

What does the Pandemic or the First Signs of the Formation of a New Civilization Indicate?

Vadim Rozin*

Professor, Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

***Corresponding Author:** Vadim Rozin, Professor, Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia.

Received: May 15, 2021; **Published:** August 28, 2021

Abstract

According to the author, it is unlikely that after a pandemic, the world will begin to seriously change; humanity has not realized the reasons for what is happening. He interprets the modern situation pessimistically, as a civilization crisis caused by the completion of the semantic project of modernity. It is argued that the modernist project was implemented, giving rise not only to modern life and sociality, but also numerous problems. As a result, the main pillars on which the Art Nouveau was built changed dramatically. The author argues that a new project is needed, corresponding to the current planetary reality, new challenges of the time, new forms of sociality and development trends. The features of the new semantic project of civilization (the need to recognize the completion of the modern project, to formulate ideas that might appeal to our contemporaries), as well as the problems that stand in the way of its implementation are discussed.

Keywords: *Pandemic; Civilization; Culture; Nature; Society; Personality; Project; Implementation; Sociality; Crisis; Law*

Introduction

More and more often, the question is raised what will happen after the pandemic - will the world change or not. Many commentators and analysts are confident that yes, the world will change dramatically. But I, like the famous Russian sociologist and economist Vladislav Inozemtsev, believe that although some progress will occur, nothing will change significantly, since humanity has not really realized what has happened, or why it is impossible to live as before [1].

"I," Vladislav Inozemtsev expresses his opinion on "Echo of Moscow", "one of the few who believes that nothing will change... Look at the world economy. It was formed over the past 20 years precisely in the hopes and assumptions that everything will develop as it is. Imagine - now in America there are 35 million unemployed, in Europe there are also a lot of them - imagine that now the structure of the economy that was, is not being restored. What's going on with these people? What will happen, say, with the millions of migrants in Europe who work in the service sector? What will happen to those people who are still working? What does it mean the world will change? It remains the same for now. Yes, it will change very radically in the next 10, 15, 20 years, because people have caught this signal that there are much more real dangers in the world than it seemed. And the economy will adjust. But in the short term, it will recover in the forms in which it existed, because it has no other forms" [2].

Most people think that in a year and a half a vaccine will be developed, which will be vaccinated by the willing and unwilling, everything will go into its own rut, and the world and the economy will rush forward again; in the worst case, doctors reassure, the coronavirus will walk the earth like a regular flu. But I think the situation is much more serious. It is better to compare the coronavirus pandemic not with natural disasters, earthquakes and tsunamis (remember, in 2004, about 200,000 people died in Sri Lanka), but with man-made disasters such as Chernobyl. In fact, man-made man-made disasters, well, maybe not in the literal sense of the word (after all, these are not terrorist

attacks like September 11). Nevertheless, they are due to human activities, which have become not only commensurate in scale with tectonic planetary processes.

The rapid spread of COVID-19 was facilitated by intensive international economic activity and trade, tourism, a colossally increased density of population and connections, the development of new nutrition technologies that would allow eating previously inedible foods, experiments and developments with genetic material (as you know, various types of animal coronaviruses, including finding out the possibility of attaching them to human tissues), contributed, oddly enough, even methods of treating patients (as many clinics have become foci of coronavirus infection).

Doesn't the rapprochement of the biosphere with the technosphere, their interpenetration into each other, contribute to pandemics? More precisely, a person, with his activity, which has become global and planetary, changes the living conditions of almost all biological organisms, not excluding his own. They begin to behave in an unusual way, it even seems that some, like the coronavirus, were specially created by humans either for the purpose of possible super-profit or as a potential weapon against their enemies (there are more than a dozen conspiracy theories of coronavirus). But all of humanity was suddenly the enemy. It turns out that the coronavirus pandemic is a response of the first and second nature to the nature of the development of our civilization. However, of course, not only the pandemic forces nature to take revenge on man, it is added to and even ahead of man-made disasters, as well as less noticeable changes - damage to the environment (for example, its pollution, warming), an increase in the risk of getting sick or dying; all this as a whole results in the dissatisfaction of many people with life.

But hasn't it always been so, it is enough to recall the cholera epidemic in the Middle Ages, which claimed millions of lives? However, after all, modern man has created effective science and medicine, now he can not only see his enemy in the "face" (through a microscope), but also develop a vaccine against him, and inoculate it to everyone. True, this development is paid for by such a transformation of the environment and human life, which gives rise to new problems, risks and epidemics. But after all, the average life expectancy of a person has increased significantly, and in general he began to live better. Modern man lives more comfortable, richer, more interesting. Well, of course, not all, but has it ever happened that everyone on earth would be good? At the same time, life has become better in this respect: the redistribution of the national product from those who work and who are successful in competition to those who are not and who are less successful are expanding more and more. Currently, as you know, millions of people in different countries live on benefits and subsidies, earlier they would have simply died of hunger and disease. True, many die today, especially in Africa and backward countries.

From a modernist project to a post-civilization project

In short, the current situation can be looked at in two ways. On the one hand, to say that despite all the problems and crises, human life expectancy is increasing, life itself is becoming better and more comfortable, very slowly, but still social justice is being established on earth. On the other hand, pandemics and man-made disasters, falling morals and social inequality, fierce economic competition and the struggle for influence, insisting on the priority of their ideological and national ideas put our civilization on the brink of death, a couple more steps and irreversible processes will begin (if they have not already begun). And then the COVID-19 pandemic will not seem so scary to us, just another call that we did not pay attention to.

I will not immediately take one side or the other, but rather consider how the world in which we live was arranged, and what has become of the «foundation» on which it still stands. This world was called "modern European culture" by the humanities, and "modern" by sociologists, and it is based on the project and principles outlined in the 15th - 17th centuries. Here is the principle of religious tolerance, approved during the reformation. And the idea that not God, but nature is the source of human well-being. And the social scenario formulated by Francis Bacon, according to which the main goal is to master nature, creating for this natural science, engineering and industry based on them. This also includes the task of building a non-class society and state, which should take upon itself the protection of citizens, as well as the regulation of economic and social relations. To these principles, it is necessary to add both the cult of a free,

proactive and reasonable personality, which must solve all these problems, and the idea of a society that must balance the state, making sure that it does not subjugate citizens, depriving them of their freedom [1].

All these principles and ideas set the “semantic project” of modernity, which took the place of the semantic project of the culture of the Middle Ages. The latter was a belief in the existence of a Creator in three persons, who created the world and man; the idea that this world will pass and there will be the second coming of Christ and the last judgment; The project also included a script for remaking the old man into a new one, a Christian. Approximately by the XIV-XV centuries, this conceptual project was implemented: the bulk of the European population adopted Christianity and lived in accordance with the principles of Scripture and the idea of the Last Judgment was pushed aside by the church into an indefinite future. Man lived more and more with earthly concerns, the estate society was disintegrating, the Catholic world was in crisis.

It took a new conceptual project, which was created. At the same time, the reality, within the framework of which existence was thought, was transferred from heaven from God to earth, and man was placed at the center of the world and creation. The single space of the Christian Catholic faith split into different denominations (Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, Anglicans, Baptists). Earthly reality was increasingly interpreted as nature, the laws of which were studied by natural science, it was nature that was considered as a source of strength, energies and human well-being. To realize this vision, an industry based on engineering was called upon, and that, in turn, creating new technology, used the laws of nature. The disintegration of the medieval estate society, the process of secularization, trade and industry created the conditions for individual freedom and the formation of mass audiences (communities) of producers and consumers. To introduce their livelihoods into a social framework, law, economy and state are created; in parallel, society is emerging as a force commensurate with the state, designed to control it, which, as further history has shown, was rarely and with great difficulty.

This was approximately the content of the semantic project of modernity, which began to be implemented starting from the 16th - 17th centuries, and quite successfully, as well as the main directions of development of this project. By the twentieth century, the Art Nouveau project was not only implemented, but also subjected to serious criticism, since new problems and various negative consequences of the implementation of the Art Nouveau project were realized. The end of the second millennium can be qualified as the beginning of the transition from modernity to post-European civilization, which is characterized not only by criticism and denial of the modern project, but also by an increase in crisis phenomena, despite the fact that at the same time none of the states was going to abandon the modern project, on the contrary, the main development trend is to squeeze as much out of this project as possible. So the installation to return after the coronavirus pandemic to the previous directions of development and values indicates that we continue to live in captivity of the ideas of the project outlined here. Consider just one idea of this project - anthropological, the idea of personality.

Personality: Free, proactive, standing above nature, reasonable - such a person was declared by Bacon, Descartes, Pascal, Kant, and it was such a person that was required to learn the laws of nature, to build natural science and engineering, to create a nation state, law and society. Since then, a lot of water has flown under the bridge. A modern personality is a lot of different personality types («unique personality», «mass», «moral», «deviant», etc.). But the main thing is that before her, as before the personality of the beginning of the era of modernity, nature has not yet been recognized, plans for the creation of a new world (state, law and society), a world that is more just and orderly, do not loom. In that era, such a perspective inspired the personality, gave energy, forced to create. At the present time, on the contrary, everything looks, on the one hand, already known, and therefore of little interest, on the other hand, complex, uncertain and therefore dangerous. Moreover, it is the knowledge of natural laws that indicates a high probability of the death of humanity. It does not matter whether it is so or not, unfortunately, the modern personality has turned out to be deprived of a life perspective, a cultural meaning of existence.

But maybe it is possible to live without such a perspective, not knowing how the world actually works, and what awaits us? “Einstein,” notes the famous philosopher of antiquity Pierre Ado, “was delighted with the laws of nature, which presuppose a transcendental mind, and with the order of the world, corresponding to the order of thought. One could say in this regard: it is not clear that the world would be

understandable... the issue of providence and the order of the world are of little importance. Epicurus did not believe in this, and, by the way, the views of the Stoics, after all, are not very far removed from some modern concepts" ([3]: 240).

It must be admitted that, indeed, at the present time many live without knowing the order of the world. True, for an average person, and not a subtle philosopher, such a life is unbearable. Nevertheless, in order to live normally and act in concert, such a person needs an understandable picture of reality that meets his aspirations (what we have called the semantic project of culture).

But even where modern man thinks he knows the order of the world, he is greatly mistaken. Take a simple example, the belief that there are three fairly independent realities - cosmic (physical), biological (vital), and social. The study of evolution and attempts to answer the question of the origin of biological life and humans are derived from this triad. Scientists believe that initially, about 4 billion years ago, there was no life on earth, but processes related to cosmic reality took place. At some stage, conditions and such a degree of complexity of this reality developed, which allowed the simplest forms of life to arise in a leap, under the influence of random interactions. Biological evolution began, which was characterized by the development and complication of organisms.

There are two ways to explain these processes - the first, natural science (the concept of Darwin and STE) and the second, where the formation of the new is explained by the change in reality as a result of the fact that the previous whole (reality) reaches a certain level of development and complexity. "In his brilliant constructions," writes Robert Salman, "which have already become classics by now, the French mathematician Rene Thom expressed the idea that any organization, system or living organism obeys a certain logic in its development, following a certain growth curve until then, until it reaches some ceiling. At such a moment, a breakdown (or «catastrophe») occurs, predetermining the disappearance or disintegration of the object under consideration, due to which a new form arises, the type of which is almost impossible to predict on the basis of previously observed conditions. At the same time, the new form self-organizes according to new principles, demonstrating a completely new way of development... any system of causal laws is reliable only at a certain level, and the creation of conditions for achieving a certain aggregate state depends on some other, fundamental principles and laws, causal connections of a higher order, which can be formulated only when there is a qualitative transition to a new state... Therefore, the universe, the world can be characterized as an open system, a kind of sequence of worlds in worlds where the unpredictable (that is, unknown laws of a higher order) and necessity (that is, the principle of consistent, logical organization) constantly interact with each other... Modern science has proven that the world cannot be perceived only as a simple set of objects of solid matter or a set of masses with energy, and the information component in the sense of a certain genetic code, a communication component spreading between forms, an element of interaction between an observer and an object, internal cohesion (that is, global interdependence) of all fragments of the mosaic" ([4]: 128, 129, 131).

In turn, the development and complication of biological life, by approximately the same logic, created the prerequisites for the emergence and formation of man and social life. I show that the origin of man and archaic forms of sociality can be explained only if three assumptions are introduced and substantiated. First, that somewhere at the turn of a million, one and a half million years BC. preconditions were formed, among which were both random and natural (a sharp cold snap that reduced forests, survival in these conditions of hominid communities with a developed signaling system and a strong leader's power, a transition to paradoxical behavior, i.e. the opposite of the situation in which hominids find themselves). Secondly, on the basis of signaling, biological behavior, semiotic (sign) and nonbiological, prosocial behavior has developed [5]. I regard this behavior as a neoplasm, it does not represent the more developed biological behavior of hominids. Thirdly, that the first type of culture and sociality (archaic) was formed on the basis of the semiotic scheme of the soul, the invention of which was also subject to the logic of the accidental and natural [5].

It is worth dwelling on this triad of realities in more detail, firstly, because it partly allows us to understand the features of different types of nature, and secondly, an analysis of the relationship of cosmic, vital and social reality can shed light on such important processes of our time as an ecological crisis, a pandemic, the threat of the death of our technogenic civilization. Indeed, isn't the ecological crisis and

pandemic caused by processes in social reality? Is it not the design intelligence of the new time that makes a person conquer nature (both cosmic and vital), put more and more on genetic engineering, which contributes to the closure of the biosphere and the technosphere, develop business ties and tourism, which leads to the strengthening of connections and contacts between people, to overcoming the borders of states and geographic space? It all looks in such a way that these three types of realities came into interaction, although they seem to be independent of each other. Anyway, people on earth act as if they are independent. Only in recent decades have we begun to guess about the interconnection of cosmic, vital and social realities (natures).

The first question worth discussing here is what happens when a new type of reality emerges. Take, for example, social reality and such processes as the formation of love in archaic and ancient culture. The famous American anthropologist Margared Mead describes love in the Arapesh tribe (New Guinea). They explained the appearance of children in this way: children are obtained from the blood of the mother and the sperm of the father. This explanation from a semiotic point of view is a typical narrative schema. It was invented by some member of the tribe, allowed to solve a problematic situation (misunderstanding of how children are made), set a new reality and understanding, allowed to act in a new way (after getting married, the spouses lived with each other as often as possible in order to transfer more sperm to the mother and as soon as the first signs of pregnancy appeared, sexual relations between spouses completely stopped until the next time a new child was «created»).

Problematic	Scheme	New reality
Situation	Semiot. Subject	New activity
First phase	Second phase	Third phase

Plato in the «Feast», as I show, also creates narrative schemes (two Aphrodites - the vulgar and the heavenly, the scheme of androgyne, bearing spiritual fruits, Eros as a genius). They are introduced with a dual purpose: 1) to block the traditional popular understanding of love, according to which it was believed that love is caused by the gods of love, and a person is a simple object of their manipulations (the first diagram), and 2) to introduce a new understanding of love as a search for one’s half and striving for integrity (the second scheme, androgynous), as a work that presupposes idealization and the subordination of love to the tasks of friendship and salvation (the third and fourth schemes) [6].

We agree that both schemes of love (Arapesh and Plato) relate to social reality. Could they be considered to have grown out of the biological love of hominids? No, love in social terms is a new formation, it cannot be considered the next stage in the development of biological attraction and the construction of relationships between individuals of animals of different sexes. And yet there is a connection: it is attraction, and preference, and pleasure from communicating with a very specific individual. In this respect, the above three biological processes are the basis of social love.

However, since in social reality, not biological, but social tasks are solved (understanding, blocking traditional and introducing new forms of behavior and activity, etc.), insofar as the biological processes that provide social are forced to rebuild. So, the arapesh, having married, are forced to love, even when they have no desire, and cannot love their wife in the interval between conceiving children (therefore they love on the side). Likewise, Socrates in the «Feast» avoids the sensual love to which Alcibiades inclines him, since this love does not fit into Plato’s schemes. But in accordance with these schemes, the beloved, within the framework of platonic love, endow their beloved (beloved) with the features of the beautiful, the desire for various virtues, up to the desire for salvation; it is important that now the attraction and choice, and the pleasure of communication must satisfy the specified platonic concept of love.

Summarizing, we can conclude that with the formation of a new type of reality, certain processes of the previous type of reality are assimilated as the basis for processes of a new type, but at the same time they are modified and transformed in order to satisfy the relations of the new whole.

It is clear that assimilated areas, let's call them «modified», do not cancel the «mother's reality», at first they constitute a very small part of it. However, since they belong to the mother's reality and at the same time have been transformed to satisfy the relationship of the new reality (the whole), the modified areas become the sources of transformations in the mother's reality. For example, since the concept of platonic love belittled the role of sensual relationships in love, as well as the importance of family and marriage, in the practice of real love relationships, according to Plato, difficult problems arose. In the course of the evolution of love, these problems were gradually solved in the following cultures, on the one hand, within the framework of courtly love, which returned sensual relationships to love and on the other, a romantic bourgeois model of love that agreed with the idea of family and marriage [6].

Social reality		
↓↑		
Modified Areas of Vital Reality	→	Vital reality
	←	
		↓↑
Cosmic reality	→	Modified regions of cosmic reality
	←	

Two fundamental characteristics of any of the three types of reality (cosmic, vital, social) are development and complication in the course of development. However, the increase in complexity must be understood structurally and functionally, not just quantitatively. That is, it is not so much about an increase in the number of elements and connections, this is just one option for development, but about such an organization and structure that allows you to solve a wider range of tasks, to act more efficiently. In social reality, the design mind is an example of one of the sources of such development and complication.

In turn, the development and complication of reality changes the nature of the transformation of its underlying basis, which in the previous type of reality form modified areas; the transformation of these areas covers more and more territory and changes qualitatively. As a result, the modified areas further affect maternal reality. Sooner or later, the border probably begins to appear, about which Rene Thom writes: «any organization, system or living organism obeys a certain logic in its development, following a certain growth curve until it reaches a certain ceiling». It is important that the contribution to the approximation of this ceiling (border) is made not only by the processes of one of the types of reality we are interested in, say, social, but also by the processes of its modified areas (in this case, the processes of the modified areas of vital reality). The fact is that since the modified areas act as the basis for the processes of the next reality in evolution (in this case, social), their transformation cannot but affect the nature of its processes. They also begin to transform, but under the influence of their underlying basis. The closeness (limitedness) of the planet also played an important role here, which refers not only to the vital, but also to the cosmic reality.

Isn't that the key to explaining the current pandemic? The social development of modernity, especially the processes launched by the design mind, determined the complexity and scale of social processes that significantly transformed biological processes in the Earth's space, allowing, for example, animal coronaviruses or their artificial avatars to overcome the barrier and quickly adapt in the human population. As a result, as a response to this transformation, changes began in social reality: the curtailment of international contacts and, in part, the processes of globalization, the strengthening of the significance of the national state that has been shaken in recent years, changes in the conditions of economic and economic activity, etc. A similar process gave rise to an ecological crisis even earlier, man-made diseases, migration processes and a number of other negative processes, which in the aggregate would be perceived as a threat to the death of our civilization. Indeed, the social development of modernity predetermined such a development of industry and technologies, including the military, which on the scale (sphere) of the planet began to transform the processes of cosmic reality, and these, in turn, vital processes.

But not only ideas about personality and planetary reality have radically changed, they are experiencing a crisis and transformation and other basic pillars (principles, paintings and scenarios) on which modernity was built - the idea of nature, culture, economy, state, law. They can no longer fulfill the function of a conceptual project of civilization. Probably, a new project is needed, corresponding to the prevailing reality, new challenges of the time, new forms of sociality and development trends.

Let's return to the problem of forming a new conceptual project of post-European civilization. From what we have written here, it follows that the semantic project of modernity has been completed, giving rise to both the culture in which we live and a new social reality that no longer fits into the project of modernity, fraught with numerous problems, up to the threat of human existence. This situation is aggravated by the belief that the basic principles of modernity are correct, and therefore it is necessary to continue to implement them. From our point of view, one of the tasks, if we bear in mind the formation of a new semantic project, is to show that the project of modernity is over, and that it has spawned a post-European civilization, which is characterized by complex, difficult-to-solve problems [7].

If we talk about a new conceptual project, then first of all the task of "saving our civilization" arises, which presupposes a gradual change in the nature of development, values and ideas. Not mastering nature, a strong state and power, not comfort and entertainment, not gaining advantages over others, but confidence in preserving life on earth, understanding what is happening, including the need for restrictions in relation to a number of one's own fundamental desires and goals, cultivation values of a healthy life, love, helping others, opposition to evil and selfishness.

In order for the stated directives to save civilization not to be a utopia, in order for them to be realized, it is necessary to take into account at least three circumstances. First, the current reality and the above social trends. Both should not be ignored, otherwise social changes will go in the wrong direction, which is planned. Reality and social trends need to be thought over and problematized in order to develop an attitude towards them. For example, is it right to live without working at all? What can this lead to? Is it right when emigrants from another culture move to yours, for everything ready, and at the same time insist on preserving their own culture and way of life? Is it right to deprive the producer of most of the profits under the pretext of sharing with others, since everyone has the right to a decent standard of living?

Secondly, it is necessary to take into account the real state of consciousness of the population and communities involved in social changes and the salvation of civilization. How not to remember Plato with his image of the cave. Plato understands that a person who is not ready for change cannot be moved to a new way of life, therefore, in *The State*, he writes: "If someone starts to drag him up a steep slope, uphill and does not let him go until he takes him out into the sunlight, is he will not suffer and will not be indignant with such violence? And when he came out into the light, his eyes would be so amazed by the radiance that he could not make out a single object of those that he was told to be authentic" ([8]: 296). It is clear that different communities and groups, down to individual individuals, have different ideas about the world, as well as what to do, where to go. Here there are both mundane realistic concepts, and more airy, space ones.

Thirdly, since the characteristics of the new world are unknown, and they cannot be obtained from the summation of existing desires or imposed on others, as are obvious, insofar as these characteristics must be groped, sought based on philosophy, modern science, art, based on the collective discussion of all interested social subjects.

The conceptual project of the Middle Ages and Art Nouveau developed on three different levels. At the first, the whole was asked. For the Middle Ages, this is the idea of a Christian god and a scenario for the transformation of the old man into a Christian. For the new time, the whole was indicated by the tasks of mastering nature, creating natural science and engineering, and building a new type of sociality. At the second level, the state, law and other social institutions were created, society was formed. On the third (anthropological) scenarios of individual life were formed (the medieval idea of human transformation and salvation, the new European idea of enlightenment and earthly well-being).

It can be assumed that the new conceptual project will unfold on three levels. The whole here will be set, on the one hand, by the idea of saving our civilization, on the other, by the definition and formation of such a form of life that solves the problem of salvation and simultaneously works for man and culture, and both are not given in advance, but must be groped in the processes problematization, research, practical experiments, collective discussions, the work of a person in relation to himself. At the second level, two types of institutions are likely to be created - the state, but re-subordinated to society (to make it impossible for the state to usurp power), and the institutions of «horizontal ties», within which business relations will be built with the help of new information and digital technologies. and communication between individuals of different countries, religions and beliefs. At the anthropological level, it is necessary to re-form the scenarios of individual life, to determine the meaning of an individual's life at different stages and cultures of his life path (childhood, adolescence, adulthood, old age), to correlate this meaning with the requirements of the whole and social institutions.

The goals, objectives, and actions listed here are all part of a rational plan. This is what you need to do if you act rationally, relying on knowledge. But when it was in history that a person acted rationally, and does everyone equally understand what a reasonable, rational behavior is? It should be borne in mind that people on the planet are at very different stages of development. That many peoples believe that they are only just connecting to the benefits of civilization, while the peoples of the golden billion have already received everything a long time ago, and partly through the exploitation of the rest. That the development of modernity in the twentieth century led to the formation of a real class of «new egoists» («new bureaucracy»), prospering through the redistribution of national products and the misuse of social institutions. That many people on earth consider modern social life unjust and are confident that it can be made just.

Given all these circumstances, what does rational, intelligent behavior mean? Is it necessary, for example, for the sake of saving life on earth or for a more correct social development focused on minimal negative consequences and a healthier lifestyle, to postpone these ideas and desires of developing peoples or new egoists? In short, it is unlikely that modern man in general is ready to act rationally and reasonably. Not to mention individual countries where traditions have developed that temporarily or forever exclude reasonable behavior.

John Ritzer opens his book *Modern Sociological Theories* with the assertion that although “people create a world that ultimately enslaves them,” they “always have the opportunity to change the world order that limits them” ([9]: 16). Let's see what opportunities they have for this. At one time, social chaos and selfishness (we are talking about the formation of modernity) managed to curb and minimize due to the invention of new European institutions - parliament, national state, general elections, systems of checks and balances, law and others. And at the very least, this social order worked well in a number of European countries and the United States until the twentieth century. Today it has ceased to fulfill its purpose, both because social life has radically changed, and also because technologies have been invented that allow the created social institutions to be used for other purposes, for the selfish purposes of individual communities and even individuals and groups.

In general, selfishness in the world is growing. A.F. Losev asks why God tolerates evil and does nothing? Maybe because the old social order of modernity ordered to live, and the new one has not yet been created? E. Swedenborg argued that all people are divided into good, reaching out to God and Heaven, and bad, cultivating evil, and God maintains balance in the struggle of these forces. But then evil would not have to increase, but it is clearly growing. We have to admit that it's not biological nature, they say, there are predators and their prey, there is a food chain in which we occupy a certain place. No, at the level of social reality, the ideas of good and evil are valuable in themselves, they are created, among other things, by the design mind. For example, recently Dmitry Bykov at Echo of Moscow argued that Russia's troubles stem largely from secret services (from Ivan the Terrible to Putin), which are an absolute evil in Russia as well, a historical tradition.

But maybe evil can still be caged and minimized by creating a new social order? However, how can this be done if there are many social forces and organisms in the world at different levels of development: some are already ready to change, while others are not, they are only connecting to the benefits of modernity. Some are obsessed with the ideas of social reconstruction and justice, while others do not

believe in them and believe that social justice is unattainable. The idea of dialogue and mutual concessions presupposes a certain level of development from their participants, which does not exist, and it is not known whether it is possible in principle.

The situation is aggravated by one more circumstance - in addition to the three types of reality considered above, it seems that the fourth is becoming, it can be called the «anthropo-activity-technical» type of reality. This idea is suggested by the Internet, mobile communications, robotics and a number of other neoplasms. Is the Internet, for example, a purely technical invention and system? No, the Internet is constantly improving, due to which it develops, people are sitting on the Internet who solve a variety of social and individual tasks, batch transmission of information on the Internet, as well as virus attacks and the fight against them are very reminiscent of a special form of life, the Internet is changing our vision and a way of life, connecting the people of the planet in a new way ([10: 235-247]. The expression, «the world has become small, and everyone is connected to each other» reflects a new attitude, replacing the social type of reality and modernity.

Doesn't it then turn out that our world is doomed? However, not for the first time. Let us recall, for example, the end of ancient culture and the beginning of the Middle Ages. The fall of culture, the savagery, the spread of evil, the cholera pandemic and much more testified to the death of the world. But, starting from the VIII-IX centuries, the rise of culture, the development of cities and crafts, the formation of Christian morality began in Europe. The need to live, trade, maintain order, defend against enemies took over evil and social chaos. I think the same will happen in our world. At the same time, the role of the design mind should be rethought and limited. But, I suppose, social action will increasingly be built on the basis of knowledge of different types of nature and realities.

Conclusion

I don't think it's worth waiting for real, global catastrophes to break out that will force peoples to rethink what is happening? Is it possible to accelerate this rethinking by betting on broad enlightenment, preparing ideas and scenarios of solutions for living in a new world? Does it make sense to lay your life on the altar of future world changes? Perhaps a more correct strategy is to live and work in two worlds: the usual one, with all its shortcomings, and the "world" of preparation for the near future, in both of which one must try to live correctly and rationally? In this case, it turns out that one must live, as Pierre Ado argued, not knowing the order of the world? This is partly true, at present it is hardly possible to predict the future structure of the world; nevertheless, it is not only possible, but also necessary to think over the correct guidelines for life.

I am perfectly aware of how the proposals outlined here will be perceived by many readers - as a utopia and a subjective view. But I, as a philosopher and psychologist, are just doing my duty. I believe that without attempts to create such projects, without the competition of different projects, a real project will not appear, which will seem attractive and realistic and will begin to conquer the minds and the world.

Bibliography

1. Rozin VM. Formation, development and completion of the new European sociality (thinking over the book by V. Fedotova, V. Kolpakov, N. Fedotova "Global Capitalism: Three Great Transformations"). *Culture and Art* 4 (2020): 29-43.
2. Inozemtsev V. "Personally yours". *Echo of Moscow* (2020).
3. Ado Pierre. *Philosophy as a Way to Live: Conversations with Jeannie Carlier and Arnold I. Davidson*. M., St. Petersburg; Ed. "Steppe Wind" (2005): 288.
4. Salman R. "The future of management". M: Peter, St. Petersburg (2004): 304.
5. Rozin VM. "Cultural Man: An Introduction to Anthropology. Edition 2nd". M.: LENAND, (2019): 240.
6. Rozin VM. ""The Feast" of Plato. New reconstruction and some reminiscences in philosophy and culture". M.: URSS (2015): 200.

7. Rozin VM. "Is there really an eschatological future ahead of us?" *Philosophy and Cosmology* 21 (2018): 32-41.
8. Plato. *State. Sobr. Op. in 3 volumes. T. 3* (1994): 79-389.
9. Ritzer J. "Modern sociological theories". 5th edition. SPb.: Peter (2002): 688.
10. Rozin VM. "Technique and technology: from stone tools to the Internet and robots". Yoshkar, Ola: Volga State Polytechnic University (2016): 280.

Volume 10 Issue 9 September 2021

©All rights reserved by Vadim Rozin.