

The Pandemic, the Crisis of Modernity, and the Need for a New Semantic Project of Civilization

Vadim Rozin

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor,
Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow, Russia)

E-mail: rozinvm@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4025-2734>

Rozin, Vadim (2020) The Pandemic, the Crisis of Modernity, and the Need for a New Semantic Project of Civilization. *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 25, 32-42. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/25/3>

In the article, the modern pandemic is considered as one of the signs of deep crisis of our civilization, as the answer of the first and second nature to the character of its development. The author believes that the pandemic stands in line with technogenic disasters, but that it is unlikely that after the pandemic, the world will change, as mankind has not realized the reasons for what is happening. In a modern situation, it is possible to look differently: optimistically and pessimistically, as on the civilizational crisis caused by the end of the semantic project of a modernist style. The basis of this project is analyzed: the idea of nature acquirement, the creation of natural science and engineering, the task of building the state, law and society. It is affirmed that the project of modernity was implemented, giving rise not only to modern life and sociality, but also to the Mont Blanc problem. In order to demonstrate the transformation of reality as a result of the project of modernity, the author discusses what happened to the concepts and concepts of nature, technology, personality, economy, state and society. This analysis allows him to argue that the mainstays (principles, pictures and scenarios) on which modern was built, have changed dramatically. They can no longer perform the function of a semantic project of civilization and, therefore, a new project is needed that corresponds to the existing reality, new challenges of the time, new forms of sociality, and development trends. The main trends of social development are characterized: formation of new technologies, the crisis of coherent concepts of modern, the formation of Webcieties and maticultures, convergence of capitalism and socialism systems, formation of new morality and vision of reality. At the end, the author discusses the features of the new semantic project of civilization: the need to recognize the completion of the project of modernity, to formulate on three levels of ideas that could capture our contemporaries (the corresponding hypotheses are expressed), to discuss the conditions of such a project.

Keywords: civilization, culture, nature, society, personality, project, implementation, sociality, crisis, law

Received: 15 May 2020 / Accepted: 28 June 2020 / Published: 3 October 2020

Introduction

The planet is large, somewhere, for example, in Russia, the pandemic is approaching a plateau, and in some countries, quarantine and self-isolation regimes are already beginning. They are preparing for the opening of borders. Increasingly, the question is, what will happen next — will the world change or not? Many commentators and analysts were sure that, yes, the world would change dramatically. But I, as well as the well-known Russian sociologist and economist Vladislav Inozemtsev, believe that although some progress will occur, nothing will change significantly, because mankind has not yet really realized what has happened or why it is impossible to live as before (Rozin, 2020).

Vladislav Inozemtsev on *Ekho Moskvy* says, “I am one of the few who believes that nothing will change ... Look at the world economy. It has been formed over the past 20 years precisely in the hopes and assumptions that everything will develop as it is. Let us imagine — now in America, there are 35 million unemployed, in Europe there are also a lot of them — let us imagine that now the structure of the economy, which was, is not recovering. What happens to these people? What happens to, say, the millions of migrants who are in Europe working in the service sector? What will happen to those people who are still employed? 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 is going to adapt. But in the short term, it will recover in the forms in which it existed, because it has no other forms.

As for Russia, again, we have seen perfectly well over the past 12 years that the standard of living of the Russian population is declining ... We have no sources of growth. This became apparent after the crisis in 2008. Yes, oil helped a little bit. But the growth has faded in the last years of Medvedev’s presidency. It is impossible to wait for it to grow. We are going in a long, downward trend. Now it is going to accelerate.

...I cannot say that people are used to it, but in general, they do not understand how this trend can be changed. It can be changed only by destroying this state. People are afraid of this, because everyone can remember the 91st year; they do not understand what will happen if it all collapses. And therefore, there will be a very serious line that many will not want to cross... with the current system of management, with the current system of economic management, it is impossible to hope for any growth” (Inozemtsev, 2020).

Most people think that in a year or a year and a half, a vaccine will be developed that will be vaccinated to the willing and unwilling, everything will go into its rut, and the world and the economy will rush forward again. In the worst case, the doctors calm down, the coronavirus will tread the globe like a normal flu. I think the situation is much more serious. The Coronavirus pandemic is better compared not with natural disasters, earthquakes, and tsunamis (remember, in 2004, approximately 200,000 people died in Sri Lanka), but with technogenic disasters like Chernobyl. Technogenic disasters are human-made, well, maybe not in the literal sense of the word (these are not terrorist acts like September 11). Nevertheless, they are conditioned by human activity, which has become not only commensurate in scale with planetary tectonic processes.

Note that the rapid spread of COVID-19 has been facilitated by intensive international economic activity, trade, tourism, hugely increased population density and contacts, the development of new nutritional technologies that allow for the consumption of previously inedible foods, experiments and developments with genetic material, and strangely enough, even methods of treating diseased people. So many clinics have become foci of

coronavirus infection. Who would have thought, says Konstantin Remchukov, editor-in-chief of “*Nezavisimaya Gazeta*,” that “the virus will come from somewhere,” everyone flies by planes... “In Wuhan, 20 years ago, 18 million tourists visited this whole province, and 288 million tourists in the 18th year. There are airplanes flying to 54 countries, 82 cities in China. And, you know, if they fly out of this Wuhan, go to the market, eat... And so around the world... Of course, these are factors predetermined by the level of globalization” (Remchukov, 2020).

Does not a pandemic contribute to the rapprochement of the biosphere with the technosphere, to their interpenetration into each other? More precisely, a human through 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 unusually. It even seems that some, like coronavirus, are specially created by man either for the purpose of possible superprofits or as a potential weapon against their enemies (by hearing, more than a dozen conspiracy theories of coronavirus). Suddenly, the enemy was the whole of humanity. It appears that the coronavirus pandemic is the answer of the first and second nature on the character of the development of our civilization. But it is clear that not only a pandemic forces nature take revenge on man, technogenic disasters are added to it, and even ahead of it, also, however, as well as less noticeable changes — damage to the environment (for example: pollution, warming), increased risk of falling sick or dying, all this in general leads to dissatisfaction of many people with life.

But, has it always been so, enough to remember the cholera epidemic in the Middle Ages, which took millions of lives? But indeed, modern man has created an effective science and medicine. Now he can not only see his enemy in the “face” (in the microscope), but also develop a vaccine against him, and vaccinate everyone. The price for this development is indeed such a transformation of the environment and human life, which generates the subsequent problems, risks and epidemics. But indeed, the average life expectancy of humans has increased significantly, and in general, he began to live better. Modern human lives more comfortable, richer, more interesting. Well, of course, not all, but has it ever been so that everyone on earth as well? At the same time and in this respect, life has become better: the redistribution of the national product is increasing from workers and successful in competition to nonworkers and less successful. Today, as we know, millions of people in different countries live on allowances and grants, and earlier, they would simply die of starvation or disease. Indeed, many are still dying today, especially in Africa and backward countries.

From a project of modernity to a project of post-civilization

In short, you can look at the current situation in two ways. On the one hand, to say that despite all the problems and crises, human life expectancy increases, life itself becomes better and more comfortable, very slowly, but still social fairness is established on earth. On the other hand, pandemics and technogenic disasters, dissolution of morals and social inequality, rabid economic competition and struggle for influence, insistence on the priority of their ideological and national ideas have put our civilization on the verge of death. A couple of steps and irreversible processes will start, if not already started. And then the COVID-19 pandemic will seem to us not so terrible, just another call that we did not pay attention to.

I am not going to take one or the other side, but rather I will consider how the world in which we live, and what happened to the “foundation” on which it still stands. This world received the name from the humanities “New European Culture,” from sociologists

“modern,” and is based on the project and principles outlined in the 15th — 17th centuries. Here is also the principle of religious tolerance, approved during the reformation. And the idea that nature, not God, 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 by creating natural science, engineering, and industry based on them. This also includes the task of building a non-estates society and a state. It must take over the protection of its 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, enterprising and rational person, who should solve all these tasks, and the idea of a society, which should balance the state, making sure that it does not subjugate its citizens by depriving them of their freedom (Rozin, 2020).

All these principles and concepts set the “semantic project” of modern, which took the place of the *semantic project of culture of the Middle Ages*. The latter was a belief in the existence of the Creator in three persons, who created the world and humans. The idea that this world will pass, and there will be a second advent of Christ and the Last Judgement. The project also included a scenario of remaking an ancient man into a new Christian. Around the 14th — 15th centuries, this semantic project was implemented: the majority of the European population adopted Christianity and lived according to the principles of the Holy Scriptures, and the church removed the idea of the Last Judgement into an uncertain future. The man lived more and more with earthly concerns. The class society collapsed; the Catholic world was in crisis.

A new semantic project was needed, which was created. In this case, the reality within which the existence was thought, from heaven was transferred to earth. In the center of the world and creation was man. As stated in the treatise of Pico Della Mirandola, “Then God accepted man as a creation of an undefined image and, putting him in the center of the world, said: “...I place you at the center of the world so that from there it would be more convenient for you to view everything that is in the world. I have not made you either heavenly or earthly, mortal, or immortal, so that you by yourself, a free and glorious master, shape yourself in the image that you prefer” (Mirandola, 1962: 507, 509).

The united space of the Christian Catholic faith was divided into different confessions (Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, Anglicans, Baptists). Earth reality was increasingly interpreted as nature, the laws of which were studied in natural sciences, it was nature that was seen as a source of strength, energy, and well-being of man. The engineering industry was called upon to realize this vision, which in turn, creating a new technique involved in the laws of nature. Decomposition of medieval class society, secularization process, trade, and industry created conditions for individual freedom and formation of mass audience (communities) of producers and consumers. Law, economy, and state are created to bring them into the social framework; in parallel, society is being formed as a force commensurate with the state, designed to control it, which history has shown to be rare and difficult.

It was the content of the conceptual project of the modernist style, which began to be implemented from the 16th — 17th centuries. By the twentieth century, the project of modernity had not only been implemented. Still, it was also seriously criticized, as new problems and various negative consequences of the project of modernity were implemented. The end of the second millennium can be qualified as the beginning of the transition from modern to post-European civilization. It is characterized not only by criticism and denial of the project of modernity, but also, by the growth of crisis phenomena. While at the same time, no one of the states was going to give up the project of modernity.

On the contrary, the main trend of development is to squeeze out of this project as much as possible. The attitude to return to the previous directions of development and values after the coronavirus pandemic testifies to the fact that we continue to live in captivity of the ideas of the project outlined here. Let us consider how the ideas on which the project of modernity stands have changed.

Nature. When the project of modernity was just taking shape, we were talking only about the “first nature.” Nature was thought of as “written in the mathematical language,” as obeying eternal and invariable laws, as containing hidden forces and energies that can be mastered and controlled, provided that the natural sciences discovered the appropriate laws and the creation of engineering devices operating within the framework of these laws (Rozin, 2017). Usually understood nature (outside the window) was reduced to this image, which, by the way, led to the ignoring of consequences uncalculable by engineer. On the contrary, space, which was largely deprived of its sacral beginning, was seen as an ideal example of the laws of nature, because here the processes were not distorted by human intervention or unique earthly conditions.

Nowadays, the perception of nature has changed significantly. It seems that we have already discovered the basic laws of the first nature (one of the last areas still unexplored is biological reality). In addition to the first nature, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the concept of “second nature” was introduced (for example, as part of the distinction between “nature and spirit sciences”). Today, the second nature is primarily a social and human phenomenon. Concerning nature, it is already difficult to speak, written in the language of mathematics. The second nature, as I show it, is grabbed, ended in schemes rather than in mathematical constructions (Rozin, 2017: 233). Nature is no longer seen as a source of our well-being. Yes, it gives much, no one denies it, but at the same time, it is a source of serious destruction and risks (environmental crisis, technogenic disasters, etc.). As a result, nature can no longer be seen as a basic reality of our existence and well-being. And space is now understood differently. The question of its exploration has shriveled before the exploration of the solar system (which, indeed, is quite real), and outside it, man is more likely to deal with the first nature, but uncertain and singular. In fact, in relation to this nature, he does not know what to do. Today the space is perceived mainly as a challenge to our usual notions of cognition, science and thinking.

Technique. Again, during the formation of the modernist design, the technique was understood quite differently than it is now. These are mechanisms and tools later in the 18th — 19th centuries of the machine. And the main technique with the easy hand of engineers was thought as operating on the basis of the laws of nature, as calculated and designed, and therefore, as a means of targeted controlled human activity. But already Nikolai Berdyaev, discussing the phenomenon of the machine, guessed that the technique enters the life of man on a completely new basis, that it can not be reduced to either human activity or nature, it forms a new reality that rises between the two (Sadykova, 2018). At present, this has become evident — in addition to nature and sociality, technology forms an independent reality that has as much influence on human life as the first nature.

If in 18th — 19th centuries it was engineering that was the leading type of technical activity, today it is technology. At the same time, I show that the essence of modern technology is not so many procedures and operations based on the processes of the first nature (this type of technology I call “technology in the narrow sense”) as co-organization of different activities (scientific, engineering, design, organizational, managerial, etc.), caused by socio-cultural factors (respectively, “technology in the broad sense”). These two points (organization of

different types of activities and socio-cultural factors) make technology in the broad sense, an extremely important factor in the development of our civilization (modern and post-modern). Since these moments are aspects of modern's sociality, technology in the broad sense is linked to social projects and systems. This explains why modern states link their well-being with the development of technology.

Personality. Free, enterprising, standing above nature, reasonable — such a person declared Bacon, Descartes, Pascal, Kant, and such a person was required to learn the laws of nature, to build natural science and engineering, to create a national state, law and society.

The modern personality is a lot of different types of personality (“unique personality,” “mass,” “moral,” “deviant,” etc.) (Khmil & Popovych, 2019). But most importantly, before it does not open, as before the person of the beginning of the era of modern, not yet known nature, do not lighthouse plans for a new world (state, law and society), a more just and orderly world. In that era, this perspective inspired the individual, gave energy, forced to create. Today, on the contrary, everything looks already known, on the one hand, and therefore little interesting, on the other hand, complex, uncertain and therefore dangerous. Moreover, it is the knowledge of natural regularities that indicates a greater probability of mankind's death. It does not matter whether it is so or not. Unfortunately, the modern personality has been deprived of life perspective, cultural meaning of existence.

Maybe it is possible to live without such a perspective, without knowing how the world is actually arranged and what awaits us? “Einstein, — notes the famous philosopher of antiquity Pierre Ado — delighted with the laws of nature, assuming a transcendental mind, and 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 understood ... the question of providence and the order of the world have little meaning. Epicurus did not believe in it, and, by the way, the Stoics' views are not very far removed from some modern concepts after all” (Ado, 2005: 240).

It must be admitted that, indeed, many people nowadays live without knowing the order of the world. It is true that for the average person, not a subtle philosopher, such life is unbearable. However, in order to live normally and act in harmony, such a person needs a picture of reality that is understandable and corresponds to his or her aspirations. We have called the semantic project of culture.

The economy. This reality takes shape quite late, only in the second half of the 18th century, although the market and economic activity appeared in the Ancient world. The formation of the economy was caused by the problems of calculating and forecasting, on the one hand, the financial activities of the then-emerging state (taxes, profits, maintenance of the army and yard, etc.) and, on the other hand, business activities, including trade. Economic technologies began to be invented — market regulation, capital accumulation, accounting, crediting, stock exchange activity, and others. They made it possible to solve these problems, determining whether the planned enterprise would be unprofitable or profitable. Whether the state would be able to make ends meet, and whether it would find funds for another war or the construction of a luxury palace. Already at this stage, the economy contained a layer: the first, economic and entrepreneurial activity, and the second, economic technology. So far, there was a relative balance between these layers. Of course, in times of crisis and war, it was possible to turn on the machine and print the right amount of money. Still, experience and negative consequences showed that this is the right way to economic ruin and the emergence of new, even more, unsolvable problems.

In the modern economy, the relationship between these two layers is different. The second layer has developed and outgrown a number of new ones. We may say secondary,

economic technologies: for example, the economic policy of the state and industrial and financial groups, the creation of financial markets, the establishment of monopolies and others. It is not society and law that has long been the “invisible hand of the market” and the quite observable hand of the state, but new economic actors in the person of industrial and financial groups, economic speculators of different kinds, communities and individuals who have seized power in the state. It is not easy to understand the economic policy of the state, but in times of social crises and pandemics, it becomes more visible. This is, for example, the current situation in Russia.

“A commercial state, — says Inozemtsev on *Ekho Moskvy*, — is a system in which formal instruments of state management are fully subordinated to the task of multiplying the wealth of its leader, his close associates, their friends and relatives, as well as all those whose political loyalty is necessary for the *big boss* to maintain his power and ensure his own security. Here it is pointless to talk about corruption in the generally accepted sense of the word, as it is an attempt to earn on one’s position in the political system, which implies serving public interests. At the same time, in a commercial state, this task is not even set. Enriching the political top is the highest goal of the system, and taking advantage of its position is its fundamental imperative” (Inozemtsev, 2019). “In Russia, the state and its employees believe that all that has come into the budget is their own. Even when Putin does not want to give the population what Navalny is offering, it is exactly the same psychology: “This, excuse me, is mine. The National Welfare Fund is Vladimir Vladimirovich’s pocket. It has nothing to do with the people of the Russian Federation. “If I want to give something to someone, you will first ask very humiliateingly — I will give you something” — this principle is reduced to the entire system of bureaucratic hierarchy ... The Russian state is an accumulating structure that works in the interests of its own bureaucracy. It has always worked like this, and as soon as it gets the chance, it will continue to work” (Inozemtsev, 2020).

The state. Social studies of recent years show that it is the state that forms the essence of modern, in the sense that its construction has drawn, on the one hand, the need for the formation of other formations of modern (nations, economy, New European law, society, etc.), as well as predetermined such processes as ideological rivalry of countries and world wars. The state constantly forgets (often consciously) about its role and mission — to serve society, not to turn it into its own means. Martin van Creveld writes, “The state closely linked to the fall of the medieval world and the subsequent civil and religious wars, was originally conceived primarily as a tool for establishing law and order in the relations between people and groups among themselves <...>. The transformation of the state from an instrument into an ideal would never have happened if it had not increased its control over society, far exceeding everything that its predecessors had only tried to do in the early New Age ... Every European state, and later any other state after 1789, wanted to be sure that its daily activities were under its control and, as far as possible, served the purposes of that very state. The most important means of achieving this were the police and prison apparatus, the education and social security systems” (Creveld, 2006: 165-166, 331).

Nevertheless, the states, especially the democratic ones, were the engine of the formation and development of modern, they owe it to the rapid development of modern industry, science, education, healthcare; without the initiative of the state many reforms would not have taken place. But the state gave birth to bureaucracy, the establishment, and the industrial and financial elites. In Creveld’s view, the state is now becoming ineffective and has to cede its functions to other social institutions. Loginov says, “The crisis of the state is expressed in the loss of levers of governance, in the blurring of sovereignty and the catastrophic fall of the

legitimacy of state power... The disappearance of the nation state has the flavor of catastrophe, capture, occupation of once sovereign territory... the state is increasingly relieving itself of responsibility for the situation in society, minimizing the “social burden”. (Loginov, 2011). “The state,” writes Crevelde, “which was the most significant and characteristic institution in the modern world since the middle of the 17th century, is in decline. Everywhere — from Western Europe to Africa — many of the existing states either voluntarily or involuntarily unite to form larger alliances or disintegrate. Whether they are disintegrating or uniting, many of their functions are already being intercepted by various organizations, which, whatever their nature, are definitely not States” (Crevelde, 2006: 3; McCann & HAdhmaill, 2020; Rouet & Ušiak, 2019).

But if the state leaves, then the society, which was created as a force proportional to the state and designed to control it, must also weaken, which is what we are witnessing, except for a few democratic countries. Various communities and groups are beginning to come to the fore, trying to seize power and redistribute goods and services produced in the country and partly in the world (Buroňová, 2019; Hollenbach, 2020; Fitzsimmons, 2020).

Thus, it must be recognized that the main pillars (principles, pictures and scenarios) on which the modern was built have changed dramatically. They can no longer serve as a semantic project of civilization (Avery, 2017). Probably, a new project is needed that corresponds to the existing reality, new challenges of time, new forms of sociality and development trends.

A few words about the latter: the first trend is well known. Technologies are rapidly developing, including, as modern research shows, those that allow the social structures established in modern times to be misused, in fact, for selfish purposes by various communities or even individuals. The second trend is the crisis of basic schemes and coherent (i.e., common to many people) ideas of modern. In particular, the law is devalued. The importance of limiting ontologies of nature and personality is decreasing. However, there is an increasing understanding of the role of human activity and activity as a source of many problems and challenges of modern. The third trend is the formation of network communities based on the Internet and mobile communications, for which space no longer matters. The fourth trend is the formation of meta-cultures, which include national cultures and states (for example, the Common Market or the United States with its oriented countries, or China, etc.). An important social trend is the convergence of two types of social systems — capitalism and socialism. Almost all states are gradually becoming hybrid in that, on the one hand, they develop the market and capitalist production and, on the other hand, they are increasingly moving towards centralized management and distribution of the national product (from working to partially working and not working at all, from successful to less successful in terms of competition). Whereas previously, socialism was only tilted by capitalist states during world wars, it is now also tilted by pandemics. If we assume that pandemics will multiply, this is indicated by a lot, will the process of convergence not accelerate in this case? Another trend is the formation of new moralities and visions that deny the labor and ethical principles of modern. Instead of them are proclaimed rather unusual, for example, “the opportunity to live without working at all,” because a small part of society, relying on modern technology and robotics, is able to feed all the others, or “correctly to force the rich and working to share with others the fruits of their labor,” or “fairly not what corresponds to the right and contribution of the individual, but the balance established in the struggle of interested subjects,” etc. Well, as a commonplace: there is a growing conviction among thinking people that our civilization is rapidly approaching its demise, that we live in a crazy world.

Let us return to the problem of the formation of a new semantic project of post-European civilization (Brown, 2019). From what we have written here, we can conclude that the Semantic project of modernity is complete, giving birth 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 the modern era are correct, and therefore it is necessary to continue implementing them. From our point of view, one of the tasks, if we have in mind the formation of a new semantic project, to show that the project of modern is curtailed, and that it gave birth to post-European civilization, which is characterized by complex, difficult to solve problems (Rozin, 2019).

If we talk about a new semantic project, then, first of all, the task of “saving our civilization,” which implies a gradual change like development, values and perceptions. 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 on a number of their own fundamental desires and goals, cultivating the values of a healthy life, love, help to others, confrontation with evil and selfishness.

Conclusions

To ensure that the attitudes expressed to save civilization are not perfect, and so that they can be implemented, at least three circumstances need to be taken into account. Firstly, the current reality and the social trends mentioned above. Both cannot be ignored. Otherwise, social change will go in the wrong direction as planned. Reality and social trends need to be thought through and challenged 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, to everything ready, while insisting on preserving their own culture and lifestyle? Is it right to deprive the producer of most of his profit on the pretext that he should share with others, because 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 rescue of civilization. How not to remember Plato from his cave image. Plato understands that a person who is not ready for changes cannot be moved to a new way of life. He writes in the “State” “If somebody will forcefully drag him upwards by the steepness, to the mountain and would not let him go until he takes him to the sunlight, would not he suffer and resent such violence? And when he came out into the light, his eyes would be so shining that he could not see a single object of which he is told to be true” (Plato, 1994: 296). It is clear that different communities and groups, even individual individuals, have different ideas about the world, as well as about what to do, where to go. Here there are both grounded realistic concepts and more aerial and cosmic ones (Krichevsky, 2020).

Third, since the characteristics of the new world are unknown and cannot be obtained from the summation of existing desires or imposed on others, as they are obvious, these characteristics must be found, searched, based on philosophy, modern science, art, based on the collective discussion of all social actors concerned.

The conceptual design of the Middle Ages and modern was developed at three different levels. The first-level “set the whole.” For the Middle Ages, it was the idea of a Christian god and the scenario of the transformation of an old man into a Christian. For the new time,

the whole indicated the tasks of mastering nature, creating natural science and engineering, building a new type of sociality. On the second level, the state, law and other social institutions were created, and society was formed. At the third (anthropological) level, scenarios of individual life were formed (the medieval idea of human transformation and salvation, New European idea of enlightenment and earthly well-being).

We can assume that the new semantic project will also be developed on three levels. The whole here will be assigned, on the one hand, to the idea of salvation of our civilization, on the other hand, to the definition and formation of such a form of life that solves the problem of salvation and simultaneously works for man and culture, both of which are not given in advance. Still, it must be found in the processes of problematization, research, practical experiments, collective discussions, the work of man in relation to himself. At the second level, two types of institutions are likely to be created — the state, but re-subordinated to society (in order to make it impossible to usurp the power of the state), and institutions of “horizontal links,” within which, with the help of new information and digital technologies, business relations and communication between individuals from different countries, faiths and beliefs will be built. At the anthropological level, it is necessary to redefine scenarios of individual life, to define the meaning of life of an individual at different stages and cultures of his or her life path (childhood, adolescence, adulthood, old age), and to correlate this meaning with the requirements of the whole and social institutions.

I am well aware of how many readers will perceive the proposals outlined here as utopia and subjective views. But I, as a philosopher, am simply doing my duty. I believe that without attempts to create such projects, without the competition of different projects, there will be no real project that will seem attractive and realistic and will begin to conquer the minds and the world.

References

- Ado, P. (2005) *Philosophy as a way to live: Discussions with Jeannie Carlier and Arnold I. Davidson*. Moscow, “Stepnoy Veter.”
- Avery, J.S. (2017) *Civilization's Crisis. A Set of Linked Challenges*. <https://doi.org/10.1142/10501>
- Browne, J. (2019) *Think, Imagine: Engineering the Future of Civilization*. Pegasus Books.
- Buroňová, Z. (2019) Terrorism Discourse in the US — Evolution of Discourse at Presidential Level after 9/11. *Politické vedy*, Vol. 22, No. 4, 102-124. <http://doi.org/10.24040/politickevedy.2019.22.4.102-124>
- Crevel, M. (2006) *The rise and fall of the state*. Moscow, IRISEN.
- Fitzsimmons, M. (2019) “Horizontal Escalation: An Asymmetric Approach to Russian Aggression? *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 13, 1, 95–133. Available online: www.jstor.org/stable/26585376
- Hollenbach, D. (2019) *Humanity in Crisis: Ethical and Religious Response to Refugees*. Georgetown University Press. Available online: www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvrmfqjj
- Inozemtsev, V. (2019) Ineffective. Ruthless. Yours. Why do we all live in the commercial state of Putin. *Snob*, July 4.
- Inozemtsev, V. (2020) Personally yours. “*Ekho Moskvy*,” May 15.
- Khmil, Volodymyr, and Ihor Popovych (2019) Philosophical and psychological dimensions of social expectations of personality. *Anthropological measurements of philosophical research*. 16, 55-65. <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i16.187540>

-
- Krichevsky, Sergey (2020) Creation of a “Cosmic” Human: Ideas, Technologies, Projects, Experience, Risks, Limitations, and Prospects. *Future Human Image*, Volume 13, 32-45. <https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/13/4>
- Loginov, A. (2011) The crisis of the national state and the ideology of cosmopolitanism. Available online: <http://www.pravaya.ru/look/21804>
- McCann, G., and F.Ó HADhmaill (2020) International Human Rights, Social Policy & Global: Critical Perspectives. Bristol University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv10kmc63>
- Mirandola, P.J. (1962) Speech on the dignity of man. *History of aesthetics*. Vol 1. Moscow.
- Plato (1994) State. *Collection. Essay in 3 volumes*. Vol. 3. Moscow.
- Remchukov, K. (2020) *Performance on “Ekho Moskv.”* Broadcast “Personally yours.” 6.04. 2020.
- Rozin, V.M. (2017) *Nature: Concept and stages of development in European culture*. Moscow, LENAND.
- Rozin, V.M. (2019) System Approach for Cosmology: a Version of a High-Potential Philosophical Research. *Future Human Image*, Volume 12, 64-75. <https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/12/5>
- Rozin, V.M. (2020) Establishment, development and completion of New European Sociality (thinking of the book of V. Fedotova, V. Kolpakov, N. Fedotova “Global Capitalism: Three Great Transformations”) *Culture and Art*, 4, 29-43.
- Rouet, G. and J. Ušiak (2019) From Singular and Regalian Diplomacy to Plural Diplomacy. *Politické vedy*, Volume 22, Number 2, 8-11. <http://doi.org/10.24040/politickevedy.2019.22.2.8-11>
- Sadykova, E. (2018) Essay on N.A. Berdyaev’s article “Man and machine.” *Essays.club*. Available online: <https://ru.essays.club/Гуманитарные-науки/Философия/Эссе-по-статье-Бердяева-НА-Человек-68470.html>