

Leader's Strategy in Super Smart Digital Society

Anatoliy Alekseev-Apraksin^{1, *} Anna Bertova¹

¹ *Institute of Philosophy, Saint Petersburg State University, Saint-Petersburg 199034, Russian Federation*

*Corresponding author. Email: apraksin.spb@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The contemporary world is undergoing a global transformation. The near future is conceived by governments of technologically developed countries as a transition to a new social order, to *Super Smart Society*. Determining the parameters of sociocultural changes associated with this structure and identifying relevant leadership strategies is the main goal of this article. The study of this concept methodologically is based on cultural philosophical analysis. In addition to the relevant analytics, materials from official resources of the government of Japan, Russia, and other countries involved in the study of *Society 5.0*, the plans of which, despite the specifics, are very representative. This is especially true for Japanese plans since according to the developers' plans, they are aimed at solving problems facing not only the country of the Rising Sun but all progressive humanity. The author focuses on studies of the post-industrial, network, and information society. Comparing such distant disciplines as neurophysiology, psychology, and artificial intelligence programming (with which the prospects of *Society 5.0* are inextricably linked), some semantic lacunae that underlie the transformation of life in the near future are revealed, that is, the virtualization of reality, semantic depletion of signs and increased value uncertainty. The author pays special attention to the problems of the development of human capital, the restructuring of knowledge, the skills used to meet human and social needs. The paper shows that the digitalization and clustering approach set a particular mode of motivated activity of leaders today. Three leadership strategies remain relevant: functional, based on resource *hubs* and *bridges* as places of power for leaders of the *Culture 5.0*, marketing, and strategy of conceptual and thesaurus myth design. Each of them can be implemented in a wide applied and predilection range: from administrative-technocratic and expert to the objective or artistically intricate.

Keywords: *Society 5.0, Culture 5.0, artificial intelligence, digital dementia, information pseudo-debility, iconic turn, technological singularity, personal branding, leadership, Japan.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The modern world lives in an era of change. People everywhere face challenges that have no unequivocal answers. In this situation, any reasoned position and responsible strategy seem extremely interesting. If a concept is supported by powerful resources and the will of transnational forces to implement it, it requires special attention. Today, leaders of developed countries are pondering over the problem of ensuring comprehensive development in the situation of revolutionary changes in information and communication technologies and the transition to network forms of life organization. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) emphasizes science, technology, and innovation perspectives as their basic plans. This trend is followed by many national programs such as "Industrie 4.0" in Germany, Advanced Manufacturing in the USA, Made in China 2025, Strategy Development 2017-2030 of the Information Society of the Russian Federation. Japan offers its version of an innovative social order designed to become a worthy answer to the challenges to date. The Land of the Rising Sun is one of the leaders in the field of futuristic technologies; it has announced the administrative reconfiguration of the life processes

under the concept of the Super Smart Society - an open society which is, judging by official presentations and discourse initiated by the government of Abe Shinzo, based on humanism, freedom, and justice.

The desire for an early resolution of the most pressing problems intensified in May 2019 in relation to the beginning of the New Era of the imperial rule which motto "Reiva" denotes the order and harmony. Particular programs and strategic measures were designed with the aim of transition to *Society 5.0*, the nearest system of organizing the social structure of Japan. They are supposed to be provided with the resource and administrative capabilities of *Abenomics* which is based upon "three arrows" of monetary easing, fiscal stimulus, and structural reforms, and are aimed at implementing these values. The desire to maintain leadership in the innovation sphere through the development of human capital and the construction of super intellectual society has its background. Already in 2016, Japan adopted "The 5th Science and Technology Basic Plan". It is supposed to accelerate economic growth by linking all available network platforms, cyber-physical systems, and the Internet of things technologies. Thence, the declared goals include:

1) Reforming companies, digital technologies, and business models from the perspective of continuous innovation and globalization;

2) Enhancing the power of individuals so that women, children, and elderly people as anyone else can lead a safe, healthy, and comfortable life while maintaining the lifestyle they want;

3) The solution of social problems such as aging of the nation and the vulnerability of the population to natural disasters.

A special article on the Japanese government's website says that now Japan and the world as a whole have entered a period of dramatic change. With the development of the economy, the need for energy is growing while international competition is tightening. The disproportion of wealth accumulation becomes more and more evident. Social problems are deepening and come to be more complicated. In modern society, it is becoming increasingly difficult to combine the solution of socially significant problems with economic feasibility. In this regard, it is assumed that for the transition to Society 5.0 Japan needs to force through the five "walls". *Bureaucratic*, by the creation of a new central government system. The wall of *legislation*, by adopting a new system that promotes innovation. The wall of *technologies*, by establishing mechanisms for the rapid introduction of new technologies. The wall of *human resources*, by involving all segments of the population in the new economy and society. The wall of *social acceptance*, by finding methods of harmonious integration of innovation with the needs of society [1].

According to these ideas and plans, the transition to Society 5.0 will allow Japan to solve the problems of the aging society that the country faces earlier than other states. Therefore, in the field of healthcare, it was decided to develop ties between medical institutions around the world through the usage of telemedicine (exchange of information on patient health, remote treatment of diseases, distant monitoring of health status, biomonitoring). For this purpose, in particular, the Yadok (YaDoc) integrated online treatment system is being developed [2]. In the field of education, it was decided that not only teachers but also representatives of leading business sectors should participate. In the field of science, it is necessary to implement the Open Science policy of openness and interaction with people and businesses all over the world. Besides, in Japan, there is a problem of sparsely populated remote regional centers where residents have difficulties in accessing various amenities. It is proposed to solve this problem through the automatically controlled transport network as well as by expanding the Internet orders delivery system equipped with drones. The problem of the public infrastructure deterioration is to be solved by the introduction of high-tech sensors, robots, and other equipment capable of monitoring the condition of roads, bridges, tunnels, and dams. It is also proposed to

abandon the long-term payments, still carried out in cash, and completely switch payments for services and products into the Internet and electronically through improving transaction systems. As it is already well-known today, in some cities not only in Japan, one can pay by smiling at the face-recognizing cash register terminal.

In the official video which advertises the new society, one can see an idyllic picture of life in a remote mountain settlement. Mail and parcels are delivered by drones. Elderly people consult doctors online. Houses are equipped with smart appliances that can send orders to the store. Public transport is run without drivers in human form, coaches stopping automatically at the points convenient for people. Agriculture and stock-breeding happen nearly without personal involvement [3].

It is promised that in Society 5.0 social differences in the level of welfare will disappear due to innovations. Inequality associated with regional specifics, age, gender, language will vanish, and human needs would be satisfied with a more flexible individual attitude. Moreover, providing specific personal needs with exact means in the required amount should improve the market economy [4]. The main socio-cultural marker of the future advance would be attention not to the system but a person. It is assumed that through the use of artificial intelligence and robots, people in Society 5.0 will be freed from the need to carry out unpleasant, hard work and will have a more meaningful life at a qualitatively new level.

2. THE ORIGIN OF THE SOCIETY 5.0 CONCEPT

The concept of Society 5.0 demonstrates the inclusion of Japan in the discourse based on studies of the history of world culture and the identification of tectonic shifts and transformations of sociocultural reality in it in the long run. It is one of the well-known analytical generalizations associated with the identification of three waves of innovation that divide the history of mankind into four periods: primitive, agricultural, industrial, and informational. This concept was developed by Bell [5] and Toffler [6]. An important feature of both studies is an evolutionist approach regarding culture and society. In both models, technologies were put forward as the determining factors of changes in human life. Moreover, the main characteristics of each period or wave of development were but a shift in the way of life, social institutions, and worldview. Briefly, this concept can be represented as follows.

Society 1.0 is the oldest stage of mankind's development. It represents many independent and disparate communities of hunters and gatherers. Large families that did not have labor specializations were led by chiefs and guided by shamans and magicians. Every cultural practice of Society 1.0 has been inextricably linked to nature. For people who constituted that society, nature and surrounding world were not It but Thou, following Buber. By developing speech and using the oral transmission of knowledge, they described the world through analogies that inspired inner sensation. It is verified that people thought through binary oppositions and, despite the simplicity of this procedure, carried out powerful demiurgical activities to create symbols, things, and meanings. Awakened creative abilities, developed mythological consciousness, and instrumental mythopoetic thinking were the means. This incredibly long period of knowledge transfer and accumulation of experience ended with what we today call the Neolithic revolution, the transition to a productive type of management (cattle breeding and agriculture) which led to the population growth, differentiation of labor, and other significant consequences.

Society 2.0 is associated with the development of cattle breeding and agriculture, sedentary lifestyle, construction of cities, ending up with the appearance of states and empires. Its formation was accompanied by the complexification of social relations, dominance of religious picture as ideology, emergence of the writing and law. People paid for certain stability and an increase in labor productivity by the impoverishment of their diet and decrease in spontaneity and diversity of life. This shortage was partially reimbursed by foreign trade and creation of internal systems for redistributing products; thus people of Society 2.0 have reached a new scale of unification and filled out new types of relationships in the hierarchy. Inequality, professional specializations in politics, military affairs, religion, craft, and trade found its justification in the divine fundamentals. Nature also acquired divine status but begins to be actively transformed, the process that motivates people to improve the technology. This significant period of its development began already in the VIII millennium BCE. In the middle of the first millennium BCE when the new levels of individualization and awakening of self-consciousness began, Society 2.0 weakened and has come to the exhaustion of its capabilities at the beginning of the era of great geographical discoveries, colonization, and the industrial revolution.

Society 3.0 is an industrial society. The transition to it is associated with the desacralization of the world and nature, broad development of the business activity, education, and printing. Following rapidly changing frames of the world, a person finally felt able, by the

power of one's mind, to dissipate the spell which enabled the nature to entangle a human. Based on the optimism of the Age of Enlightenment and the logic of the industrial revolution, people rushed to solve practical problems. They invented the fly shuttle, steam engine, internal combustion engine, canned food, electricity, etc. Remarkably, the science and the discovered fundamental laws underlying inventions were of not much concern for the inventors. Development of world spaces required the progress in manufactory production and an increase of the segment of industrial resources in gross production. As a result, the majority of people were employed not in fields and gardens but factories. The proletariat prevailed over the agricultural population. Ideals of equality and solidarity gained popularity, however, only for particular classes and groups. Western gentlemen, merchants, and then nouveau riche were maneuvering between capitalist ethics of shame and biblical guilt; in their strategies for building Society 3.0, they relied upon market power and reliable practical knowledge. Social contradictions were treated as class struggle. The content of the life of the working population was called mass culture.

Society 4.0 is an informational mobile society that provides its development through revolutionary changes in communicative technologies. It began with the advent of broadcasting networks and then took its sway through personal computers, cellular communications, the Internet, information and communication technologies that have changed human life in the same way as before mechanization has done it by crowding the manual labor of artisans out with machine industrial production. Industrial and agricultural activities have given way to the information business which has been prevailing in the gross product of developed countries since the end of the 20th century. The current proletariat is the office employees who are guided through life by the industries of entertainment, beauty, tourism, hand-made and craft activities. Success is not gained through physical labor but ideas, knowledge, skills, and creativity [7]. The discovery of the network nature of communicative practices has directed the efforts of the leaders of the new era towards building and debugging relationships that allow to entertain the exponential growth in project efficiency and diverse fruits of emergentism [8]. Once regularized hierarchical structures are eroded everywhere by connections of a different type. The alluring webs of unnamed possibilities have neither road nor fulcrum humans are so attached to. Easily accessible information about everything in the world led to the devastation of signs and the collapse of meanings and values. As Baudrillard said, "We are in a universe where there is more and more information, and less and less meaning" [9]. Most people today live in the realm of information management and marketing manipulation, and knowing

this, they are more and more immersed in relativity and skepticism. There are no more truths and fundamental entities for the man in the street. The paradox of Society 4.0 is that although information loses its semantic content, it is the theoretical knowledge that becomes a priority. It continues to drive innovation. In other words, contemporary economists, scientists, engineers, administrators, and politicians depart not from practice, as it was in the industrial society, but from the theory.

Society 5.0 (Super Smart Society) is still a purely abstract analytical construct and not a description of the life of a particular society. However, the problems of our time and several obvious trends in the development of the information society make it possible to foresee the prospects for future transformations. The work of people of Society 4.0 is marked by an increase in routine communication and information operations. Artificial intelligence, smart things – homes – cities are called upon to rid us of this routine, as it used to be of the hard physical labor (Society 2.0) or monotony of conveyor production (Society 3.0.). If at the beginning of the information age it was not clear how it is possible to render the service sector (massage, psychotherapy, police) automatic since these not-so-material spheres are based on interpersonal communication, now you can chat, provide navigation, receive information and even hear a joke from Alice, Siri, Maroussi, Lesley or another bot and voice assistant. A smart chair does massage. Robots tidy the office up, print out documents, and make a cup of coffee. The surveillance camera sends a bill directly to the bank for violating traffic rules. And maybe you don't even aware that you've paid for it because the notice got lost, and in the meantime, you are absorbed in distance learning and master on-line algorithms aimed at mastering the competencies necessary for survival. Strictly speaking, the Super Smart Society is a kind of parallel world to the ordinary consciousness in which information itself is the meaning and the form of meaning. It does not need anything else for carrying out the semantic process but to reproduce itself. Virtuality is becoming an everyday reality. Although today the Japanese builders of Society 5.0 claim that the person in it will be the measure of all things, recollecting Protagoras, we can deduct from this statement that the near future will retain its current flowing sensuality without gaining any objectivity and stability.

3. THREATS AND PERSPECTIVES FOR LIFE DIGITALIZING

The processes of introducing new standards of Super Smart Society is a sign of the ongoing race between superpowers in the creation and putting the artificial intelligence, digital economy, neural networks,

Nano-technologies, bioinformatics, quantum computing, as well as large and diverse databases that are food for artificial intelligence into service of society. Not fully strengthened and formed, it is already a key marker for the upcoming Super Smart Society. A significant event confirming that artificial intelligence is rapidly gaining strength is considered to be a series of games in Go held in 2016, in which the Google self-learning neural network Alpha defeated the world champion, Korean Lee Sedol. Although, according to many, artificial intelligence is still deficient in artificial universalism, Google *Chief technology officer* Kurzweil suggests that AI will be able to finally surpass the human intellect and become truly “strong” around 2029. By 2045, its algorithms will be capable of self-awareness and the creation of its kind [10].

What are humans afraid of? The coercion of digitalization and the invasion of the private life by the soulless “Other”. It is no secret that more and more companies use artificial intelligence to consider résumé when applying for a job. How one can trust a machine that has a thousand unknown indicators, among them, for example, an algorithm determining your credit solvency upon the battery level in the smartphone, in a split second? Everyone is also scared by the inhuman optimization of lifestyle. The inevitable rise in unemployment is daunting. People don't like the unprecedented collection of personal data updating databases such as the Unified Federal Information Register (EFIR), introduced in Russia in 2020. Total digitization observes one's basic documents data, accounts, property, payments, relations, transportation details, medical data, fingerprints, mode and algorithm of behavior.

The fears are caused by incentives and penalties systems introduced by authorities and corporations when the high level of social credit can be awarded with discounts and benefits whereas the low-level leads to a ban to use certain amenities or even imprisonment, as it is already invented in Xinjiang Autonomous Region of China.

In the already mentioned appeal of the government of Japan to the population, it is stated that in Society 5.0 all human connections and values that were in demand in the previous era will be preserved. In a video advertising the new order, grandmother and granddaughter are shown living together and warmly communicating whereas each of them doing one's busyness. People around maintain friendly relations, communicate with familiar sellers whom they electronically order products, and continue to entertain usual interpersonal relationships full of sympathy, love, interest, and affection. However, existing experience shows that digital communicative reality leads to the alienation and separation of people. Moreover, in the

development of smart technologies, it is difficult not to recognize a threat to democracy, freedom, and widening inequality. Even for the sake of security and support for vulnerable people, since under this argument digitalization is introduced, most people are not ready for complete personal transparency and total surveillance which Zuckerberg once demonstratively warned about by taping the video camera on his computer. People long for convenience and comfort but few are willing to reconcile with supervisory capitalism and necessity to pay for their convenience with loyalty and silence.

Interestingly enough, that the first stage of the introduction of Society 5.0 in Japan (it was included in the country's development plan for 2016-2020) has not yet brought the expected results precisely for the above reasons. According to the opinion of a specialist in Japanese business and finance, Dr. Shinozawa (SOAS University of London), the majority of Japanese people do not know about Society 5.0 program. It seems to have place primarily due to the lack of any real achievements in this area to date. The stumbling block to its implementation is that to create the digital infrastructure of Society 5.0, it is necessary to put together a huge array of personal information about each citizen of the country. The Japanese were extremely distrustful of the idea of such data transfer to the government; moreover, some citizens even sued the government, accusing it of unconstitutional actions that could potentially endanger the security of their personal data [11]. Also, many people understand that a hypothetical future of a high-tech society, contrary to the official statements by its designers, would not lead to a greater unity of people and improvement of the entire social system but, on the contrary, to greater disintegration and differentiation of Society. Constant contact with AI and robots can hardly contribute to the warmth of human relationships: in Japanese society, there is already a whole layer of young people (the so-called hikikomori) who refuse social contacts, work, and study by replacing them with communication with gadgets. With increasing dependence on AI, such asocial behavior can also spread within other groups of the population, especially among those who lost their jobs due to the robotization of the industrial process. Dr. Shinozawa [11] also notes that the care provided by a robot to a sick or elderly person cannot be compared with human care in terms of emotional richness. Therefore, in an "ideal" future society may face competition for "live" medical staff, in which the most affluent people will be able to afford the cost of the expensive labor of a "live" nurse or social worker. Thus, Society 5.0 declared in Japan as designed for eliminating social inequality may eventually turn into a social anti-utopia.

While economists and politicians are trying to convince everyone of the need to build a controlled technological paradise, the voices of researches working to improve artificial intelligence are audible. Their main fear is associated with the onset of *technological singularity*, that is, the irreversibility and uncontrollability of debugging would-be created artificial intelligence. Many speculate that AI can enter into an unbridled reaction of self-improvement cycles and would pass a thousand-year evolution in a split second. This topic was raised by Bostrom, Yudkowsky, Vassar, Voss, Omohundro, Norwig, and many others [12]. In their opinion, as soon as *superintelligence* gets out of control, it will become the last invention of mankind. Will the *intellect* which has attained divine power want to remain a slave to humanity? - scientists are asking. After all, fully developed AI would need humans to the same extent as humans need to preserve the locust populations. In general, both positive and negative hypotheses predict the onset of radical change by 2050.

Culturologists and philosophers, pointing out already arrived and probable transformations of life, most do not share optimism regarding digitalization. Fears of physicists, mathematicians, and programmers do not bother them much. Indeed, even if the artificial intelligence passes the Alan Turing humanity test, where can it get its will, intuition, goal-setting? Recollecting Searle's *Chinese room* experiment [13], how one can write a program while not being aware of its task? Suppose that at some point we would believe in achieving success of obtaining artificial semantic meanings from formal manipulations with symbols, and artificial intelligence will convince us that it has reached the "divine" level. What to worry about? As Voltaire said, "If God does not exist, he should have been invented." Science debunked the idea of God and then created it again. What is the problem? Why be afraid?

Another thing is the observations of neurophysiologists and psychiatrists who are already observing the intellectual and creative degradation of people who are dependent on the Internet. In communication-advanced countries, neurophysiologists diagnose two mass types of deviations (especially among adolescents): *information pseudo-debility* [14] and *digital dementia* [15]. Many convincing studies have been carried out in this direction; they show that compared to the 1990s, we began to communicate several times less, that we are getting dumber when we keep a smartphone in our hands [16-18]. We cease to think creatively because the default system of our brain which is responsible for these processes is blocked by incessant information flows and neural networks responsible for orientation in space. Why one has to stop this flow if it is so pleasant? Studies [19] have

shown that the biochemical patterns of digital and drug dependence are completely identical. It is an easy way to get the hormone of happiness, dopamine. The magnitude of online gaming pastime today has prompted the World Health Organization (WHO) to include this problem in the list of the international classification of diseases (ICD-11). It turns out that it is not the insidious artificial intelligence that is dangerous, because it is not clear where the *will* in it should come from to enslave humanity. People are in a dangerous situation because they may become incapable of creative self-actualization being entangled in the information cocoon created by their own hands, where only events that process semantic forms created in course of communicative self-production are important but not people and means of communication.

4. LEADER DESTINY IN SUPER SMART SOCIETY

If leadership is considered at the level of countries and transnational communities in terms of developed countries, i.e. technologically, it is would be won by those who are the first to enter the cybernetic era into the world of supercomputers, artificial intelligence, and close relation of a human cyborg with bio-cybernetic devices. As for the leadership of individuals in Society 5.0, the situation is not so clear. The plans of architects of the new society declare the priority of human capital and the emergence of new values. The question “what are these values consist of?” still has no answer. This topic is somehow removed from the agenda and for long has not been an asset for reflection. The above declaration is a pun, substitution semantics with syntax. Besides, a human differs from other living and artificial creatures by the presence of culture; in the technological race and futuristic social engineering, however, the culture and humanities with their principal object being the practice of self-determination are given the third place. If during the planned transition to Society 5.0, the final move from the Gutenberg galaxy to the Zuckerberg galaxy, we are to escape the pandemic of informational dementia and digital autism, what can a leader rely on? First, on the acquisition of subjectivity since without subjectivity in general neither goal-setting nor achievement of the goal is possible. Second, on attaining self-identity since without it no becoming, indicating, noticing is possible. Third, on technology, the choice of which depends on the nature of a particular person – talent, ambitions, character, sphere of interests. In the emerging future, three strategies should be recognized as feasible: formal, marketing, and myth-designing.

The formal strategy consists of determining the optimal positions in existing or developing structures of

joint activities. Originating in the New Age, in the era of the emergence of Society 3.0, a person acquired the right to seek influence and significance not only by the nobility of origin but by the power of talent or perseverance. This opportunity persists today. Adjusted for restructuring from hierarchical to network cluster forms of organizing communicative practices, the movement to leadership is the movement in occupying key positions in formal structures (“bridges”, “hubs”). In this case, leadership status is ensured by legal provisions and principles of accepted significance and subordination which determine the relations and links between participants in a project or process.

The marketing strategy was developed during the advance of Society 4.0 formation and involves the construction of special regard to oneself or one’s skills and competencies as a product. Behind it stands well-known arsenal of personal brand promotion technologies developed by Trout and Ries [20]; Rein et al. [21]. No one is going to rebuild consumer society. The motto “I consume, therefore I am” is relevant as never before. The novelty consists only in the fact that a virtualized society is capable of forming leaders daily. Marketing practices that produce impressions are simulative. If leadership in the pre-information era consisted in the fact that recognition came to a person as a reward for real activity, the current image platform is capable of forming a “multidimensional” image of a person modeling its identifications through the prism of virtuality. The attention to a person depends on the coincidence of the visual and verbal image with changing but predictable demands of society.

The myth-designing strategy is connected with the archaic nature of human consciousness and paradoxical oncoming movements that guide people through increasingly sophisticated technologies to myths and archetypes. The iconic turn that was performed at the turn of the century [22], [23] showed that myths and archetypes are consistent with the information-visual culture because they reveal their content not only through discourse but iconically, through visual form. In the space of new artificiality, this tendency can also be interpreted as a person’s movement towards oneself or as a *new archaic*. This resource helps people navigate in a changeable and relative transcultural space. Drowning in information, losing the integrity of perception in cluster networks, people save themselves in the myths of political, social, commercial sense, adapting the world in such a manner. In this situation, leadership is built in co-working with “emotional intelligence” [24], or by addressing meditation practices that oppose digital dementia, or by getting structured according to models for building an authentic personal brand [25], [26]. Technologies for the formation of self-identity, based on basic values and needs [27] or relying upon those cultural universals that, regardless of the

field of activity, give strength to take responsibility for themselves and the world as a whole, are also at disposal for fashioning a leadership status.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The construction of the Super Smart Society is a short-term perspective for all advanced and developing countries. It is based on evolutionary ideas and the technological dimension of history. The basis of a new society is the emancipation of people from the information routine provided by artificial intelligence, smart machines and things. If multifaceted planning concerning social management, possibilities of economic, and technological development is being carried out, the sphere of culture and human development remains a little-mastered topic. Exactly in this domain, we already face many serious problems. Among them, it is digital dementia, informational autism, breakdown of human ties, universal alienation.

One can see that the trends in accelerating changes in the environment and human ability to self-change, the rapid development of network forms of interaction, digitalization, clustering of society and culture set a special mode of motivated activity of leaders today. They point to three leadership strategies that remain relevant - functional (based on resourceful “hubs” and “bridges” as places of power for leaders of Society 5.0), marketing (while the dominant consumer development model is maintained), and conceptual and thesaurus myth-design strategy. Each of them can be implemented in a wide range of applied and tasteful skills: from administrative-technocratic and expert to artistically playful.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The reported study was funded by Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR) according to the research project No. 18-011-00977.

REFERENCES

- [1] Keidanren (2016) Toward realization of the new economy and society: Reform of the economy and society by the deepening of “Society 5.0”. http://www.keidanren.or.jp/en/policy/2016/029_outline.pdf Accessed on 28 Dec 2020
- [2] A. Sonoda (2018) Atarashii iryou infura no souzou e (To the construction of the new medical treatment infrastructure). <https://yab.yomiuri.co.jp/project/mirai/5/discussion3.html> Accessed on 21 Nov 2020
- [3] Society 5.0 (2019) Japan. Sharing Tomorrow. <https://www.japan.go.jp/technology/#society> Accessed 28 Apr 2020
- [4] The Government of Japan (2019) Realizing Society 5.0. https://www.japan.go.jp/abonomics/_userdata/abonomics/pdf/society_5.0.pdf. Accessed 28 Apr 2020
- [5] D. Bell, The coming of post-industrial society: a venture in social forecasting, Basic books, 1976, 507 p.
- [6] A. Toffler, The Third wave, William Morrow and company Inc., 1980, 544 p.
- [7] Ch. Leadbeater, Living On Thin Air: The New Economy, Viking, 1999, 243 p.
- [8] M. Sheller, J. Urry, The new mobilities paradigm, *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 38(2) (2006) 207-226. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1068/a37268>
- [9] J. Baudrillard, In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities, or, The End of the Social and Other Essays, *Semiotext(e)*, 1983, 123 p.
- [10] R. Kurzweil, The age of spiritual machines: when computers exceed human intelligence, Penguin Group, 2000, 388 p.
- [11] O. Gagan (2020) Society 5.0: Japan’s lofty plans face hurdles. <https://www.raconteur.net/business-innovation/society-5-0-infrastructure>. Accessed on 25 Dec 2020
- [12] J. Barrat, Our Final Invention. Artificial Intelligence and the End of the Human Era, St. Martin’s Press, 2013, 303 p.
- [13] J. Searle, Minds, brains, and programs, *Behavioral and brain sciences* 3(3) (1980) 417-424. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00005756>
- [14] A.N. Alekhin, A.V. Kurpatov, *Filosofiya psikhologii. Novaya metodologiya*, Olma Media, 2006, 448 p.
- [15] M. Spitzer, *Digitale Demenz: wie wir uns und unsere Kinder um den Verstand bringen*, Droemer, 2012, 366 p.
- [16] S. Greenfield, *Mind Change: How Digital Technologies Are Leaving Their Mark On Our Brains*, Random House, 2015, 348 p.
- [17] C.A. Rowan, *Virtual Child: The terrifying truth about what technology is doing to children*, Sunshine Coast Occupational Therapy Inc., 2010, 248 p.

- [18] S. Palmer, *Toxic Childhood: How the Modern World is Damaging Our Children and what We Can Do about it*, Orion, 2007, 368 p.
- [19] B. Michela, S. Campanella, R. Finocchiaro, Web addiction in the brain: Cortical oscillations, autonomic activity, and behavioral measures, *Journal of Behavioral Addictions* 6(3) (2017) 334-344. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1556/2006.6.2017.041>
- [20] A. Ries, J. Trout, *Positioning: The Battle for Your Mind*, McGraw-Hill Education, 2001, 224 p.
- [21] I. Rein, Ph. Kotler, M. Hamlin, M. Stoler, *High Visibility: Transforming Your Personal and Professional Brand*, McGraw Hill Education, 2006, 240 p.
- [22] W.J.T. Mitchel, *Picture Theory. Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation*, The University of Chicago Press, 1994, 462 p.
- [23] G. Boehm, *Wie Bilder Sinn erzeugen: Die Macht des Zeigens*, Berlin University Press, 2007, 282 p.
- [24] D. Goleman, R.E. Boyatzis, A. McKee, *Primal leadership: learning to lead with emotional intelligence*, Harvard Business School Press, 2004, 336 p.
- [25] H. Rampersad, *Authentic Personal Branding: A New Blueprint for Building and Aligning a Powerful Leadership Brand*, Information Age Publishing, 2009, 284 p.
- [26] D. McNally, K. Speak, *Be Your Own Brand: A Breakthrough Formula for Standing Out from the Crowd*, Berrett-Koehler, 2011, 158 p.
- [27] M. Vasilieva, A. Nadein, *Brand: power of personality* (transl. Sila lichnosty), Piter, 2003, 208 p.