, according to their own interests Economic globalization, deepening inequalities:

“Globalization does not erase or inequalities or contradictions that constitute an important part of the fabric of national and global social life. On the contrary, develops ones and others, recreating the other levels and new ingredients. The same conditions that feed the interdependence and integration, feed on inequalities and contradictions in tribal, regional, national, continental and global levels.

It happens that the world is formed as a vast and complex kaleidoscope of Nations, nationalities, ethnic groups, minorities, groups and classes. It reproduces diversities and social, economic, political and cultural inequalities in different degrees and multiple arrays. If there is something that reproduces and emphasizes, on a global scale, it is uneven and combined development of relations and material and cultural productions. The not contemporary, which already is a fact in the field of the nation, is generalized and delves into the realm of global society. There are several cultural

universes and materials, real and imaginary, that intersect and overlap, complement and are divorced, are integrated and contradict” (IANNI, 1998: 84).

We can highlight the imagination of “scenarios” futuristic cyber society, through film and literature. The Futurist cinema (*Blade Runner*), the human species shared / have the robots or androids, whose artificial intelligence and “melded”, may be beyond human. In *2001 Odyssey to the space*, S. Kubrick, imagine a computer that is able to alter the course and take control of a spacecraft, on a trip “intergalactic”. In his madness, (film it), some humans decide to opt for the “love” of a female voice and intelligence voice of woman software, (a computer), the main male character is attracted to which.

But what is specifically “human”, in the different technological mutations, technological advances deepen or reduce social gaps, inequality? Can put it at the service of human development, unfinished at the same time with the ecosystems? What technologies are especially destructive to the environment and life on the planet (for example, oil and its derivatives, like “plastic” used in nearly all gaskets, “massive consume” - nuclear energy, military and purposes “peaceful”, the quick disposal of appliances that support the NTC)?

Terrific visions of the techno-bureaucratic society have been represented in the literature (Orwell) and even advance masterfully (Mary Sheleey/Frankenstein), Julio Verne since the 19th century. The dehumanized future has not been far from the creative imagination.

Optimistic visions of new communication technologies ranging from idea of technology as a lifeline for the mass production of food (biotechnology, GMOs); Intelligence artificial as a complement or substitute human brain, robotics, virtual learning, virtual communities, information society and knowledge.

Some of the social problems involving these new communication technologies, from the perspective of human rights, are:

Another’s news exclusions (social and cultural); (traditional and technological illiteracy) in global and regional inequality.

Greater negative psychosocial consequences: autism, narcissism, necrophilia, cyber-bullying, cyber-espionage, impoverishment of the language spoken and written, digital dementia, historical fundamental rights regression characterized by unique thought, monolithic language, intolerance, xenophobia, racism, in the ideological-political field - cultural.

Predominance the criteria of “market” in *real* and *virtual* social relationships.

The “life’s styles” (or death) contemporaries, along with environmental pollution, at least in urban populations and of these the subject to everyday of the NTC, characterized by sedentary and nomadism lifestyle and detachment from real relationships, the neglect of nature, alienation, may be associated with the leading causes of death: heart disease, diabetes, dementia.

“The main causes of mortality in the world are ischemic heart disease and stroke, resulting in 15 million deaths by 2015 and have been the main causes of mortality during the past 15 years. Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) caused 3.2 million deaths by 2015, while the lung cancer, along with the trachea and bronchi, took the lives of 1.7 million people” (WHO).

The number of deaths due to diabetes, which was less than a million in 2000, reached 1.6 million in 2015. The deaths from dementia between 2000 and 2015 more than doubled, and this disease became the seventh leading cause of death in the world by 2015.

Many of these deadly diseases are attributable, particularly **cancer**, environmental pollution, to smoking, due to the irrational consumption and the powerful tobacco industry. How many of these deadly diseases are attributable to sedentary lifestyles brought about by the NTC? The right to health (human and ecosystem), is in free handicap, omission, oblivion.

According to the World Health Organization:

“**dementia** is a syndrome involving the deterioration of memory, intellect and behavior and the ability to perform activities of daily living. Although it primarily affects the elderly, dementia is not a normal consequence of aging. Throughout the world there are some 47 million people who suffer from dementia, and 9.9 million new cases recorded each year” (WHO).

IV

Towards the end of the second decade of the 21st century (2017) humanity lives a profound *crisis of civilization* (human rights and environmental). At the same time, different evolutionary processes (progress of knowledge), scientific and technological, social and cultural revolutions, regressions (destructiveness, conventional and non-conventional wars) and uncertainty about their fate, as mentioned by Edgar MORIN, is a “lasted future”:

“Everything in this world is in crisis. Say crisis is, as we have seen, progression of uncertainties. Everywhere, in all, the uncertainties have progressed. I.e., if the prophets can prophesy, if viewers can see, the diagnosticians can no longer see well and forecasters cannot predict more. The present is in danger.

The planet live, hesitates, wheel, burps, you have hiccups, to break wind, every day. Everything is made, live, in the short term. The future is deleted so much more as soon as it depends on, not only accidents and forks (which perhaps have already place...), but also one possible all or nothing.

However, we are not in confusion. We have lost the linear evolution, becoming pre-programmed, the robotic future, but have gained a complex of critical ideas. We know that the linkages and the multiplication of crisis are inseparable from an evolution that we had thought to call ‘evolution’ and ‘progress’; we have seen that if this evolution entails effectively development and progress, developments involve involutions and progressions involve regressions.

We also know that this evolution involves ruptures and radical transformations, it will produce yet more radical changes, and that we are in the same century of revolutions. Finally, we know that evolution tends perhaps to its self-destruction. Thus, we are in a world that seems at once in evolution, revolution, in progression, regression, in crisis, in danger. Need us, therefore, associate these notions of evolution, revolution, crisis, regression, rather than select one and delete the other. Live all this at the same time. And our uncertainty does not know which of these terms will eventually be decisive” (MORIN, 2011: 45-46).

Some of those “progressions”, mainly the technological, mean “regressions”. Other “regressions” imply, for example, the rationalization of consumption, clean technologies, “progressions”, especially in ecological conservation. On human rights, progress and setbacks to global scale are diverse and heterogeneous, from the regional, social and cultural point of view.

In some countries, both in the North and in the South, East and West, human rights, that have been conceptually developed in at least three generations (individual, socio-economic, political and cultural rights, and the so-called cooperation and solidarity), middle distance abysmal (as in Mexico) between the legal reality and social reality³.

In addition, global recognition, evidence large differences between East and West. Also we can say, that since 1948, date of promulgation of the **Universal Declaration of human rights** and its further development with the international covenants (International Bill of human rights), conferences and international conventions, in a wide range of issues, has become a true, necessary and universal human rights education culture. The contemporary social reality shows a contrary way.

Currently we can't say, that have been going on in the world a “culture” of human rights, but on the other hand, dominated the des-humanization, the lack of social solidarity, exclusion and inequality, ethnic separatism, racism and xenophobia, in society and in conservative, neoliberal political elites who used as medium and massive ideological support, new technologies of the self (FOUCAULT), recalling the nightmare of the “Totalitarian State” of George ORWELL (1984).

In the process of globalization current capitalism (agreed in the Washington consensus), characterized by the hegemony of the transnational capital, privatization of public sector, the market economy, the Elimination of labor rights, control of international organizations by the hegemonic powers, it has come to “global” level to an extreme concentration of wealth (to benefit between 1% y .01% of the world's population) and increasing cultural between social classes and social inequality ethnic groups and regions. “1 percent of the population owned 40% of global assets, and that 10 percent of the population owned 85 percent of the total global wealth. The poorest half of the world adult population owned for its part 1 per cent of global wealth”.

“A study by the World Institute for the research of the development economic of the University of the United Nations stated that in the year 2000 1 percent of the population owned 40% of global assets, and that 10 percent of the population owned 85 percent of the total global wealth. The poorest half of the world adult population owned 1 percent of wealth global (James B. Davis, et there) this on the other hand, however, is not more than a snapshot of an ongoing process. Daily appear even worse news for global equality, and therefore also for our quality of life overall. And the situation does not only worsen (...).

The stubborn persistence of poverty on a planet dominated by the fundamentalism of the economic growth is enough for the Viewer to stop and reflect both on direct and on the collateral damage of this distribution of wealth damages. The deep chasm that separates the poor without future of rich, optimistic, confident and complexes - a

³ HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH (2016). “In August of 2016, the Government reported that it is was still unaware of the whereabouts of more than 27,000 people reported as missing since 2006. It is usual that police and agents of the public prosecutor's Office do not take basic investigative measures to identify those responsible for enforced disappearances, and often indicate the relatives of missing persons who should investigate on their own. Authorities have not identified remains or parts of human bodies found in different parts of the country, including in clandestine graves”.

chasm of such depth that it exceeds the capacity of most hard-working and brave Explorer to delimit it entirely - is a good reason to be enormously concerned. As they warn Rocard and the other co-authors of the article, the first victim of this deep inequality will be democracy, as all goods required, increasingly scarce and inaccessible to become subject of a fierce rivalry (and perhaps wars) between those who have and those who are desperately in need” (BAUMAN, 2014: 12-13).

(Study cited by BAUMAN, of the authors: James Davies, Susanna Sandström, Anthony Shorrocks and Edward N. Wolf, “The world distribution of household wealth”, discussion document n. 2008/03, World Institute for Development Economics Research, United Nations University, February 2008).

The global society keeps and perpetuates such abysmal economic and social inequalities, kept as “structural violence”; real obstacles to material validity of fundamental rights, a discursive level, the ideological positions contrary to human rights (neo-Nazism, neo-fascism, authoritarianism, liberalism), democratization and moral values, have been expanding at the speed of revolutions scientific - technological of the century XX and XXI (nuclear energy, aerospace, biotech, astrophysics, etc.) and communications: from the radio, analogue commercial television, so sad for the current digital media broadcast: cellular telephony, internet and social networks.

The “neoliberal” ideological fundamentalism everywhere proclaims the economic values of the “free” market and the irrational consumption (with serious ecological consequences for the planet). Is the alienated society who produces and reproduces, through the NTC, the sad, disseminated with greater speed and speed at global and local levels.

In this logic of the market, everything has a price; everything is bought everything for sale. Its trend is the imposition of the single thought and not cultural diversity. It promotes the ideological intolerance, not human understanding and international cooperation and social solidarity. Production and consumption are guided by criteria of quick profit, planned obsolescence, immediate gratification, the culture of non-biodegradable waste (used and thrown away).

The objectification of goods extends to all human activity, not only to the labor goods, strength work, but to the whole of the inter-personal relationships. BAUMAN calls “liquid modernity”, this dizzying social reality, understood as the fragility, the replenishment of exchanges, the rapid replacement, linkages, if these can be called so, “humans”. What is human in the neo-liberal globalization? And in liquid modernity, social exchanges are crossed by the essential criterion of “market”. In its origins, capitalism, had to the “money”, of fetish fashion, as the one God, that it overthrew all the other gods (MARX) current global capitalism has taken to extremes this dogma liberal and neo-liberal, radicalized it.

Neo-liberalism has led also, in addition to breaking with the regulating principle of the State and promote indiscriminate privatization and annihilation of the welfare State, to a regressive elimination of the “individual liberties”, social rights (such as health and education), and international cooperation and peace, environmental sustainability. Today the conservative elites who have imposed on Mr. Trump (2017), in the U.S., invalidate the individual and social rights, promote removal of international commitments to reduce the production of greenhouse climate and greenhouse anthropogenic (CCA) and drive new economic protectionism.

The current crisis presents a great uncertainty at the same time from the perspective of the rights of nature and biodiversity (**Earth Charter**)⁴. The destructiveness of human, accompanied by technological **necrophilia**⁵ (FROMM), the Cybernetics society, technoscience, robotics, of type of “science without conscience” (MORIN), like nuclear energy, have occurred in the past 50 years, the destructiveness of the habitat, the loss of biodiversity, pollution, among other effects, endangering environmental sustainability and survival of life on the planet Earth (natural resources considered as an object (thing), subordinating to the human species (anthropocentrism) and for enjoyment of a few (productive transformation without social equity).

⁴ Charter of the Earth

“(…) As never before in history, the common destiny calls us to look for a new beginning. Such is the promise of these principles of the Earth Charter. To fulfill this promise, we must commit ourselves to adopt and promote the values and objectives in it exposed.

The process will require a change of mentality and heart; It also requires a new sense of global interdependence and universal responsibility. We must develop and implement the vision of a sustainable lifestyle imaginatively to local, national, regional and global levels. Our cultural diversity is a precious heritage and cultures will find their own ways to finalize provisions. We must deepen and broaden the global dialogue that generated the Earth Charter, since we have much to learn in the partner search of truth and wisdom.

Life often leads to tensions between important values. This may involve difficult decisions; However, seek the way to harmonize diversity with the unit; the exercise of liberty with the common good; the short-term objectives with long-term goals. Every individual, family, organization and community, has a vital role to play. Arts, Sciences, religions, educational institutions, the media, companies, non-governmental organizations and Governments, are called to offer a creative leadership. The partnership between Governments, civil society and enterprises, is essential for effective governance.

In order to build a sustainable global community, the Nations of the world must renew their commitment to the United Nations, to comply with their obligations under existing international agreements and support the implementation of the principles of the Earth Charter, through a legally binding international instrument on environment and development.

Ours is a time that it is the awakening of a new reverence for life; by the firm resolve to achieve sustainability; by the acceleration in the struggle for Justice and peace and for the joyful celebration of life”.

⁵ **Necrophilia** (E. FROMM). Necrophilia, love for the dead, in Greek neckros, meaning “cadaver”, the dead, the inhabitants of Tartarus, in latin, nex, necs means violent death, murder (...) (FROMM, 1970: 324 and ss.). The Spanish philosopher Miguel de UNAMUNO used the word “necrophilia” to designate a character trait and not an evil act in the traditional sense in 1936 on the occasion of a speech given by the general nationalist Millán Astray in the University of Salamanca, who was rector Unamuno at the start of the Spanish civil war (...).

“(…) The death already not expressed symbolically by fecal or smelly corpses. Their symbols are now machines clean and bright; they do not attract men smelly bowel movements but the structures of aluminum and glass. But the reality that hides this antiseptic facade becomes increasingly visible. Man, in the name of progress, is transforming the world into a foul and poisoned place (and this is symbolic to us). It corrupts the air, water, Earth, animals... and himself. It is doing this to such a degree that seems doubtful that Earth is still living in a hundred years. Know the facts, but in spite of the many protesters, who take the reins of the they go ahead with technical ‘progress’ and are willing to sacrifice everything that is life for the cult of his idol (...). It gives the same to do so intentionally or not. If you had no knowledge of the possible danger, may be discharged you of that responsibility. But it is the necrophilia element of his character that prevents you to take advantage of the knowledge that has” (FROMM, 1970: 348-349).

“(…) But there is another relationship that has no choice but that arise when considering the nature of cyber, completely alienated man: its aspects schizoid or schizophrenic. Perhaps the most notorious trait in the modern man it’s the split between thinking, affection and desire. (...) The Cyber man is almost exclusively brain orientation: is a mono cerebral man. His way of seeing the world to spin - and see himself - is intellectual; you want to know what things are, how they work and how can build or handled. Science promoted this point of view, and has been dominated since the end of the middle ages. It is the very essence of modern progress, based on the technical domination of the world and consumption” (FROMM, 1970: 349).

The global environmental crisis has generated critical reflections (ecology, philosophy, complex thinking) about our human nature, as a dependent living beings (Biological) of the health of the planet: we are evolving part of the planet and the cosmos; our species (*homo sapiens*) and its cultural evolution, has a community of destiny (the global village), preceded by centuries of dispersion and the localism, insulation, walls and borders, ethnic and political, military, economic, religious, cognitive divisions. Complex thought, nature and human rights are an essential part of this new global awareness of this new form of thinking and acting, a global democratic citizenship.

V

Today it is necessary to reflect on the social and cultural impact of the new technologies of communication, its nature, limits and conditions, positive and negative, impacts from the humanizing perspective of human rights and fundamental values (*liberty, equality, fraternity, solidarity, tolerance and cultural diversity*).

This perspective has been particularly abandoned intentionally by the new ideologists and marketers privatization of education, without regard for cultural diversity, the irrational economic impact, neoliberal globalization and possessive individualism which today imposes itself as a unique formula, for the productive transformation without social equity, justice and democracy. For this reason, believe that reflect and give a new direction to the new educational technologies and its challenges we need to: a time of uncertainty and rapid social and technological changes, with huge and historical cultural backwardness, social inequality, ideological intolerance, abuse of power, crisis of human rights, and ecological destruction.

The new communication technology (NTC), alongside other processes that accompany them (such as economic globalization), have redrawn the traditional categories: notions of space-time, the real and the virtual (the real, the symbolic, the imaginary), public and private, *biophilia* and *necrophilia* cultural, what is legal and illegal, standard and crime, creating new offences not established as crimes, some of them still, like cyber bullying, values and sad, for the new “transgressions” standard and before “prohibitions” by the convention and traditional morality (buying and selling all kinds of organs, assisted reproduction, new types of family, surrogate motherhood, belly rental, sale ovules, cyber-prostitution).

Freedoms and control state espionage, among other social and cultural processes that have social, for human health and the right to health (facing problems such as cyber-addiction, loss of memory, lack of physical exercise) and implications of the ecosystem (irrational consumption) from the perspective of the various “generations” of rights: individual, social, cultural, political, educational rights diffuse, solidarity and international cooperation, nature and the environment (nature rights). Mix effects and causes, are confused, the phenomenal world becomes “essential” and is “phenomenology”, the appearance, in the same way as the real and the virtual, lose consciousness and handle, a world without sense, without “scale of superiors values”, dominated the economic values, competition, intolerance and xenophobia. To understand the present (and who can understand it with the speed of change?), we don't have to another role of historians, recognizing the inevitable “distance” between the event and the awareness of its meaning. In addition to our ignorance, our own limited knowledge is what blinds us (cf. MORIN, 2011: 19).

If these criticisms can be interpreted as a techno-digital phobia, or global phobia, there is not our position. Appropriate use of social networks, information, and critical consumption of media, the rights and duties of the subjects in the real and virtual world should be taught to children and adolescents. Parents should supervise early *video games* and TV programs that promote violence, and the internet activities. Social networks that promote intolerance, violence and the bullying or harassment (school, work, etc.). It must promote a true humanizing universalism, not tax for the “market”.

For this test, we have assisted in the “advantages” of the NTC, we have resorted to writing on a computer (currently it seems a need for essential truism), consultation of printed books, but also consulted hypertext on the Internet, in traditional and virtual libraries. We have seen, in our personal experience, along with a generation that has lived, from the second half of the 20th century, different technological, communicative and also cultural changes that undoubtedly following generations, born in the 21st century, perhaps live with more intensity and speed of changes.

Now combine different technologies multimedia, formerly separated: the radio or traditional TV, printed media, including newspaper, magazines, books, electronic media, as the radio-internet (closed and open with advertising programs), which are real universal libraries and communities of Internet users exchanged music preferences, or produce, their own preferences, their “ours” radio stations, as well as news that have opened their doors in the radio-internet, to escape to the “censure” official of the monopoly of the radio, TV or print media, what, for example in Mexico, most have been part of the “establishment”, and hostage-taking political and economic power.

The multimedia: TV-internet, with programming, through the network, challenging the production and distribution of documentaries, films, or “series”, which conventionally had its own means of monopolization and commercial distribution, against independent producers. Traditional means of “entertainment” in the dominant ideological players almost throughout the twentieth century, as a **Cinematograph**, created in 1895 by the Lumière brothers in France, and used by dictatorships and democracies as ideological media, is currently accompanied by new electronic means of production and distribution of content, the more different “multimedia” formats, leaving behind the adjoining the cinemas, replaced by playback on DVD, all kinds of genre film, commercial or art, in the homes of families of all social classes socialization without precedent, through formal trade or the borders of the “illegal reproductions”.

Fortunately, in front of that computer morass, copy and paste, the reserve, prudence, caution about the shallowness of digital information, there are serious research in all disciplines, enabling to deepen not only the effects on behavior and physical and mental health (individual and social), but also in the causes that encourage, what the German psychiatrist Manfred Spitzer, called “**digital dementia**”: the risk that lead the NTC, especially if it starts from childhood and youth, so that we can say climate change anthropogenic (CCA), if not guarding it in time (if possible) and do not consider the “digital culture” and the “virtual” world as a fate fatal and inevitable, although this is interested towards the large electronics corporate and its organic intellectuals (professors, analysts, propagandists, industrialists, politicians, etc.).

Digital media lead us to use less, each time less, our brain, and prevent, in infants and young people (the first with a brain capacity still in growth), the “brain formation”, reducing its ability to yield (memorization) directly affecting thinking, reasoning, will (self-control, autonomy) emotions, social behavior (addiction, insulation, autism, depression), among other findings that are becoming the research on digital technology

behavior, and the human brain. (cfr. formation of the brain during life; ascent and decline, positive and negative factors, Dr. SPITZER, 2013: 299)

The formation processes of the human brain (one of the most complex biological organisms) starts in childhood, develops in adolescence, and reach maturity in a period of age between 20 and 50 years, to decline naturally during old age and even death in old age. **The positive factors** of its development at an early age, among others, are manual and sports activities, arts, learning other languages, healthy eating, bonding with the family and the community, nature, profitable work, personal relationships.

Negative factors to their brain development, which produced the risk of an **early decline**, in childhood and adolescence are prompted by new digital and multimedia technologies (TV, DVD, video, computer games, addiction to the internet, etc.) producing various disorders of attention, language development, bad learning, lack of body movement problems, which leads to overweight and addiction lack of sleep by stress and multi-tasking, bad food (fast food).

“(…) This different auspicious ‘sickness’ psychosomatic, such as isolation, addiction, depression, digital dementia, and finally advance brain death. This is one reason for those education authorities around the world, and international organizations like the UN, and the UNESCO, who, OECD, took letters on the issue, but have not done so. Why some of these multinational agencies encourage, promote the ‘learning’ of the NTC, indiscriminately from an early age, and as one of its priorities for the educational skills of the 21st century system? According to Manfred S., memory improves with the real, direct contact between people, unlike the interaction ‘virtual’ (**forget more online than in reality**), **according to a clinical study:**

(…) We also carried out the following discovery: the performance of the memory of each person separately in a third match back was better when the collective memory was produced electronically, but in direct contact. **As well as it does the same if some contents that must learn acquire them interactively in a group and with a direct and personal contact, or if that group is formed virtually on the internet.** The causes are obvious: direct contact clearly provides more material for processing and leads to a processing more emotional and more profound than the clearly reduced contact (impoverished) through the screen and keyboard. When processing information between parties through dialogue or a debate, it is - according to the knowledge we have - the type of deep processing that exists. Precisely because people are social beings, we do have nothing better to talk about between us, and do it several times a day. However, in the life of many adolescents, this personal Exchange is replaced nowadays by digital networks. And by very shrill than pages that you navigate, it will be much less engraved in memory that the contact direct (...) because only real and personal communication allows a processing deep” (Cfr. MANFRED, 2013: 105-106).

Many of these means of cultural expression found on the Internet a new kind of unprecedented mass distribution, not to mention, the distribution and virtual sale of e-books, which coexist with the “press” (the demand and production of paper today is unsustainable for the planet), the same way as traditional newspaper or magazine printed media secular or “sciences”, new forms of mass dissemination of content, beyond the official censorship and monopolies of production and distribution of print media, perhaps to be replaced by “monopolies” global (Amazon, Google, and others companies), equivalent to the material production of goods and services (practically in

all branches of the economy, controlled by transnational corporations at the current stage of capitalism.

Traditional analog TV, is not that it had as object only transmission of “images” “real”, as he argued SARTORI, but “manipulate” also the own image and content, distorting reality and intentionally selecting the “reality” (preceding “virtual reality”, but at the same time “manipulate” ideologically the “image”, combined with sounds and texts, manipulated by the most diverse and conflicting ideological content). Many are the monopolistic examples of print media paid the “establishment”.

For SARTORI, we have gone from *homo sapiens to homo videns*, a thinking subject, a subject that look at pictures and not think, mainly, among the most vulnerable infants who, rather than know the alphabet or letters, are subjected to the image (television) and now, apparently, to the digital world. The NTC invade irresponsibly early the minds of children, preventing their proper brain development (induced by international educational policies and the interest of electronic corporations). Currently, if one can speak of something that lingers in this high speed of technological change, characterized by its quick use and disposability, (analog) TV and radio have gone equally toward digital, renewing the twenty-first century world, powerful influenza exerted on several generations of the 20th century.

And it is not that the “old technologies of de communications” (written press, radio, TV, film) would represent the Kingdom of the “liberty”. In the same way the press, newspapers and weeklies, they lived, permanently, not only in Mexico but in many parts of the world, dominated by the economic and ideological interests of the “establishment”, and those who swam against the current so independent and marginal. That means, that either means of traditional communication “escaped” of the will to ideological manipulation, censorship and control of their sponsors (companies or Governments). In the same way that, in the world of interpersonal relationships, the “modernity” “solid”, already had fractures and cracks, cave-ins, when less this was the reason for the revolution of the young in the sixties of the twentieth century, today supposedly “hard to beat” by new “oppressions” and “liberties” represented in the “liquid modernity” and their technology support.

If some displayed the network internet, as the Kingdom of the “liberty” information and communication and other human potentialities, as stated by CASTELLS optimistically:

"Information is power. Communication is counter-power. And the ability to change the flow of information from the autonomous capacity of communication, reinforced by digital communication technologies, substantially enhances the autonomy of society with respect to the established powers" (CASTELLS, 2007: 181), others see it as a new sign of the decadence “moral” civilization, the cyber-technology, cyber-space, virtual reality, virtual communities, social networks, virtual relations, the new wave of revolution culture-digital, as it was the socialization of music, with the invention of the radio and the disco vinyl, in the early sixties of the last century.

Support of mobile, cellular, telephony supported with satellite communication, digitization, and thousands of applications, have changed the habitus of many millions of people of all ages (the younger generation promotes narcissism, the pictures or selfies), mainly and progressively between generations, accustomed to the culture of the “liquid modernity” and the planned obsolescence and irrational consumption patterns they promise the “happiness”, but that rather speak of a “alienated” technology, where the subjects (consumers), objectified, alienated, are alien to themselves, others and their

own environment ecological, accompanied by a fast life of technological products and culture “necrophilia” (sexual love and not sexual by the inert), cyber, robotic, as provided by FROMM, from the Decade of the 1970s:

“(…) Let's start by considering features simple and most notorious of the contemporary industrial man: Suppression of focal interest by people, nature and living structures and growing attraction towards mechanical artifacts and lifeless (…).

(…) This new type of man is not interested, after all, in the stool or the corpses; actually has such phobia of corpses which makes them seem more alive than when the person was in life (isn't this a reaction formation, but rather part of all orientation that denies the reality of natural, not man-made). But it does something much stronger. Deflects her interest in life, people, nature, ideas... in a Word, everything is alive: transforms life into things, including himself and the manifestations of human faculties of reason, see, hear, like, love (…).

(…) The world becomes a sum of artifacts without life; synthetic food synthetic bodies, the whole man becomes part of total he controls and mechanism that simultaneously controls to it. It has no plan or purpose in life but to make it imposed by the logic of the technique you do. It aims to manufacture robots, which will be one of the greatest feats of technical mind, and some specialists say that the robot be hardly distinguished of living men. **This will not be an amazing feat, now that the man is difficult to distinguish from a robot**” (FROMM, 1970: 347-348, underlined our).

Some futuristic scenarios of the next fifty years, which do not include the depletion of ecosystems and therefore, **ecocide**, and the end of economic growth without environmental sustainability, displayed the robots' growing presence, the Orwellian State super-vigilance, the increase in the speed of transport, as a “happy world”. The distant and the near (space weather), recombine, in alienating new “cybernetic culture”, where stand out more different addictions, diseases, risks, mutations, regressions, Involutions, crisis.

In the same way, the computer and *society of knowledge*, promising the expansion of “virtual” education, academic virtual communities, virtual universities, museums and virtual libraries, interpersonal relations “victuals”, in which deposited is the hopes of a “home global”, the Cyber-culture, of a world without borders, a common language, the cyberspace and languages associated with its technological growth (predominantly English language), whose servers or “dominions”, the USA are in economic and political power centers, mainly.

Can be distinguished, in these technologies the differences between the “hardware” and the “software”, the first as technical support, the second as cyber language processors and computers, always changing at the speed of light. Into that world must know that new “language” technical, increasingly specialized, and producing various types of global populations: those who are “connected” to network and market and the “no connected”, cyber-alphabets and cyber-illiterate, producing new inequalities and social exclusion, some voluntarily, others, involuntarily.

The nostalgic **old technologies**, for example, in recording musical reproduction, yearn for the quality of the reproduction of the Long Play (LP), front of the cd, or music on the net, all of them reproductions without point of comparison with the music live or face-to-face, but with a huge mass reproduction, and at a lower cost, in almost every

corner of the world except in the most isolated geographically and culturally (Western) speaking populations. The big question is if you're NTC will contribute or not, to generate a greater global inequality, untenable and unsustainable, inhuman, and degrading treatment today of the human condition, as well as to an improvement or kick-back in the “compression” and the *cultural and biological diversity* of the planet. This is the current dilemma.

CONCLUSIONS

Little is known, still human and cultural implications of these technological transformations in the long run, but for example, in the field of human health (physical and mental), **ecocide** (waste technology), the NTC in general bring important sequelae (electromagnetic radiation that can cause brain tumors, cancer) and against the health of the planet, the consumer society has produced a variety of polluting materials, some of them “not biodegradables”, as plastics, e-waste, nuclear waste, noise pollution, air pollution, light pollution, the destruction of ecosystems (rights of nature).

New subject “technologic” has characteristics that limit the thinking activity (as pointed out SARTORI), is a “autist” programmed with their immediate reality and contradiction can be linked virtually with another continent, with other community “virtual”. Hyper-textual communication of a cellular phone is “reduce” and compresses the written language, it prefers this, above the “advantages” of the orality of (interactive of yours) traditional telephony by cable and satellite. Video conferencing overrides personal, material, real, contact the virtual relationship. Virtual school overrides personal contact. Virtual sex overrides corporeity and risk, the compromise leaves the social anonymity.

But the truth is that the global network, as well as subjects that compose it, presents contradictions, ambivalence, intolerance, new oppressions, cyber-espionage, cyber-crime, cyber-attacks and other virtual crimes, with material consequences and objective. Isn't that what “virtual” lack of materiality, can be turned into it, how subjects (children) who commit suicide as a result of cyber-bullying, or children who fall into the networks of harassment and sexual commerce, through networks of cyber-crime, cyber-crime and extortion network.

Would the question is if these technologies make us more “humans”, with the aid of artificial intelligence, robotics, computer science, Cybernetics? Is the “human” changing? Would is globalization a new “dehumanization”? Would entered a social reality anticipated by ORWELL in his novel “1984”?⁶ Empire of surveillance, the

⁶ G. ORWELL, 1984

Chapter I was a bright day and April cold and clocks gave the thirteen. Winston Smith, with his Chin pinned on the chest in his effort to circumvent the troublesome wind, slid quickly through the houses of the victory glass doors, although not quickly enough to avoid that a dusty blast slinks with him.

The lobby smelled cooked vegetables and old mats. In the background, a color poster, too big to be in an interior, was glued to the wall. It represented only a huge face of more than one meter of width: the face of a man of about forty five years with a large black mustache and beautiful and hardened factions. Winston moved to the stairs. It was useless to try to get on the elevator. It didn't work frequently and at this time the power was cut during day hours. This was part of the restrictions with which prepared the week of hate. Winston had to climb to a seventh floor. With his thirty-nine years and an ulcer of varicose veins above the right ankle, climbed slowly, resting several times. On each landing, in front of the door of the elevator, the poster of the huge face looked from the wall. It was one of those drawings in such a way that the eyes remain one wherever that is. THE BIG BROTHER WATCH YOU monitors said the words at the bottom (...).

Ministry of the lie? Or well, in the nightmares of KAFKA, where new “bureaucracies” technician made the Nazi-Fascist nightmare, of destruction of the person?

In the current social and cultural crisis, characterized by the dehumanization, the possessive individualism, the dominance of the market, the human destructiveness (ecocide), have to look at these technological progressions in their evolutions and regressions, also in its revolutions (technical or cultural), which happens all at the same time, all at the same time (MORIN). It is true that technological solutions, allow us to resolve the practical issues of the consumer market and financial transactions, the public contributions, tax obligations and may enhance the “entertainment” (circus without bread), in addition to the educational possibilities of a possible possibly democratic cultural revolution. We can assume different positions: “eclectic”, “cynic”, “acratic”, “ambivalent”, “enthusiast”.

From the perspective of *human rights* education and promotion, the contemporary ethics of moral values is under permanent attack, frank regression and stagnation. The *dignities* of man “modern”, as he called them CERRONI, namely **ethical dignity, the legal, social, political, economic, the cultural** and educational (now dismantled)⁷, the **right to health** (human and planet), they present new challenges facing new forms of oppression and ideological domination, they are already promoted by the pure and plain “market” relationships, i.e. by the own “civil society” dominated by transnational corporations, or by the new powers (strength) of the “Estate” enhanced by new technologies of social control (cyber-espionage); or by actual and possible combinations of both, as in the neo-liberal political system, which is actually a “neo-liberalism”, which bears more resemblance to a new totalitarianism.

But the NTC are advantages? According to their promoters (transnational corporations and intellectuals organic)? Do we give (s) the benefit of the doubt? Is the cyber-space, cyber-culture, a new totality, a new ecumenism religious, a new “utopia”? Cyber culture, holds a “paradox”, the more universal, less tote, more heterogeneous:

“(…) New media ecology is organized around the expansion of cyberspace. I want to now state its central paradox: the more universal (extended, interconnected, interactive), less total. Each additional connection adds to the heterogeneity, new

⁷ **The dignities of the modern man/CERRONI**

The term **dignity** being used, with reference to the man, from Kant onwards, in the singular to underline the essential characteristic of each individual, it's to be a person or a member of the human race like any other. But it is time to reflect on singular said, taking into account the fact that person does not already only be end in itself, or autonomous ethical Center, as though Kant, rather, for example, it means being holder of “human rights”, of “political freedom” and “civil rights”; and also, from now on, be holder of the human pretensions to realize the dignity of man in the economic sphere of productive activities.

All these connotations of modern man are structured and developed, for a time, in contemporary culture, especially the constitutional charters and international documents. But lacking even a satisfactory theoretical systematization of all these “dignities”, and therefore missing, correspondingly, a theoretical coordination of major sectors, among which usually “comprises those dignities” [...] (CERRONI, 1999: 74). As well as the dignities of modern man are separated, the theoretical fields in which those have obtained the legitimization are separated. However, it remains the danger - checked by daily events - that even in the general separation, each of those human dignities may be neglected, scorned raped. On the other hand, because there is in fact a single link on the historical level, missing theoretical coordination could undermine the integrity of the range of the modern dignities (ethical, legal, political, social, cultural), breaking up the system in a disjointed range of postulates which are interspersed in dangerous byways. The modern ethics of person then flows back towards an educated metaphysical abstract man, without practical meetings; the rights system is reduced to the formal mechanism; political freedoms decay to be exercises “instrumentals”; the rights-interests of workers become petty corporate claims, without ethic-political coordination [...] (CERRONI, 1999: 75).

sources of information, new lines of flight, so much so that the global sense is less readable, increasingly more difficult to circumscribe, close, master. This universal gives access to an enjoyment of the world, to the collective Act of the species intelligence. It makes us participate more intensely in humanity alive, but this is contradictory, on the contrary, with the multiplication of singularities and the increase of the disorder” (LEVY, 2011: 93).

REFERENCES

- AUGÉ, M. & CASTELLS, M. *et. alli* (2007). MORAES, D. de (coord.). *Media manipulation and Society*. Barcelona: Gedisa Editor.
- BAGÚ, S. (1970). *Time, social reality and knowledge*. México: Siglo XXI.
- BAUMAN, Z. (2014). *Wasted lives, Modernity and its Outcasts*. Spain: Paidós.
- BAUMAN, Z. (2014). *Does the wealth of a few benefits us all?* (trans.: Alicia Capel Tatjer). Spain: Paidós.
- BAUMAN, Z. (2013). *On Education in a Liquid World*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- BAUMAN, Z. (2009). *Life of consum.* México: FCE.
- BAUMAN, Z. (2003). *Liquid love*. México: FCE.
- BAUMAN, Z. (1999). *Globalization. Human consequences*. México: FCE.
- BRAVERMAN, H. (1978). *Labor and Monopoly Capital*. México: Nuestro Tiempo Editor.
- CASTELLS, M. (2007). “Innovation, freedom and power in the information age”. In AUGÉ, M.; CASTELLS, M. *et. alli* (2007). MORAES, D. de (coord.). *Media manipulation and Society*. Barcelona: Gedisa Editor, 175-197.
- CERRONI, U. (1999). “The dignities of the modern man”. In *Rules and Values of Democracy*. México: SEP-Conaculta.
- CISNEROS, Isidro H. (2004). *Modern Forms of Intolerance. From Discrimination to Genocide*. México: Editorial Océano.
- CHOMSKY, N. & POLK, L. (2014). *Nuclear war and environmental catastrophe*. Spain: Paidós.
- CHAMPEAU, S. & INNERITY, D. (comps.) (2014). *Internet and the future of democracy*. Spain: Paidós.
- FROMM, E. (1972). *Psychoanalysis of Contemporary Society*. México: FCE.
- FROMM, E. (1970). *Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*. México: FCE.
- FREUD, S. (1986). *The Essentials of Psycho-Analysis*. Barcelona: Altaya Editor.
- HIRSCH, J. (1996). *Globalization, capital and State* (trans.: Gabriela Contreras Pérez, Sandra Kuntz Ficker, Ulrich S.). México: UAM-Xochimilco.
- HOBBSWAM, E. (1998). *History of the Twentieth Century*. Spain: Alianza Editor.
- IANNI, O. (1998). *The Global Society*. México: Ed. Siglo XXI.
- LAÏDI, Z. (1999). *A World Without Sense* (trans.: Jorge Ferreiro). México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- LEVY, P. (2011). *Cyberculture. The culture of the digital society*. México: Anthropos, UAM.
- MATELART, Armand: “¿To what ‘New World Information Order’?”. In M. AUGÉ, M. CASTELLS *et.alli* (2007). MORAES, D. de (coord.). *Media manipulation and Society*. Barcelona: Gedisa Editor.
- MARX, K. (1975). *The Capital, Tomo I* (Spanish translation and Edition, Pedro Scaron). México: Age XXI, Editors.
- MARX, K. (1844). *Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts*. Mexico: FCE.
- MORIN, E. (2011). *Where the World is Going?* Madrid: Paidós.

- MORIN, E. (2007). *The Seven Knowledge of Education in 21st Century*. París: UNESCO.
- MORIN, E. (2007). *Towards the abyss? Globalization in the 21st century*. Argentine-México: Paidós.
- MORIN, E. (2004). “The epistemology of complexity”. *Gazeta de Antropología*, N. 20.
- MORIN, E. (2004). “Bio-antropo-cosmic”. *Gazeta de Antropología*.
- ORWELL, G. (Original 1948; 1980). *1984* (Spanish translation: Rafael Vazquez Zamora). Salvat Editors S.A. Electronic edition of Utopia, R6 08/01.
- PARDO SALGADO, C. (2009). *ICT: a Philosophical Reflection*. Barcelona: Laertes Editor.
- PÉREZ GÓMEZ, Á. I. (2012). *Educate Yourself in the Digital Age*. Spain: Morata, Colofón Editors.
- RUITENBEEK, H. M. (1978). *Psychoanalysis and Social Sciences* (trad. Juan José Utrilla). México: FCE, Colección Popular.
- SARTORI, G. (1998). *Homo videns. The TV Control Society*. Madrid: Taurus Editor.
- SPITZER, M. (2013). *Digital Dementia*. Barcelona: Liberdúplex, S.L. Editor.
- TAMAYO, L. (2009). *The Ecocide Mad, Ecosophy Psychoanalytical madness*. México: Fontamara Editor.
- VALDÉS, M. M. (compilation) (2004). *Nature and Value. An Approach to Environmental Ethics*. México: UNAM.
- VV.AA. (2015). *Messages of Hate and Discrimination in Social Media*. México: SEGOB, CONAPRED. Colección Matices.
- VV.AA. (2007). *The Cultural Contradictions of Modernity*. Barcelona: Antrhopos.
- WEBER, M. (Original 1922). *Economy and Society*. México: FCE.
- WEBER, M. (Original 1905). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. Barcelona: Anagrama Editor.

DOCUMENTOS

- HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH (2016). *Human Rights Report (Mexico)*. Washington, D.C.
- INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS (2016). *Situation of Human Rights in Mexico* (OAS. Documentos oficiales; OEA/). Revised 6/7/2017.
- MILLENIUM ECOSYSTEM ASSESSMENT (2004). *Of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, synthesis report*, final draft (www.millenniumassessment.org, revised el 15-V-17).
- The Earth Charter* (www2.uned.es/catedraunesco-educam/CARTADELATIERRA.htm, revised 08/8/17).
- OMS (2017). *Dementia/fact sheet* (www.who.int/features/factfiles/dementia/es/ - 50k / revised 20/5/2017).