

Study of the formation and development of European sociality

Vadim Rozin

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

Corresponding Author*

Vadim Rozin

Article History

Received: 26.05.2021

Accepted: 31.05.2021

Published: 12.06.2021



Abstract: The article considers two main subjects: the author's perception of sociality and the results of his research of formation and three main stages (Antiquity, Middle Ages, Modern Age) of development of the European sociality. The understanding of sociality is set by means of the characteristic of the sociological approach where four main specific features are distinguished. The first one is an axiological representation of sociality (fairly/unfairly, compliance/non-compliance with an ideal reference) and focus on alteration or improvement of sociality. The second one is the analysis of mass behaviour and social order. The third one is studying of sociality, since ancient culture; nature of sociality and revealing its laws. A dilemma is formulated: what studies or, more precisely, has to study the sociology – modernity or postmodernity? The fourth one is that sociology considers sociality as a modernity phenomenon, i.e. studies mass behaviour of people as such, beyond historical and cultural context. Stating

the results of studying of formation and development of the first stages of the European sociality, the author distinguishes protosociality by which he means the previous state and prerequisites of sociality where there were no specific forms of its understanding yet and sociality as such. The author considers characteristics of three main types of sociality: antique one, presuming decision-making by free citizens within a city-state; imperial one, subordinating polis sociality to the centralized emperor management, and medieval one, fancifully combining these two types of sociality. The article raises the issue of the interrelation of social studying and social action. Today, it is not a matter of social laws, but of nonlinear processes which are described with the use of a system approach and synergetic. A social engineer relies in this case on knowledge gained during studying sociality, on the reconstruction of the specific history of sociality, modern social trends. The author sets a task to characterize the relations between such aspects of sociality as economy, state, society, power, masses, culture. He demonstrates that sociality may be presented as consisting of three spheres. In the first one, three main subsystems are distinguished: state, society, and economy, the constituting element being the state. In the second sphere (anthropological one) the author identifies a new European personality, communities, masses, as well as society, but in this case, understood in the anthropological plan. Persons and communities in the anthropological sphere function as a rule in two modes – standard and parasitic ones (rent income, misuse of social structures, etc.). In the third sphere covering two others, sociality is considered in a population context. The point is that the state and the society are not unique, there are a lot of them, and they engage in the various relationship (fight for the territory and resources, competition, assistance to each other,

various exchanges, etc.). The author identifies and characterizes the main processes of sociality: globalization and modernization, implementation of social schemes and concepts, “post” and “counter” processes, processes of setting and resolving problems (“challenges” and “responses” thereto). In the last part of the work, the author suggests his reconstruction of the specific history of sociality, as well as social trends of our age.

Keywords: genesis, sociality, formation, power, management, meaning, schemes, reality, personality, individual

Introduction

I would like to begin with the characteristic of my approach and understanding of sociality. I align with the tradition claiming that sociality is a cultural and historical phenomenon. In its turn, cultural and historical approach implies analysis, or, to be more exact, reconstruction, on the one hand, of *coming into being* of the phenomenon that interests the researcher (in this case, sociality), and on the other hand – its *development* or *metamorphosis* (transformation). As any other sociocultural phenomena (engineering, science, philosophy, love, law, etc.), sociality appears for the first time in a certain culture, specifically, as I demonstrate, sociality starts to be formed in the ancient culture. In subsequent cultures (medieval and Modern Ages) it develops and undergoes metamorphoses.

Implementation of the goal of the analysis of formation means also the following: an analysis of *prerequisites* of sociality is required, i.e. analysis of what may be called “protosociality”, as well as reconstruction of the formation of sociality in the context of these prerequisites. However, sociality cannot be understood as a more developed condition of protosociality. Sociality is a new phenomenon, and although its formation implies certain prerequisites, sociality is not evolved from previous states, it is born as if from anything.

I also formulate for myself the following requirement: we shall deal with sociality as a phenomenon rather than with its reduction to some other object. Phenomenologists say in this case that the researcher’s thinking has to be “prerequisiteless”. To meet this requirement, the researcher has to place himself properly, and then the subject will appear by itself (“Phenomenological method, P.P. Gaydenko writes, cannot deal with reality which essentially is not, cannot become a phenomenon that shows itself to the knowledge”¹. But what does “placing oneself properly” means? After all, sociality is not given to our consciousness as an object of contemplation, especially even before the research. How at this stage of work we may reach sociality as a phenomenon? I believe that for this purpose it is necessary to take into account specific features of *sociological approach*. Pondering over this approach, I distinguish the following four characteristics.

The first characteristic. As a rule, a sociologist assesses social reality with respect to “fairly – unfairly”, “compliance – non-compliance (with a specific reference or ideal)². For example, K. Marx believed that

¹ Gaydenko P.P.. Breakthrough to the transcendental. New ontology of the 20th century. – M.: Republic, 1997. – Pages 363-364.

² Rawls, J. (1958) Justice and Fairness, The Philosophical Review. Penguin Press, New York, 184. [Citation Time(s):1]

capitalist sociality is arranged unfairly since due to private ownership of means of production capitalists steal from workers a substantial part of added value produced by them.

Notably, E. Durkheim estimated sociality proceeding from a social ideal. “Durkheim, notes J. Ritzer, was afraid of social chaos and hated it. His works were influenced by disorders which became a result of general social changes, such as industrial strikes, corruption of the ruling class, disagreement of church and state, growth of political anti-Semitism, more characteristic of France at the time of Durkheim. In fact, most of his works are devoted to studying social order. He believed that social disorder *is not* a requisite part of the modern world and may be reduced with the use of social reforms”³.

Estimating sociality, sociologists suggest its improvement (drastically changing or optimizing it), i.e. they are sure that it is possible (already concept “benefit” which Plato and Aristotle use in their works, contains an intention to improve social life; interestingly, today sociologists return this concept to their reflections). Simultaneously, they specify the type of “social action” (revolution, reform, change of consciousness, etc.) that enables such an improvement. For example, Marx was convinced that it is possible to facilitate the establishment of social justice by making revolutions and building socialism. Now, as we know, most sociologists are in favour of reforms⁴. While, say, Z. Bauman and B. Latour believe that it is possible to improve social life through the specific interpretation of reality by sociologists⁵.

Here is, for example, as G. Ritzer begins his book. He writes that the modern world represents a cage of rational systems, that capitalism tends to self-destruction, and the morals in the modern world mean much less than in early societies. That though the Western world underwent a liberalization process, in fact, the atmosphere within it becomes more and more suffocating. That people always have an opportunity to change the world order constraining them. At last, he concludes: “the modern world entered a post-modernist era which is characterised by lack of authenticity, falseness, simulation of reality”⁶.

Every provision in his book is an assessment, however, Ritzer does not specify what social action is capable to change the existing world order. I think, he is right in doing so, because it became clear that sociality is such a complex, poorly investigated, and incomprehensible phenomenon that it is impossible to specify social action commensurate with this complexity and understanding, or, more precisely, lack of understanding (uncertainty). Instead of global social projects the realization of which often leads to diametrically opposed results, than it was planned, M. Foucault suggests passing to local social actions and social objects. But in this case, sociologists’ setting for controlled improvement of social life, in general, becomes problematic.

The second characteristic. Unlike a psychologist, a sociologist comprehends and studies not the individual behaviour of a person and his/her mentality, but *mass behaviour of people and social order*

³ Ritzer, G. Modern sociological theories. 5th edition. – SPb.: Piter, 2002. – Pages 30–31.

⁴ Lenski, G., Nolan, P. and Lenski, J. (1995) Human Societies: An Introduction into Macro Sociology. McGraw-Hill, Boston, 11. [Citation Time (s):1]; Giddens, A. (2009) Sociology. 6th Edition, Wiley India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 329–331. [Citation Time (s):1]

⁵ Bauman, Z. Thinking sociologically. M, 1996. Translation from English edited by A.F. Filippov. – Aspekt-Press, 1996. – Pages 239-242.

⁶ Ritzer, G. Modern sociological theories. 5th edition. – SPb.: Piter, 2002. – Page 16.

determining this behaviour. Both mass behaviour, and social order are treated in sociology differently. On the one pole there are society and social institutes, and on the other, groups and social norms, for example, social values. The analysis allows us to state that mass behaviour, in fact, is understood by sociologists in three different ways. On the one side, structurally, for example, according to Latour, it is a collective. On the other side, as a form of communication⁷. On the third side, mass behaviour is considered as an activity product (according to Latour, a collective is “built”, and currently it has to be built anew). “The feeling of a crisis which, in my opinion, became central for social sciences, writes Latour, may be now expressed as follows: at the expansion of some substances, new associations do not form a viable assembly. And this is here that the policy – defined by us as an intuition that associations alone are not enough: their *composition* is still required in order to *build* the general world – appears again on the scene”⁸.

The third characteristic. Since Plato’s and Aristotle’s works, *studying* sociality is a necessary condition of improvement of social life. Moreover, in “Politics” Aristotle in fact already speaks about “the nature of sociality”, meaning by the latter the analysis of its essence. “From everything told, he writes, it appears that the state belongs to things that exist by nature and that a man by his nature is a political being, and the one who due to his nature, rather than due to casual circumstances lives out of the state, is either a being underdeveloped in moral sense or a superman; Homer also denounces him, calling him a person “without kith or kin, beyond laws, without home-fire”; such a person by his nature is only eager for war; he may be compared to an isolated pawn on a playing board”⁹.

Since the second half of the 19th century, it is suggested to investigate the social nature in a scientific way. Originally this nature was understood by analogy with reality of the first nature, the idea of “social physics” derives from there. “Comte, writes Ritzer, developed *social physics*, or what in 1832 he called *sociology*. The use of the term *social physics* means that Comte sought to create sociology on the model of exact sciences. It was expected that this new science which, in his opinion, had to become eventually *the only* predominating science, will study both social statics (existing social structures), and social dynamics (social changes). Though the one and the other include searches of social life *laws*¹⁰.

The fourth characteristic. Sociology considers sociality as a modernity phenomenon, i.e. studies mass behaviour of people as such, beyond historical and cultural context. In fact, it is one more characteristic of the sociological approach. Realizing the said setting for extra-historical and extra-cultural understanding of a person, considering the latter as a modern person, sociologists faced a serious problem. I would like to explain it on the example of researches of Z. Bauman. In his work “Relevance of Holocaust” he wanted to formulate “Holocaust lessons” by showing that Holocaust was not a deviation from usual social processes and laws and that such tragedies may perfectly well repeat nowadays. Bauman solved the set task, but at the same time or slightly later, studying what occurred in the world,

⁷ Society//New philosophical encyclopaedia. Vol. 3. – M.: Mysl, 2001. – Page 132.

⁸ Latour, B. Reassembly of the social: introduction into the Actor Network Theory. Translation from English by I. Polonskaya. – M.: Publishing House of the High School of Economics, 2014. – Page 355.

⁹ Aristotle. Politics. Works in 4 vol. Vol. 4. – M.: Mysl, 1983. – Pages 378-379.

¹⁰ Ritzer, G. Modern sociological theories. 5th edition. – SPb.: Piter, 2002. – Page 27.

he understood that social life changes promptly and therefore it is already difficult to address to the society “Holocaust lessons” formulated by him.

There was a fundamental issue: what studies or, more precisely, has to study sociology: modernity or postmodernity? If modernity, then, perhaps, it already leaves, undergoing metamorphoses; if postmodernity, then the latter only develops and its intrinsic features are still not clear. “Today, Ritzer writes, there are fierce discussions in sociology between those who continue to consider present society as a modern world, and those who claim that in recent years there were essential changes, and we passed into a new, “post-modern” world”¹¹. It is clear from Ritzer's book that there are three points of view on this issue: the first is – yes, we have already passed into a new world where there is a new sociality; the second one is – no, we are still in the modern world and it only seems that sociality changed cardinally; and the third one, which, in my opinion, is closest to truth, is that sociology deals with the complex, two-layer reality of “modernity-postmodernity”. Now I would like to expose my attitude towards some of these characteristics.

I quite agree with an assessment attitude towards social life and the need to specify the type of social action. But I think that both of these settings need to be problematized. Is it possible, for example, to understand today, following Marx, what is fair, and what is not? Is it fair to redistribute national products from working to unemployed ones (completely or partially) – this trend, as we know, has been increasingly expanding? On the one hand, it is fair, since, from the point of view of liberal values, each person, whether he works or not, shall be provided with a decent level of subsistence (has the right to such subsistence). On the other hand, it is unfair, since, as emphasize by critics of this trend, such distribution contributes to dependence, corruption of population, multiplies persons interested in living on welfares, without working, as well as organizations and institutions which are vitally interested in such situation (because it is a form of new power, bureaucracy and a source of quite good welfare for members of these organizations).

Is it possible currently to identify social technologies allowing to improve effectively life of people, for example, in a situation characteristic of our country? On the one hand, most sociologists and economists claim that it is impossible without carrying out political and social reforms, on the other hand, they show that in Russia there is such society and power which cannot carry out such reforms. Therefore, neither assessment nor the type of social action can be defined without special researches and discussions with the participation of persons concerned (population, business, authorities, various communities).

I also accept the setting according to which the sociological approach implies analysis of mass behaviour and social order. Traditionally, society is considered in sociology as a whole with respect to mass behaviour of a person, and the law, as defining social order¹². But there again both need problematization.

¹¹ Ritzer, G. Modern sociological theories. 5th edition. – SPb.: Piter, 2002. – Page 484.

¹² E. J. Hobsbawm. *From Social History to the History of Society*. Source: Daedalus, Vol. 100, No. 1, Historical Studies Today (Winter, 1971), pp. 20–45. Published by: The MIT Press on behalf of American Academy of Arts & Sciences. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20023989>. Accessed: 23/03/2009 03:18.; Bruce Lincoln. *Discourse and the Construction of Society: Comparative Studies of Myth, Ritual, and Classification*. – Oxford University Press, 1992. – 238 pages.

Is it possible, say, to consider the population of the country as society or court as a full-fledged institute of law if the state rigidly controls and directs them in order to retain the power?

I do not doubt that it is possible to speak about social nature and to study it. As it was noted above, sociality is not equal to itself, it represents a cultural and historical phenomenon. This can be considered as the first intrinsic characteristic of the social nature¹³. I obtained the second characteristic during culturological researches. I made sure that changes of sociality are influenced by personality which, according to my works, has been formed since antiquity¹⁴. One of the striking examples of such influence is the usurpation of social structures by a person, that is characteristic of dictatorships or authoritative and totalitarian states. Another, more widespread option is misuse by an official of his/her function in a social institute, namely for deriving rent and even for building real rent-bringing systems (adoption of the necessary regulations and laws, promotion of necessary people, etc.).

I accept one more characteristic of sociality, namely, that a sociality is a form of social life. In this regard, it is possible to speak about cycles of social life, reproduction of a social organism, social environment, social processes, fight of social organisms among themselves, life support systems¹⁵. Besides, below I show that “populativity” is an important characteristic of sociality as a form of life, i.e. in a specific historical time of culture we observe a set of “social organisms” (for example, kingdoms in the ancient world, and states in the Modern Age) which are in various relations and interactions with each other (wars, unions, various exchanges).

In the point of formation of a new sociality (and we are now in this situation) sociality is formed consciously. Consciously, therefore, backed by knowledge and sociality researches. In their turn, such researches imply intellectual management and support, i.e. methodological work.

At last, the specific feature of this moment is that sociality, on the one hand, was created in the context of modernity, and on the other hand, indeed, changes quickly. Therefore at clarification of the nature of contemporaneous social reality, one shall use both characteristics of modernity, and postmodernity. Relations between them (fight, substitution, convergence, assimilation, etc.) – are the subject of both social theory and practice.

Now I will tell, what I obtained within the framework of research of formation and the first stages of development of the European sociality conducted by me¹⁶.

¹³ Later I reconsidered this position and came to the opinion that concept “social nature” does not work in social sciences. Analysing sociality, it is better to speak not about laws and the nature, but about temporary regularities, trends of social changes, singular transformations.

¹⁴ *Rozin V. M.* Granting freedom to a person as a condition of formation of antique democracy and personality//Culture and Art. – 2018. – No. 1. – Pages 7-15; *Rozin V. M.* Culturology. 2nd edition – M.: Gardariki, 2003. – 462 pages; *Rozin V. M.* Culturology. 3rd edition – Urait, 2018. – 410 pages; *Rozin V. M.* Person and its studying. Edition 2, – M.: URSS, 2012. – 232 pages.

¹⁵ *Rozin V. M.* Nature of sociality: Issues of methodology and ontology of social sciences. – LENAND, 2016. – 288 pages.

¹⁶ *Rozin V. M.* Granting freedom to a person as a condition of formation of antique democracy and personality//Culture and Art. – 2018. – No. 1. – Pages 7-15; *Rozin V. M.* A road map of reconstruction of formation of ancient culture and sociality (the period of cities-states, before formation of empires)//Culture and Art. – 2018. – No. 3. – Pages 8-20; *Rozin V. M.* Studying and particularities of sociality of the Ancient World. Article first. Protosociality of the Ancient World//Culture of Culture. – 2018. – No. 2.; *Rozin V. M.* Formation of sociality of the Roman Empire under the reign of Octavian Augustus //Culture and

In my opinion, the strategy of cultural and historical analysis of sociality and presentation of the latter through a prism of sociological approach and problems, in general, justified themselves. The conducted research showed, that yes, indeed, it is possible to speak about protosociality, about formation (origin) of sociality in the ancient culture, as well as about various types of sociality (polis and imperial in antiquity and medieval). I distinguished protosociality and sociality, proceeding from the following reasons. Prior to the ancient culture, we do not observe any specific forms of understanding of social life. Meanwhile mythological forms of comprehension (conceptualization) did not allow to make expediently this life an object of activity of a person (to aspire after its improvement, to change consciously social order), without what, in my opinion, sociality does not exist.

Specific forms of understanding of social life, as we know, arose in the ancient culture (works of Plato, Aristotle, and some other thinkers). Given this circumstance, one may suppose that the first forms of sociality develop in the ancient culture. However, there is a doubt, a problem. Only certain governors listened to Plato and Aristotle. A setting for conscious improvement of social life did not become widespread in antiquity, did not come into management practice, it remained the property of philosophers and certain politicians, and that of only a few. We witness a similar picture also in the Middle Ages, and in the Renaissance. Only in the Modern Age, when modern states appear, this setting becomes widespread and general. These are states (of course, not all, though in words, all of them) that assume in the 20th century an obligation of improvement of life of their citizens. From this point of view, it is difficult to speak about sociality before the last century. Therefore, wouldn't it be more sensible to distinguish protosociality, "virtual sociality" of antiquity, Middle Ages, and Renaissance (when it was just an idea and a concept, but not social practice) and sociality of the Modern Age?

I think that it is not quite fairly to speak about an understanding of social life, it is better to speak about "schematization" and "conceptualization" since in works of philosophers and thinkers sociality for the first time is constituted on the basis of schemes created by them. The mechanism here was the following. In situations when problems of a city-state were discussed, for example, economic questions, attitude towards slaves, the structure of power, preference of war or peace, and so forth, to work out agreed solutions, perceptions were required that were beyond separate opinions of those equal citizens who worked out the solutions; grounds shared by majority were necessary. Plato and Aristotle created schemes allowing to resolve the said problematic situation (from the point of view of my reconstruction, the main solutions which are proposed by them are created on the basis of schemes)¹⁷. The contents of

Art. – 2018. – No. 2. – Pages 22-32.; *Rozin V. M.* Prolegomenon to reconstruction of sociality of the Middle Ages//Culture and Art. – 2018. – No. 3. – Pages 21–32.

¹⁷ About schemes please see: *Rozin V. M.* Introduction to schemology: schemes in philosophy, culture, science, design. – M.: URSS, 2011. – 256 pages. There are two types of schemes – graphic and narrative. However a scheme is not just a semiotic construction, but an element of structure: schemes are invented by a person, solve problem situations facing the person and the culture, set new reality within which the person starts understanding, seeing and acting in a new way. A scheme differs from the reality that is schematized. For example, a metro map is referred to graphic schemes, it is schematic with respect to the subway as a complex engineering object, it was created by designers to order passenger flows and to enable a passenger to navigate better in the subway, this scheme sets the subway as an ideal object.

schemes as expressing the position of the person who created it and opposed to other positions and contents can be defined as a concept¹⁸.

If Plato interprets characteristics of reality set by schemes in the spirit of dialectics of relations between ideas (“the All is multum”), as well as in ideology of some kind of “antique design” (“mental creation” of social life and “implementation” of constructed schemes¹⁹), Aristotle considers characteristics of social life specified by him in schemes as belonging to a special nature – polity. Revealing in “Politics” and “Ethics” the essence of social phenomena, he hopes to provide governors with knowledge which will make their activity efficient.

Plato and Aristotle, constituting a sociality, proceeded from ideas of benefit (and justice), the priority of general benefit over the benefit of an individual person, desire to overcome a gap between richness of one and poverty of others. Here, naturally, some questions arise: what are benefit and justice (it is known that people answer this question differently); how to understand the priority of general and majority over individual and minority (say, in the liberal concept protection of interests of the minority is as important as that of majority); to what consequences the policy of equalizing rich and poor leads (usually it affects the rates of social and economic development, resulting in stagnation).

Or, another question: what is sociality (may it be considered sociality at all?) within conceptualization in which tasks of improvement of human life and solution of acute social issues are not set, but, say, such purposes as a victory over another country or implementation of some social ideal are moved forward (Christian salvation, building communism all over the world, victory over disbelievers, etc.)? Maybe then it makes sense to distinguish two types of sociality, calling the first type “humanistic sociality”, and the second one, “metaphysical sociality”? Or metaphysical sociality is not a sociality?

While Plato, especially at the beginning, was sure of the possibility of implementation of his project of cardinal reorganization of social life (however, at the end of his life journey he wrote that this plan would hardly be carried out, that it was similar to “moulding from wax”), the Stagirite even did not set for society such cosmic tasks and believed that by his reflections about correct social life he only promoted its identification (coming out to the light). This distinction passed then through the whole European history: for example, Marx's confidence in the victory of socialism (“expropriation of expropriators”) and Latour's and Bauman's cautiousness considering that sociologists by their reports and interpretations of social life feasibly participate in its development, working for the expansion of the human freedom.

¹⁸ Cf.: *Neretina S. S. Tracks and concepts.* – M.: Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 1999. – 278 pages. “CONCEPT (from lat. conceptus – assembly, perception, conception) is an act of “grasping” meaning of a thing (problem) in integrity of a speech statement ... In the 20th century of ideas of concept are traced in personalistic philosophies regarding the idea of a work as being of paramount importance (M.M. Bakhtin, V. S. Bibler) ... The idea of concept again brought to life an appealing to the idea of creativity which “always is something singular”, and to the idea of speech connected with creativity presented in “steady conglomerations of sense” and opened by the Middle Ages ... A concept in post-modernist understanding is a field of suggestive signs distributed in space. Besides, since in speech objective and language forms of expression are being observed, terminologically “concept” is hardly distinguished from “notion”, becoming an ambiguous term” (Concept (Neretina) <http://ponjatija.ru/node/459>).

¹⁹ *Plato. Republic. Collected works in 4 volumes. Vol. 3.* – M.: Mysl, 1994. – 654 pages.

There may be a question, why the analysis of prerequisites of sociality (protosociality) is required anyway? On the one hand, to avoid illegal historical reconstructions (modernizations) when it is believed that the sociality existed always, and for sure it existed in such Ancient World kingdoms as Egypt or Babylon. Well, from our rational point of view, a life of ancient Egypt was governed by social laws, but from the point of view of an Egyptian, it was completely defined by gods. And if we want to understand their realities, for example, the nature of pyramids or belief in the second soul of a man, “Ka”, it does not make sense to explain these phenomena using our social objective laws.

On the other hand, the analysis of protosociality allows understanding through comparison, what cardinally new appears in the course of the formation of sociality. In protosociality, as well as in sociality, social collectives are already created (kingdoms, settlements, cities), management and power are developed, without which a collective cannot exist, a specialization takes place (not to confuse to the division of labour)²⁰. However, only in sociality, a personality emerges without which the first type of sociality – polis sociality would not appear. Only there thinking was developed which for the first time allowed to distinguish social life and the knowledge of it. Having determined in schemes and knowledge social life as an object, a human as a personality could start thinking over sociality and set a task of its improvement.

Reconstruction of protosociality, in my opinion, makes it possible to understand three important points. The first, it is an understanding that social life develops not by itself but implies human activity. Tsar is an absolutely particular person: he, by means of military captures, the conclusion of unions, blandishments, and threats, creates a kingdom (Latour would tell, builds a collective). Tsar, as a rule, is a living god, and one of the roles of the main gods is the *creation* of the world and the human. But in protosociality “social construction” or change of “social order” (for example, “mushroom” ritual when the tsar by his decree forfeits land and houses from usurers and returns them to his subjects²¹) is perceived in a mythological form: it is understood only as an act of gods, people do not participate therein.

The second moment is some kind of syncretism including anthropological, institutional (in sense of institutions, not institutes), and language (semantic) characteristics. A kingdom of the ancient world is comprehended at the same time as the tsar the so-and-so, gods, and people (Egyptians, Sumerians). It is essential that a man of that time could not conceive these three realities as existing in themselves, separately – only in syncretism. And separate communities (governors, priests, scribes, soldiers, farmers, handicraftsmen) were also perceived in a syncretic manner; for example, in Egypt priests were

²⁰ It seems that governors, scribes, soldiers, farmers and handicraftsmen of the Ancient world do not differ in anything essential from our experts acting within the framework of division of labour. But it is not so. All these occupations and roles were hereditary: for example, in a family of a soldier a soldier was born, and in a family of scribe – a scribe. The second difference is impossibility to change profession. The third one is an inclusiveness in another system of economy and social life. Specialization unlike division of labour is based not on a rational organization of production activity and training, but on a certain way of life.

²¹ Rozin V.M. Studying and particularities of sociality of the Ancient World. Article first. Protosociality of the Ancient World//Culture of Culture. – 2018. – No. 2.

intermediaries between people and gods, a specific estate of people, a “social body” represented by god Thoth²².

The third moment concerns the essence of social life – it is always based on *management* and *power*. Collective life would be impossible without management assuming stratification into those who manage, and those who are managed. Stratification assuming action of language and schemes which set for those who are managed and substantially for those who manage not only to control actions but also reality (coherent, general representations if it is about assembly and life of collective). Social management is a technical invention, the one which, as I show, created a human²³. And any new equipment implies judgment, i.e. understanding what is this, what this device means for a human (for example, in archaic culture technical devices were conceptualized as an action of spirits, in the culture of ancient kingdoms, as an action of gods and people directed by them, and during the Modern Age, as an action of forces of nature prepared by a human)²⁴. The main sense for social management is the idea of power, and – as shows the analysis of protosociality – including as early as in the Ancient World, the idea of legitimacy²⁵. Thus, the power is, on the one hand, a social management structure, and on the other hand, if we remember the syncretism stated above, the power appears as a semantic and anthropological entity (support) of this structure, i.e. an explanation and justification of the fact why management is so arranged and why these specific people manage.

The role of semantic entities is not limited only to the provision of technical innovations, they act as one of the most important conditions of assembly of a collective. So in protosociality collectives are assembled and function on the basis of such a complex concept as gods. In this context, I make a hypothesis (and I try to support it with factual material) that these are new meanings that create conditions for the formation of a new whole, in this case, a social collective²⁶. In return, for the invention and creation of a new sense, a number of preliminary conditions is required.

In perception of gods two different senses – individual and social – combine fancifully : on the one hand, gods are some kind of parents, there was a belief that without their participation a human could not be born, on the other hand, gods act as creators of social life and supreme governors. And one of the conditions of formation of an antique personality is the invention of such new sense as a human who, though asking gods for help, at the same time received in relation to them certain independence. The becoming antique personality acts as a new semantic support as a condition for the formation of polis

²² *Rozin of V.M.* Culturology. 2nd edition 2018. – M.: Gardariki, 2003. – 462 pages. When today V. Volodin claims that Russia is Putin (“If there is Putin, there is Russia, if there is no Putin, there is no Russia”), he involuntarily reproduces syncretism of the Ancient world culture considered here. And our elite ruling the country regards itself not just as elective representatives of the people, but as autocratic owners of the country.

²³ See the author's concept of origin of a human: *Rozin V. M.* Culturology. 2nd edition – 2018. – M.: Gardariki, 2003. – 462 pages; *Rozin V.M.* Semiotic researches. – M.: PEPER SE; SPb.: University book, 2001. – 256 pages; *Rozin V.M.* Engineering and technology: from stone tools to the Internet and robots. – Yoshkar-Ola, 2016. – 280 pages; *Rozin V.M.* Culturology. 3rd edition – Urait, 2018. – 410 pages.

²⁴ *Rozin V.M.* Culturology. 3rd edition – Urait, 2018. – 410 pages.

²⁵ Let's remember, for example, the myth of Gilgamesh. Why people have to submit to the tsar, priests and their servants? But because the tsar is a living god of people, priests are servants of gods, and gods created the human.

²⁶ *Rozin V.M.* Studying and particularities of sociality of the Ancient World. Article first. Protosociality of the Ancient World//Culture of Culture. – 2018. – No. 2.

sociality. In order that the imperial sociality becomes possible, such representations (meanings) as empire, emperor, Augustus's cult as the father of the "Roman world" and "divine Julius"²⁷ had to be developed.

What new did our analysis of the first type of sociality, "polis" one, give? There are many researches of the antique democracy-based, as Aristotle noted, on communication and collective solution of polis problems by equal and free citizens. However nobody showed that the point at issue was not a simple social individual, but a "becoming antique personality". Only a person who passed to independent behaviour and started building his own world and himself within in it could become equal and free. In return, as I show, an antique personality could develop only when antique society agreed with existence of such strange person, which acts independently and sees not like the others. Not simply agreed, but was compelled to change many representations and to create new social practices (antique legal proceedings, art, Platonic love, philosophy) allowing an individual to live and implement his representations without leaving society.

The second moment which is rather poorly studied in scientific literature is a support of an antique personality on thinking and knowledge and only in the second turn on myths. For example, solving a problem of freedom and choice which, clearly, are important in the practice of polity, Plato appeals to gods, however, in general, his discourse is rational. So in "Republic" Plato describes peripheries of souls in the next world. It seems that the destiny of a person is completely defined by the gods of the next world, however, the choice of further destiny (lot) is treated by Plato as quite natural, conditioned by the way the person lived, what is his reason; this choice also depends on the personality of the dead²⁸.

An antique person discussing problems of the polis and making fateful decisions is also guided by mythological schemes, but, so to speak, in the second turn, while into the forefront he puts schemes created within the framework of rational experience and philosophy.

It is natural that in these conditions management and understanding of power changed. It is not the tsar representing an institution (an important element in the control system) that governs anymore, but subjects, persons (or a group of persons) that may be replaced by the society. They, of course, also are an institution, but another one: not elements of the management structure, but, as a methodologist would say, "anthropological filling of the place" in this structure. Besides, it was necessary to divide management and power into two types: the first one, making basic decisions (which later received the name of "legislative" power), and the second one, executing these decisions ("executive power").

²⁷ If at the beginning of the 20th century the Marxist idea of building socialism was quite working, it helped to create socialist society and socialist person in Russia, the search of national idea at the end of the 20th century gave virtually nothing. At the beginning of the next century it became clear why. In particular, for various reasons construction of constitutional, democratic state failed; the power occurred in hands of a small community which, according to Konstantin Remchukov, the editor-in-chief of "Nezavisimaya Gazeta", built "state-and-KGB capitalism"; the imperial sociality was not dismantled (nostalgia for the USSR as a great power). Moreover, the authorities developed a campaign for restoration of this sociality (expansion with respect to Ukraine, articulating merits of Stalin, restoration of a number of institutions of the Soviet period, aggressive foreign policy, massaging of fight against the fifth column and the USA).

²⁸ *Plato. Republic. Collected works in 4 volumes. Vol. 3. – M.: Mysl, 1994. – Pages 417, 418-419.*

Due to such differentiation, it is worth carrying out also more general distinction – *formation* of social life and its everyday *continuation* (reproduction). In the course of formation sociality either develops for the first time or changes significantly, thus the main decisions are made by representatives of legislative power; during reproduction of sociality, when executive power operates, found solutions and institutions are repeated. In this context they are nevertheless transformed, responding to the changing situation, but not essentially. Executive power, as a rule, is subordinated to legislative power but as further history showed, a scenario is not excluded when executive power, or, more exactly, the experts forming it (or those who stands behind it), find keys to the society and legislative power and start manipulating them.

Besides two necessary conditions considered here (formation of personality and particularities of management and power) I analysed two more conditions – the nature of polis society and the existence of a specific form of understanding. As a rule, polis society represented an integrated society, joined by the unity of territory, as well as ethnic (relative) and symbolical links²⁹. Moreover, it was rather small from the point of view of communication and interaction of citizens (as a result, the possibility of “direct democracy”). A specific form of perception of sociality is a direct result of the development of philosophy focused in particular on the solution of problems of antique practice (“*techne*”, polity).

Prerequisites of the second type of the European sociality (imperial one), as shows the analysis, include three main points. As the first point, I would mention a new type of consciousness, not a polis one, but if it is possible to call it so, a cosmopolitan one. It started being formed as early as in Ancient Greece, having found its practical embodiment in conquests of Alexander the Great. In “*Timaeus*”, “*Republic*” and some other works Plato draws a picture of reality and society (state), common for all Greeks, without paying attention to ethnic or religious distinctions and particularities. Aristotle, who, as we know, was a teacher of Alexander the Great, proceeds in the same way.

The Stagirite in “*Politics*”, discussing “the best mechanism of the government”, relies not on the distinction of religions or specific features of ethnic life which he knows well and often uses as examples at the discussion of an ideal polity, but on a reasonable arrangement and benefit for the society. The object of his social action is *an average ordinary person acting reasonably*, rather than a representative of a certain ethnos or religion.

“How, Aristotle asks, life for most states and most people may be best arranged regardless the virtue exceeding a virtue of an ordinary person, regardless of education, for which natural talents and a fortuitous combination of circumstances are required, regardless of the most desirable system, but only with respect to the everyday situation which is available to the majority”. And he answers as follows: “The state aspires most of all to arrange so that all its citizens are equal and identical, and it is characteristic mainly of average people ... a state consisting of average people will have the best political system”³⁰.

Why then both Plato and Aristotle, perfectly knowing, what role is played by religion and customs and how these realities are different with different peoples, insist nevertheless on the image of the world and

²⁹ Territories with unstable borders because of wars, provided also integrity of feudal communities of “suzeraine – vassal” type; but patrimonial ties replaced here personal contractual relations.

³⁰ Aristotle. *Politics*. Works in 4 volumes. Vol. 4. – M.: Mysl, 1983. – Page 506, 508.

the human disregarding both the former and the latter? I think, first, the matter is that both philosophers perfectly understood the advantages of joint social life proceeding from values of the general welfare, virtue, and justice, values blocking civil strife, based in many respects on absolutization and upholding of ethnic and religious distinctions. Secondly, the task of rationing of reasonings, building correct thinking was connected with overcoming differences of vision and opinions, with the search of common grounds. As a result – the world picture where not distinctions, but unity was the main thing.

It is worth emphasizing also the following moment: both for an ordinary antique person, and for a politician even if they sought for association and joint life with other peoples, the distinction of antique peoples and religions was an asserted fact and reality. Such an outlook also led to what in modern political language may be called “antique tolerance” realized in three main areas – state policy, religion, and philosophy. So, a practice of conclusion of unions and preservation of the autonomy of polises and communities making part of larger state entities was generally widespread in the policy. For example, “special contracts were signed” with Roman allies (*socil*) or *foederati* during the republican period. “Federal communities (*civitates foederatae*) enjoyed full autonomy, did not pay taxes, had no Roman garrisons, and were exempted from costs of maintenance of traveling magistrates and from billeting of troops. Besides delivery of land and sea contingents, *foederati* had to recognize the supremacy of Rome and “acknowledge respectfully the greatness of the other people”, according to Cicero”³¹.

In the sphere of religion, there was another process: the transformation of local gods and the adoption of others ensuring consent and understanding in interethnic relations. For example, “in parallel with the conquest of others territories Romans also conquered foreign gods. Most Roman gods were not indigenously Roman gods, they were borrowed from other peoples. Already in the period of Latin wars gods of Latin cities were included in the Roman pantheon... The influence of Etruscans and Italic Greeks was even stronger... Together with Greek gods, Greek cults, and religious processions with singing, dancing, and theatrical presentations were adopted”³².

At last, in philosophy as well, despite aspiration to the universal general interpretation of reality, initial variety was supposed and declared to a greater or lesser degree: Plato’s “multum”, the importance of the “first essence” of Aristotle coinciding with single things, Stagirite's statement that the law and the state imply free and equal people; while the latter could be understood as a requirement of ethnic and religious freedom.

The second prerequisite of imperial sociality is an assembly of a “big collective” which subsequently was called an empire including various polises, peoples, territories, social institutions. It was absolutely impossible to govern such a collective by means of imperious institutions of separate polises, instead of them, a new governance system began to develop. One may distinguish therein, at least, two different strategies and practices: use of imperious polis institutions (they remained, but their activity was reoriented so that not to contradict tasks of a big collective) and centralised management extending to all social entities. As many researchers show, a centralised management required, on the one hand, experts who involuntarily were placed over communities of the polis (it was from these experts that the estate of

³¹ *Sergeyev V. S.* An outline of history of the ancient Rome. – M.: OGIZ. Gosotseconomizdat, 1937. – Page 79.

³² *Id.*, Page 146.

Roman officials was formed), and on the other hand, a uniting and directing subject the role of which was assumed by the emperor.

I would call an institution and the personality of the emperor the third prerequisite. As an institution, the emperor directed the army, and not simply directed, but as a strong and imperious personality, he turned it into a “social body”³³. But an emperor possessing such a social body became commensurable with a big collective society. Subsequently, as history showed, different scenarios of the succession of events were possible. For example, for ancient Rome symbiosis of two types of sociality (polis and imperial ones), usually with a leading role of the emperor was characteristic. And say, in Russia, starting from Ivan the Terrible, we see suppression of the activity of societies entering the empire and imperious institutions of certain territories with absolute domination of the emperor and his officials³⁴.

Imperial sociality creates conditions for two important social innovations – formation on the basis of institutions of full-fledged social institutes and formation of law. However, this process turned out to be very long; it comes to the end, seemingly, only in the Modern Age. It is in imperial sociality that the syncretism forcing to perceive anthropological characteristics and characteristics of social institutions in unity (as one unit) starts being overcome. If, for example, an Athenian judge always acted with an eye on the community since he was its member and only a temporary authority, an imperial official in an

³³ In their turn, the emperor's officials often turned institutions in which they worked, in their own social body. This enabled them to gain a considerable rent from their functions.

³⁴ Ivan the Terrible exposes his political theory in his Messages to Kurbsky and other persons. He derives the family tree of Russian princes “from Augustus Caesar and his brother Prus to Rurik and Kiev princes”. The divine origin of Russian tsars, according to Ivan the Terrible, justifies “limitlessness of prerogatives of the imperial power: the tsar should not be restrained by anybody and anything in his actions; he is not liable for his acts before his citizens, but only before the God, therefore he stands above the law and even if he acts unjustly, it is just a sin, but not a crime” (*Zolotukhina N.M., Tolstopyatenko G.P. History of political and legal thought in Russia in the 11th – beginning of the 17th centuries// Russian political and legal thought of the 11th – 19th centuries. Institute of Scientific Information for Social Sciences (INION) of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. – M., 1987. – Page 44*). Ivan IV denies any need to share power, say, with boyars or city councils. Bloody massacres of Ivan the Terrible pursued not only the aim of strengthening of the imperial power, but also of suppression of any dissent and creation of an atmosphere of fear in which the absolute power of the autocrat did not encounter any resistance any more. “The term “thunder-storm” by Ivan IV means intimidation of citizens. In this context he justifies his right to judge and punish not only for affairs, but also for thoughts” (Id., 45).

But what about moral function imputed to the tsar? It was believed that the Father the Tsar has to be fair. The matter is that the real power on the earth is exercised not by heaven servants, but by ordinary people, persons who may be, and unfortunately, quite often are weak, ambitious, selfish, even mentally sick. On a usual, not imperial place such a person will not do big harm, but having ascended the throne, he starts defining all main social processes in the country. As soon as, K. Kasyanova writes, a personal status of the person starts extending out of limits of his usual human relations, for example, when he attains power, “at once there is a possibility of various abuses and distortions. And the personal status of the governor of our state is a phenomenon arising always under such unlawful conditions. However, arising always in an unlawful way, it not always caused such terrible consequences, as during Ivan IV or Stalin's era” (Kasyanova K. About the Russian national character. National character and social archetype. – M.: Institute of national model of economy, 1994. – Pages 340-341).

ideal case was answerable only to the emperor who could appoint him for a very long term. And he administered justice now, following not customs of a specific polis, but proceeding from the highest interests and settings of the empire. These settings had to lie on the other side of private interests and problems of individual polises or territories, to be, so to speak, *general* and *equal*. However, it is just one of the necessary conditions of the formation of social institutes and the law.

Another necessary condition – equality and freedom of users of social institutions about which already the Stagirite wrote. In the Roman Empire even if this condition is met, then only for rather a small group of population (officials, rich people, city plebs). The main part of the population of the empire was very far from these ideals. Middle Ages are a different story. Here, especially in the cities, processes of equalizing and liberation from the power of a polis (local community, territory) of different segments of the population gain strength. Cities, Neretina writes, “became not only a great liberating force, but a force where a system of equal relations on the basis of management of affairs was born as well as a new electoral system conducting to equality <...> equality to which, nolens volens, life of city economic spirit (house world) led, since, according to a medieval saying “city air makes free””³⁵.

Christianization processes also promoted the expansion of equality. By the 12th –13th centuries already many inhabitants of Europe have identical coherent ideas, they accept the Christian faith and the scenario of private and cathedral life (personal salvation, the Last Judgement, and the second coming of Christ). These representations irrespective to social distinctions (“There are neither Greeks, nor Jews”), unite Christians of Europe, creating a basis for the future global collective.

Another medieval innovation is the formation of a new type of polity, not within an individual polis, but, on the one hand, as a discussion by the main imperious and social subjects of urgent matters of the kingdom (empire), and on the other, decision-making mediated by the law. For example, in France, these were “royal council”, “parliament”, “general states” which included the main estates and various experts, including representatives of universities, and they made decisions, following the medieval law and legislation.

Finishing the characteristic of the results of the first part of the research, I will try to square with the next one – studying sociality of the Modern Age. Its prerequisites developed as early as in medieval culture. But only in the Renaissance, as well as in the 15th – 16th centuries important innovations appeared which prepared the formation of a new European sociality. I would refer to them, first of all, the following. Completion of the medieval cultural project (most Europeans became Christians, and the doomsday in the form of the second coming of Christ was postponed by the church to an uncertain future). Formation of a new European personality placed by God, as Pico Della Mirandola wrote, in the center of the world, which “of its own free will” can create reality and itself. The rapid development of cities, trade, and industry without which there could not be a growth of the European population. The crisis of the Christian (Catholic) church and the Christian world which developed into religious wars, and resulted into Reformation and the principle of toleration. Formation of a state of a new (national) type, gradually capturing and seeking to regulate all main processes of the economic and social life of the country.

³⁵ Neretina S. Revival of political philosophy and political action. The Paris revolt of 1356-1358 – M.: Golos, 2012 – Pages 27, 92.

Development (F. Bacon et al.) of a new cultural project (building a human kingdom on the basis of mastering the nature processes, creation of natural sciences and engineering, and industry relying upon them). Gradual leaving of medieval communities (knights, aristocracy, clergy) from the history scene (or their weakening) and vice versa, strengthening or formation of new communities (merchants, bourgeois, officials, workers, capitalists, etc.).

Projects of building a new sociality (new collective assembly) appear. One of the first was created in the 14th century by Marsilius Paduanis) (his most known work is “Defensor Pacis”). More advanced projects dating from the Renaissance and the Modern Age, and include those of Machiavelli, Grotius, Jean Bodin, Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and some other thinkers. Here are the main ideas of these projects. The main participants of social life are State, Society, Natural Law, and People. Some people, as for example, Hobbes believes, are rather egoistical beings inclined to conflicts and unreasonable actions (“war of everybody against everybody”). At the same time they are active as persons, defend their freedom, strive for equality, may listen to arguments of mind and morals. The function and the mission of the state consists, on the one hand, in restraining unreasonable, egoistical behaviour of people (monopoly for violence, etc.), in order to channel this behaviour towards social benefit, and on the other hand, in managing and controlling the main social processes (economic, exchange processes, maintenance of order, protection of the country against external enemies, etc.).

Another regulator and reference point for a correct, socially significant behaviour of people are the laws and legislation guaranteed and supported by the state. While the society (from the point of view of Locke) shall not only direct and control the state (these tasks are assigned to the legislative power, parties, and other public organizations), but also make sure that the state does not deviate from directions set by the society, does not operate contrary to the society. The latter possibility, that, however, became clear much later, is due to the fact that the state operates through the same egoistical people who, as a rule, cannot resist temptation to use their official position. Moreover, opportunities provided by an imperious “place” change a person, he feels and realizes himself an exclusive being with respect to others.

This is, so to speak, the main scheme, but specifically, thinkers offered different options of relations between the said participants of social life and characterized these participants differently. For example, as we know, Hobbes was inclined towards the priority of the state over society (“Leviathan”), and Locke – towards the contrary.

On the basis of the project of a new European sociality considered here, starting from the 16th – 17th centuries, specific social collectives were created, and a new European sociality was developed, having passed a considerable way of evolution, naturally, in different options (specific features of this sociality will be the subject of further researches of the author). But by the middle of the 20th century, the new European sociality substantially became obsolete. First, because new social technologies allowed certain communities, and often even certain individuals to capture social institutions of the state, forcing them to operate not for the public good, i.e. society, but for themselves. Secondly, because the development of a new European sociality conditioned such complexity of sociality which could not be comprehended anymore within the existing social knowledge and sciences. Thirdly, because new forms of sociality

(global and planetary phenomena) developed testifying to the formation of the sociality of an absolutely new type. To sum up, we enter a new cycle of discussion and formation of sociality.

Here is how I see the second investigation phase of the European sociality. Of course, it is only a scheme with all restrictions following therefrom.

2. Sociality of the Modern Age

I would like to begin this part again from methodological reasons. It is known that originally sociologists considered natural sciences as a standard of science. For example, S. Bauman, B. Latour, J. Ritzer clearly write about it. “Born in severe times, sociology tried to imitate natural sciences in the level of scientism”³⁶. “Comte, writes Ritzer, developed *social physics*, or what in 1832 he called *sociology*. The use of the term *social physics* explains that Comte sought to create sociology by the sample of exact sciences. It was expected that this new science which, in his opinion, had to become eventually *the only* predominating science, will study both social statics (the existing social structures), and social dynamics (social changes). Though both include searches *of laws* of social life”³⁷. Respectively, from a categorial point of view sociality was understood as a “social nature”, and social action, in the spirit of engineering, i.e. as a “social and engineering” one.

Now it is difficult to speak about both social nature, and social engineering. For example, in a remarkable book “Good Society”, V.G. Fedotova characterizes social action very carefully. “For what, she asks, a scientist in the field of social sciences in the 21st century can assume responsibility? This question is unexpectedly difficult since “unspelling of the world” (M. Weber) expected from science is difficult to carry out today: the world “removed the spell” to a greater extent itself, having bared its simplified consumer, hedonistic and egoistical essence”³⁸. “An image of the future (*it is about Russia. – V.R.*) has been set in advance, as well as in previous modernizations. A false one – to become the West, a true one – in two alternative options: 1) finding sources of development while retaining identity; 2) using internal and external sources, slow change of identity”³⁹. It is very far from social engineering, resembling rather a rational action based on a trial and error method that does not exclude research.

Nevertheless, sociologists do not refuse conscious improvement of social life. How do they perceive in this context the contribution of sociology? Let's consider for an example not less remarkable book “Global capitalism: three great transformations” where this question if not directly, but nevertheless is considered in detail⁴⁰. If we summarize the answer of the authors of this book (V. Fedotova, V. Kolpakov, N. Fedotova) regarding the contribution of sociology, it will be approximately the following. First, the task of sociologists (social scientists and philosophers) is to decrown generally accepted scientific myths and memes, including false ones. Already in the first book V. Fedotova wrote: “The task of a scientist consists not only in generating new knowledge providing us with new opportunities but also in the

³⁶ Latour, B. Reassembly of the social: introduction into the Actor Network Theory. Translation from English by I. Polonskaya. – M.: Publishing House of the High School of Economics, 2014. – Page 344.

³⁷ Ritzer, G. Modern sociological theories. 5th edition. – SPb.: Piter, 2002. – Page 27.

³⁸ Fedotova V.G. Good society. – M.: Progress_Tradition, 2005. – Page 10.

³⁹ Id. Page 491.

⁴⁰ Fedotova V.G., Kolpakov V.A., Fedotova N.N. Global capitalism: three great transformations. – M.: Cultural revolution, 2008. – 608 pages.

destruction of fictitious expectations of ordinary consciousness, the sphere of management, and policy. This cleaning and self-cleaning work is an integral aspect of responsibility of a scientist which is followed by the task of searches of potential”⁴¹.

Secondly, sociological studies, as a rule, allow to plan distinctions and relations characterizing sociality. Usually, they are shaped, as befits in science, in the form of ideal objects and concepts, but in terms of their function outside the science they are first of all “schemes” which are used in social practice. Schemes – not in ordinary understanding, but in a discipline which I suggested to call “schemology” – are not simply a text (narrative or graphic), but a structure. Schemes are invented by the man, allow to resolve “a problem situation” (i.e. it is a “response” to a certain “challenge”), set “new reality” (subsequently it may be objectified), enable to understand the events and to act in a new way; at last, schemes are accepted or not during practical use⁴². For example, the scheme of Moscow Metro was created as a response to the problem of ordering passenger traffic, as well as navigation of a passenger in the subway, it sets the subway as a special reality of movements, transfers, entrances, and exits, allows the passenger to understand the subway structure and to act practically. So, distinctions and relations described in the book “Global capitalism ...” are schemes enabling managers, political scientists, authorities of different levels to see new social reality and to find therein new, more efficient solutions of numerous social challenges of our time. It should be noted however that these schemes do not indicate directly these decisions, but only create conditions to find them.

Thirdly, sociology makes it possible to gain knowledge of specific social processes, a specific social order (structure). So the authors of “Global capitalism” describe three main transformations underwent by capitalism in its development. “Unlike the First great transformation, V. Fedotova, V. Kolpakov, and N. Fedotova write, which created capitalism and brought it to a liberal classical phase, the Second great transformation discontinued liberal capitalism and transferred it to an organized form ... The system opposition of the first globalization as a feature of liberal capitalism became a part of this new transformation ... The Third great transformation – the 90^{-ies} of the 20th century – the beginning of the 21st century and its future, as it seems to us, very long continuation, were originally characterized by neomodernism, overtaking modernization of non-western countries trying to realize an ideal of liberal capitalism of the 19th century. Quickly enough – in two decades – the Third transformation turned aside, closer to the Second great transformation – to the anti-liberal phase promising new turns and bifurcations both in the development of capitalism and in the course and understanding of progress”⁴³. Besides, they consider specific tendencies of postmodernity – the crisis of identity and particularities of the Second globalization, new concepts and realities of the Third modernity.

Hence, the following type of social action suggests itself. Having cleared his consciousness as a result of criticism of own myths, the “social engineer” (a politician, a subject of authority, a practicing sociologist)

⁴¹ Fedotova V. G. Good society. – Pages 9-10; Fedotova V. G. Anarchy and order. – M.: URSS, 2000. – Page 133.

⁴² Rozin V. M. Introduction to schemology: schemes in philosophy, culture, science, design. – M.: LIBROKOM, 2011. – 256 pages; Rozin V. M. Formation and development of European sociality: Essays-researches. Book 1: The Ancient World and the Middle Ages. – M.: LENAND, 2019. – Page 33.

⁴³ Fedotova V.G., Kolpakov V.A., Fedotova N.N. Global capitalism: three great transformations. – M.: Cultural revolution, 2008. – Page 17.

designs social action, relying on distinctions and relations characterizing sociality, as well as knowledge (reconstructions) of specific social transformations, trends, social structures.

The description of specific social transformations in the work “Global capitalism”, in my opinion, has one shortcoming: it is not clear that is whole here, how parties and processes identified by authors are related, why the said transformations occurred. For example, explaining the transition to the second Great transformation, the authors write the following: “First, modernization of non-western countries, their attempt to catch up with the West led to a transfer of western economic models there. As a result, the economy of these societies separated from other spheres of their life and turned from a tool into a dominating factor. Upon transfer of western models of economic development to other countries the market in these countries and in the world, in general, began to outpace social arrangement ... Secondly, among diverse factors which influenced the transformation of capitalism into a new phase, we would like to mention especially an orientation towards continuous innovation of commodity production. The innovation became the purpose and the sense of economic activity ... thirdly, the formation of mass culture became a key factor which caused the weakening of organic solidarity. As a result, a lot of people were forced out of the production sphere to the sphere of standardized consumption”⁴⁴.

The explanation (except for the last factor) as we see, is given within the framework of an economic discourse; probably, the habit of Marxist thinking influenced here. But is it so in fact, and what the economy means in this case? Earlier the authors themselves quote K. Polanyi who says that economy is based on social relations, and not vice versa, if we follow the Marxist doctrine. “Polanyi states, V. Fedotova, V. Kolpakov, N. Fedotova write, that “... economic activity of a person is, as a rule, completely subordinated to the general system of his social relations ... the economic system is driven by non-economic motives ... “economic motives” are generated by the general context of social life ... an economic system is essentially just a simple function of a social organization”⁴⁵.

Similar questions arise and in many other places of the work. A difficult task suggests itself – to characterize the relations between the specified characteristics (subsystems and components) of sociality, such, for example, as *economy, state, society, power, masses, culture*, etc. The authors of “Global capitalism” could object, saying that these characteristics of sociality and relations have been set by them and are clear from the material and reasonings. But it seems to me that they imply reflections and shall be identified explicitly in specific schemes. As a result, of course, there will be a shift of ideas of sociality as the reflections will belong to your obedient servant.

In the article “Formation, development and the end of a new European sociality (thinking over the book “Global capitalism: three great transformations” by V. Fedotova, V. Kolpakov, N. Fedotova)”, I made an assumption – and tried to prove it – that in fact the structure of a new European sociality consists of two spheres. The first includes two main components – *the state* and *the society*. The second sphere may be called anthropological: it is possible to identify here such entities as *persons, communities, masses, at last, the society* understood not as in the first sphere, but in the anthropological plan (a big community

⁴⁴ Fedotova V.G., Kolpakov V.A., Fedotova N.N. Global capitalism: three great transformations. – M.: Cultural revolution, 2008. – Pages 230-231.

⁴⁵ Id., Page 137.

realized, for example, as a nation, people, and so forth). In both spheres, the said realities (entities) are set on the basis of schemes which are more habitually treated as concepts (for example, concepts of state and society, a concept of nation or people)⁴⁶. A.P. Ogurtsov distinguishes schemes and concepts as follows: for a concept “predominating types and functions are to be an expression of an author's innovation, for a scheme – to be the first step in its transition to recognition by a micro-community and scientific community”⁴⁷. But a scheme, as it was noted above, has also other functions.

Besides the state and the society, it makes sense to include in the first sphere economy which is also set conceptually. Let's specify now the main functions of the said entities, meaning a task to characterize the European (western) sociality. The state is conceptually interpreted as a power instance within which officials represent employees obliged to perform instructions of society. In this context, the laws and legislation are interpreted as driving belts between the state and the society, as well as individual citizens. With their help freedom of citizens is harmonized with general social requirements and norms. Originally state functions included the collection of taxes, conquests, and protection against enemies, maintenance of internal order. Subsequently, the state often starts defining all aspects of the activity of society and individual citizens⁴⁸.

Society was introduced as a force proportional to the state. Its purpose, on the one hand, is control of the state inclined to extend its power to the society and citizens, depriving them of freedom, and on the other, goal-setting and sense-setting, i.e. the task of defining the direction of development and the meaning of life.

Subsequently, society and state took upon themselves the solution of tasks which traditionally were referred to the competence of political philosophy. Namely, *improvement of human life and society*. Such a setting as I show determines one of the characteristics of the European sociality. But other specific features of the European sociality must be also kept in mind: reflection and assessment of sociality, analysis of mass behaviour and social order, cultural and historical approach, recognition of the contribution of a new European personality to the sociality, treatment of sociality as a form of social life, at last, interpretation of sociality in the logic of “completion and formation”, i.e. currently sociality of modernity comes to an end and at the same time a new type of sociality is developed (its particularities are looked through in the analysis of trends of social transformation)⁴⁹.

The function of the economy including economic activity (production and consumption) and a semiotic layer of calculations, concepts, and projects, – the creation of conditions for *an efficient developing economy* yielding maximum profit⁵⁰333. From the point of view of some researchers, the economy began

⁴⁶ Rozin V. M. “Formation, development and the end of a new European sociality (thinking over the book “Global capitalism: three great transformations” by V. Fedotova, V. Kolpakov, N. Fedotova)”//Culture and art. – 2020. – No. 4. – Pages 29-43.

⁴⁷ Ogurtsov A.P. Genetic methodology and transition from an individual innovation to its all-importance//Methodology of science and anthropology – M., 2012. Pages 54-55.

⁴⁸ Kreveld M. Blossoming and decline of state – M.: IRISEN, 2006.

⁴⁹ Rozin V. M. Formation and development of European sociality: Essays-researches. Book 1: The Ancient World and the Middle Ages. – M.: LENAND, 2019. – 182 pages.

⁵⁰ Rozin V. M. Formation of economy in Europe in the 18th century as conscious scientific reality and discipline//Philosophy of science and engineering, 2020. No. 1. – Pages 81-95.

to develop under the influence of the state which needed an efficient developing economy³³⁴. Since capitalism is associated with a continuous accumulation of capital required for loans and business activity as well as an end in itself, the capitalist economy creates in parallel an opportunity for penetration of capital into power (known merging of state power and business).

Persons and communities in the anthropological sphere, as a rule, function in two modes. It is possible to call the first mode “standard”, here a person in general carries out roles set in respective concepts. For example, an official or a government in their activity honestly carry out institutional instructions of their profession and appointment. The second mode, if it is possible to say so, “parasitic” (rent-building, misuse of social structures, for example, for implementation of personal interests, etc.). It is parasitic not in terms of morals, but because the social nature allows such use. Say, the society entrusted a commander with the protection of the fatherland and for this purpose conferred him extensive powers. As a result, there was a situation when the commander had an army and such powers that he had an opportunity to put society under his control, and he took advantage of this situation for a hundred percent. Of course, it is possible to say that he acts immorally, infringes the public contract. But his act may be also interpreted differently: there was a situation allowing an opportunity to bend the society to the will of a special personality; the army and expanded powers constitute his “social body”; and this personality did not miss this opportunity.

Unlike a personality and communities which often realize themselves as independent subjects, the general population (masses) are not capable to seize social structures. Moreover, they are neither capable of ensuring the functioning of the state. But masses define some social processes. Masses can be manipulated when they are provided with “the bread and the circuses”. Society in the anthropological sphere is most often amorphous and split, but if it is consolidated as an integrated social subject, it may control and direct the state.

One more specific feature of the state and society making the necessary introduction of one more, third sphere (covering two others), is their “populative” character. It is that the state and society are not alone, there are a lot of them, and they enter various complex relations (fight for territory and resources, competition, help to each other, various exchanges, etc.). Populative character of the state and society is reflected in an interesting concept of world-system analysis of Immanuel Wallerstein⁵¹. He shows that it is impossible to understand sociality, disregarding its populative and system character. Another thing is that, in my opinion, the system approach is insufficient here. For example, certainly, concepts and development of state and society are influenced by the fight for territory and resources, competition, international unions, and trade, but it is difficult to describe these interactions by the language of world-system analysis.

The relationship between populative states and societies which are at different levels of development is defined not only by the mentioned processes (fight for territory and resources, competition, help to each other, various exchanges), but also by hierarchical unity of the territory (state, region, Planet). I speak here about territory, not in the traditionally geographical sense, but in a broad sense as now the territory

⁵¹ *Wallerstein I.* Mirosystem analysis//Time of the world. Issue 1. – Novosibirsk: Publishing house of NSU, 2000. – Pages 105-123.

is formed also by the Internet, mobile, and transport communication. Territory understood in this way creates conditions for two main types of interaction of states and societies – *modernization* and *globalization*. In the first caseless developed and successful states and societies consider more developed and successful ones as “a zone of nearest social development”. In the second case, more developed and successful states and societies extend their influence and achievements on other states and societies located in this territory. “One of the researchers, H. Lentner, writes: “From my point of view, globalization began at the end of the nineteenth century with the growth of modern industry, new technologies of transport and communications, with development of international exchange of goods and streams of capitals and migration of a modern type”. Another author, M. Waters, believes that globalization is comparable to modernization ... In the 19th century, there was the first globalization of 1885-1914 including an exchange of capitals, goods, people, and ideas. It was interrupted by World War I, nationalism, communism, and fascism. The second globalization was marked by an active development of world trade, distribution of liberalism and appeared together with the disintegration of communism after which such an opportunity appeared. In other words, *we may call globalization both all signs of unity of the mankind, and economic process of free trade and exchange in the 19th century, as well as an absolutely new phenomenon of the same nature of the last twenty years*”⁵².

The processes of globalization and modernization are not the only ones. There are at least three more types of processes in sociality: *processes of implementation of social schemes and concepts*, “*post*” and “*counter*” *processes*, i.e. those of orientation to previous and attractive conditions of sociality (“*post*”, “*revival*”) and vice versa, processes of criticism and denial of previous and some other conditions (“*counter*”), at last, *processes of statement and solution of problems* (“*challenges*” and “*responses*” thereto).

The first type of processes may be illustrated on the example of implementation of the state concept. Originally two different concepts – “*Leviathan*” (Hobbes) and “*Society*” (Locke and Montesquieu) were constructed. The first implied full control of the state over citizens, society, and economy, the second one, control of civil society over the state. As Martin van Kreveld wrote regarding the second concept: “The difference between civil society and the state did not raise any doubts in him. Locke proclaimed: the first not only precedes the second, but in fact the state was created by civil society to protect itself both from violation of the inner peace, and from external invasions”⁵³.

But concepts are just schemes and settings for their implementation. Even if the state existed at that time, it was only in the form of a plan and virtual reality. The second stage is the deployment of schemes and social practices, providing for the implementation process. For example, an intention to collect more taxes led to the development of cartography and delineation of borders of the state. “As soon as the problem of delimitation of states and measurement of their territories was more or less solved, the next task was clarification, what resources, human and material, were available to governors *within* each state”⁵⁴. Statistics is created, the first population censuses are carried out, and the taxation is ordered on

⁵² Fedotova V.G., Kolpakov V.A., Fedotova N.N. Global capitalism: three great transformations. – M.: Cultural revolution, 2008. – Pages 116-117.

⁵³ Kreveld M. Blossoming and decline of state – M.: IRISEN, 2006. – Page 145.

⁵⁴ Id., Page 11.

their basis. “Every European, and subsequently, any other the state after 1789 wanted to be sure that daily activity of its population was under its control and as far as it is possible, serves the purposes of this state. Police and penitentiary, education and social security systems became the most important means of achievement thereof”⁵⁵. Simultaneously and even earlier the state creates ministries promoting the development of trade and industry.

At the third stage as a result of these efforts the state shapes already as a real social phenomenon. Implementation of Leviathan concepts favoured the formation of authoritative and totalitarian states, and Locke and Montesquieu's concepts, of liberal and democratic states such as Canada, the USA, post-war France, Germany, Italy. State development and studying processes began.

An example of the description of “post” and “counter” processes may be seen in the work “Global capitalism”, when authors analyse modernization. “Modernization theories were destroyed not by the existence of scientific alternatives, but by their inability to answer an existential challenge of layers which were most difficult to adapt to the process of radical changes. These were also new collective social movements – peasants' revolts, “black” and Chicano movements, revolts of indignant peoples, youth movement, student disorders, women actions, etc. Nevertheless, post-war social theories contained the following trends:

- 1) modernization theory – romantic liberalism (“post” – V.R.);
- 2) anti-modernization theory – heroic radicalism (“counter” – V.R.);
- 3) post-modernist theory – comic alienation;
- 4) emergence of neomodernization phase – a revised convergence theory and again romantic liberalism (“post” – V.R.).

“Theoretical balance of each phase is still alive today, – Alexander says”⁵⁶.

But if authors of “Global capitalism” use this technique only as one of the methods, V.A. Belyaev put it in the basis of his methodology. It is enough to mention the titles of his two books: “Designing modernity: Post-cultural and intercultural aspects. Design and system approach” and “Self-consciousness of modernity: Between counter-modernity and post-modernity”⁵⁷. In the abstract, to the second book, Belyaev writes that “the concept of modernity and its self-consciousness presented in this book may be considered as an answer, on the one hand, to the challenge of counter-modernist aspiration to overcome modernity, and on the other hand, to the challenge of the post-modernist extremely negative option of self-criticism of modernity”⁵⁸. As we see, one more method put by him in the basis of methodology is

⁵⁵ *Kreveld M.* Blossoming and decline of state – M.: IRISEN, 2006. – Page 165-166.

⁵⁶ *Fedotova V.G., Kolpakov V.A., Fedotova N.N.* Global capitalism: three great transformations. – M.: Cultural revolution, 2008. – Page 290.

⁵⁷ *Belyaev of V.A.* Self-consciousness of modernity: Between counter-modernity and post-modernity. – M.: LENAND, 2016. – 248 pages; *Belyaev V.A.* Designing modernity: Post-cultural and intercultural aspects. Design and system approach. – M.: LENAND, 2015. – 400 pages.

⁵⁸ *Belyaev V.A.* Designing modernity: Post-cultural and intercultural aspects. Design and system approach. – M.: LENAND, 2015. – 400 pages.

the analysis of challenges and answers. But I usually write not about challenges and answers thereto, but about problems and their solutions that is almost same, I think.

In Kreveld's work, there is an interesting fragment. "The state, he writes, closely connected with falling of the medieval world and subsequent civil and religious wars, initially was conceived, first of all, as a tool for establishing law and order in the relations of people and groups among themselves. However about one and a half centuries after its birth it met a burning nationalism and started appropriating it, giving itself thereby ethical content"⁵⁹. The influence of nationalist ideas was diverse: they promoted not only the strengthening of the state, especially in military terms but also the development of the economy. For example, L. Greenfield writes that the year of publication of Adam Smith's book "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations", may be considered as a year of birth of the modern capitalist English economy. She thinks that economic protectionism arose in England at first as nationalism as such. Then "national English consciousness during economic integration and development of international trade became a basis of the international competition"⁶⁰344.

Nationalism becomes an important guideway and a factor of the development of European states in the second half of the 18th – 19th centuries. Ideas of a national state include concepts of uniform territory, language, the common historical destiny of people. In their turn, behind these concepts, there are interests of certain communities, but hardly interests of society in general during the formation of the nation. According to Greenfield, nations are created "by intellectuals and professional intellectuals, other social groups occupy generally a passive role in this process"⁶¹. Roald Dobrovensky, discussing the formation of the Latvian nation, shows that if the territorial unity and language in the first half of the 20th century in Latvia already developed, the literary language being created by efforts of such intellectuals as poets Raynis and Aspasia, others, not less necessary – the state and the society – either were absent at all or just were in the process of development. Therefore the Latvian nation formed later⁶².

What is the conclusion? Since the second half of the 18th century, ideas and the concept of nationalism started to influence significantly the development of the state, defining its institutes and important aspects of life of the population. But approximately the same role was also played by other concepts such as *creation of socialism, creation of the state of general welfare, expansion of vital space*, many of which could be implemented. However, as a rule, most expectations has not come true that, however, became clear post factum and not to those social subjects who had implemented these concepts.

Does not it mean in this case, that the state, and European sociality related thereto, are not only an organic, natural entity, but also an artificial one, created by people, and quite often it is based on such ideas and concepts which are disastrous both for the state, and the society? Why then, it is asked, society did not brake, did not change cardinally the direction of development? Because the state, as M. Kreveld, and Z.

⁵⁹ Kreveld M. Blossoming and decline of the state. – M.: IRISEN, 2006. – Page 331.

⁶⁰ Fedotova V.G., Kolpakov V.A., Fedotova N.N. Global capitalism: three great transformations. – M.: Cultural revolution, 2008. – Page 191.

⁶¹ Id., Page 190.

⁶² Rozin V. M. Exploit and "fall" of Yannis Raynis (reflections inspired by reading the novel of R. Dobrovensky "Raynis and his brothers" and J. Shumpeter's books "Capitalism, socialism and democracy")//Culture and art. – 2018. – No. 11. – Page 49-59.

Bauman believes, subordinated to it both the society, and individual persons; besides, communities or individuals who received absolute power in the state were committed to such schemes and concepts which supported their power, making it permanent, but destroyed social life and society.

We considered, naturally, not all structures and relations of western sociality. They defined in many respects its development and transformation up to our time. However, it is impossible to characterize these processes, knowing the only structure of sociality; these processes are nonlinear, they are conditioned not by the laws reminding the laws of the first nature, but by regularities which are better described by system approach and synergetics. A quite good example of such an approach provides the concept of “spontaneous systems with synergetic effects” by the academician V. S. Stepin who recently left us. It, in particular, this concept shows that in points of bifurcation it is impossible to tell unambiguously where development (the direction of transformation) will proceed, and it is human activity that often defines this direction.

Therefore, for more efficient social action besides knowledge of how sociality is arranged, knowledge of the specific history of development (transformation) of sociality is required. In the work “Global capitalism: three great transformations”, in my opinion, both of these problems were solved. In the article “Formation, development and the end of a new European sociality (thinking over the book “Global capitalism: three great transformations” by V. Fedotova, V. Kolpakov, N. Fedotova)”, relying on the research of these authors, I offer my option of the specific history of a new European sociality. In doing so, I distinguish prerequisites of sociality, its formation, four stages of development or transformation, including the stage of the “end of European sociality” relating to our time.

Prerequisites of western sociality included the following social processes: formation of European personality in Renaissance, leaving from the scene of class society and formation of communities of citizens equal in rights, change of the “sense (picture) of culture” (a medieval religious picture is replaced by a rational one, according to which the meaning of life of a person is reduced to mastering the nature, which will make the person powerful, rich and happy), economic activity quickly developing in this period together with the market; at last, the European reformation processes⁶³.

In formation, I distinguished three main stages. On the first one monarchs, in search of money necessary for conducting wars and ensuring a worthy standard of living, try to raise as much money as possible from their citizens and for this purpose appoint authorized representatives for collecting taxes. In doing so, they transfer to them a part of their imperious prerogatives. At the second stage, this function started to be carried out not by the king’s confidants, but by officials appointed by him who gradually lay hands-on trade and production, and later on various aspects of the life of citizens.

At the third stage, the transfer of imperious prerogatives of the monarch to officials gradually deprives him of real power, but in return, a problem of legitimacy of officials arises. It is settled by way of designing and introducing a new reality – on the one hand, the state which is declared the Supreme

⁶³ Rozin V. M. “Formation, development and the end of a new European sociality (thinking over the book “Global capitalism: three great transformations” by V. Fedotova, V. Kolpakov, N. Fedotova)”

instance of power, and on the other, society as a force proportional to the state. Formation of the latter promotes the development of economy, science, and industry, national state.

The first stage of development of European sociality is the construction of a liberal and democratic state (domination of society). Transition to the second stage (two world wars) was associated with an aggravated inequality (rich and poor), the fight of socialist parties and countries against capitalism, domination of nationalist concepts of state, obtaining power by communities inspired by these nationalist or socialist concepts. The war allowed power communities not only to mobilize life of citizens for the fight against enemies (having at the same time deprived them of a substantial part of freedom) but, what is not less important, *to subordinate* – temporarily or for a long time – *society to the state* (the authors of “Global capitalism” call the second transformation “organized present”).

For the third stage of development of the European sociality (after the World War II and approximately until the end of the 20th century) not only fight of two world camps and expansion of capitalism to the East and the countries of Africa and South America are characteristic, but also an attempt of developed capitalist states to create a *welfare society*. However, the development of sociality in such a direction led to the sharp increase in bureaucracy and broke the economic balance. As a result, society started opposing established practices, partly, coming back to the previous classical stage of development of capitalism.

The fourth stage of development of the European sociality may be qualified as the “end of a new European sociality”. Incomplete processes of formation of a new sociality as prerequisites may be also referred to it. As a rule, such processes are connected with *trends of social changes*. Completion of a new European sociality follows two lines: the state is transformed and loses domination, while the society changes, and essentially. Kreveld points to the following reasons of the transformation of a modern state: “dying away of a big war”, “retreat of the state of general welfare”, “technologies become international”, “threat to the internal order”, “loss of belief in the state”⁶⁴. It is possible to speak about two more reasons: misuse of government institutions (the state is captured by passionate communities pursuing their own aims, officials are engaged in rent-building), as well as identity crisis destroying both personality, and society.

One more trend is the transformation of vision of cultural reality. Ideas of the first nature and culture gradually pass into the background, while the image of *collective creativity and activity of a person* – within the framework of which there is a transformation of nature (from here, for example, the idea of “technonature”), and culture – comes to the fore. A person gradually realizes what it is his activity that is the reason of both modern achievements and menacing crises (ecological, social, cultural ones), that only self-organization and self-restriction may help with their solution.

The convergence of socialism and capitalism is one more not less important trend in social relations. In fact, most countries of our planet move towards convergent (hybrid) socialism-capitalism. The experience shows that nothing better than the market, competition, and private property has been devised yet, and will hardly be. Therefore those countries which accept socialist scenarios and programs, also base their production and economy on the said three capitalist pillars. On the other hand, in the capitalist

⁶⁴ Kreveld M. Blossoming and decline of the state. – M.: IRISEN, 2006. – Page 269-331.

countries, and in the world in the general community represented by transnational institutes (the UN, UNESCO, etc.) processes of redistribution of the national product (from working and successful in terms of competition relation to idle and less successful, from the developed countries – to developing, etc.) accrue. That is capitalist economy and socialist centralized redistribution are evident (that as early as in the beginning of the 40^{ies} Joseph Schumpeter wrote in his book “Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy”).

The following trend is the formation of a new system of values, rights, and public morals. The principle which has been already implicitly proclaimed now – that each person, regardless of what he/she does and how he/she works, has the right to a worthy standard of living (on which, as we know, is based the help to refugees, poor and jobless) – in fact, belongs not to the old social ethics, but to a new one. But ahead are other similar but more radical principles, for example, “a person may live decently, without working at all”, or “it is correct to force rich and working to share with others fruits of their work”, or “fair is what corresponds not to a contribution of a person or humanistic ideals, but to the balance established in the fight of interested subjects”, etc.

It is a difficult question, whether problems of preservation of life on Earth will have a serious impact on a new sociality. Destruction of the human life and the biosphere advances rapidly nowadays, and efforts aimed at maintaining and renewing them which are made by the man, are incomparable with those that are necessary. In principle, the problem of preservation of life on Earth would have to become one of key problems in the nearest future, that, of course, would demand from mankind restrictions and cardinal revision of values of its life. However we see that so far all efforts of the intellectual elite of the mankind to convince thereof governors and population of our planet do not bring due results. People are too selfish, are at different levels of development, do not realize the gravity of the threat hanging over them. In this case, it is possible to assume with a high probability that in the long term we are faced with the prospect of a series of technogenic and social disasters. And if mankind survives them, in the future culture it will be nevertheless compelled to handle its main task.

Let's return now once again to the problem of social action. It has to rely, of course, on social research. However, not social laws, but as we tried to show, characteristics and regularities of sociality, knowledge of the specific history of sociality, social trends of the present are the result of the latter. On their basis, as well as with support on experience, various schemes allowing to act efficiently may be constructed (see the analysis of two examples of efficient social actions in publication⁶⁵).

What may be derived from the presented research for a better understanding of European sociality? First of all, the composition of the main forces forming sociality. In the forefront, it is the structure “state – society”, interrelated by means of economy and conceptually. The anthropological environment including individuals, community, masses, and society acts as an external sphere for this structure (i.e. society shall be considered in two ways – as a subsystem within a structure “state – society” and as a social population). Besides, cultural and historical context is also an external environment (sphere) (traditions, some historical events, for example, the Holocaust or the Chernobyl accident, a habit to respond in a certain way to the challenges of the time, structure and tendencies of communities and many

⁶⁵ *Rozin V. M.* Social design and social technologies//Trends and management. – 2019. – No. 3. – Pages 1-14.

other things). The third environment includes crisis social situations, for example, wars, epidemics, economic crises, etc.

Usually, the state is considered as a means, as social equipment. It was created as a tool for the solution of tasks of the society: protection against enemies, maintenance of order, creation of equal and favourable conditions for economic activity and so forth. But at the same time, the state represents a social organism: it is not only institutes and institutions solving tasks assigned by the society, but also a community of officials and authorities of various levels (elite of functionaries, bureaucracy, establishment). People forming this community live in two main modes. When carrying out roles (functions) assigned to them by the society and the state, they are experts (employees) and act, following duty regulations, complying with laws and regulations. But as individuals belonging to a community of power and officials, as well as to anthropological community, these individuals quite often act contrary to the laws and duty regulations since they pursue their own purposes and intentions (enrichment, acquisition of the desirable status, expansion of power, career advancement, etc.). Which does not prevent the combination of these modes.

The existence of the said two modes of functioning (life) of individuals belonging to the community of power and officials explains, on the one hand, the tendency of the state only to imitate the fulfillment of functions and roles assigned by the society to the state (or to fulfil them to a minimum extent), on the other – an aspiration to subordinate to itself society and anthropological communities, not excepting specific individuals. A great role in this transformation is played by social concepts and imputation practices (promotion, infusion, false information, creation of the necessary pictures of reality, and so forth). In general, the role of social concepts supported by imputation practices is rather high, especially if passionate communities or groups seeking to implement abstract or messianic ideas and concepts (fascism, communism, world supremacy, alteration of mankind, etc.) stand behind them. Such communities and groups, and even individuals may sometimes seize the state (“seized state”), turning it into a “social body” and forcing to function not for the society and the man.

The said transformation is promoted by two more factors: crisis social situations (wars, epidemics, economic crises, etc.), as well as cultural and historical conditionalities, for example, immaturity and lack of integration of the society, a habit of power communities to solve social problems in a certain way, the developed pictures of the world and scenarios.

The European sociality of the Modern Age shall be considered as being transformed under the influence of three major factors: implementation of social concepts (state, society, economy, welfare of citizens, law, etc.), crisis social situations, and results of previous social transformations (for example, Kreveld shows that creation of the state of general welfare led to an economic crisis and refusal by the society of respective concepts).

In their turn, social concepts develop under the influence of several factors: desire to solve crises and to respond the challenges of the time, the pressure of historical and cultural traditions and imputed values, the creativity of communities and individuals who assumed the mission of development and overcoming crisis, pressure of the developed social situation.

Martin Kreveld claims that the state leaves. Even if it is so, in this case the society has to leave too, and it is unclear what will happen to the economy and the law. However, perhaps, the state simply transforms but does not leave. It has to transform probably in the direction which will make impossible interception of power and submission of society to the state. But it is only an assumption, time will tell.

Reference

1. Gaydenko P.P.. Breakthrough to the transcendental. New ontology of the 20th century. – M.: Republic, 1997. – Pages 363-364.
2. Rawls, J. (1958) Justice and Fairness, The Philosophical Review. Penguin Press, New York, 184. [Citation Time(s):1]
3. Ritzer, G. Modern sociological theories. 5th edition. – SPb.: Piter, 2002. – Pages 30–31.
4. Lenski, G., Nolan, P. and Lenski, J. (1995) Human Societies: An Introduction into Macro Sociology. McGraw-Hill, Boston, 11. [Citation Time (s):1]; Giddens, A. (2009) Sociology. 6th Edition, Wiley India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 329–331. [Citation Time (s):1]
5. Bauman, Z. Thinking sociologically. M, 1996. Translation from English edited by A.F. Filippov. – Aspekt-Press, 1996. – Pages 239-242.
6. Ritzer, G. Modern sociological theories. 5th edition. – SPb.: Piter, 2002. – Page 16. Society//New philosophical encyclopaedia. Vol. 3. – M.: Mysl, 2001. – Page 132.
7. Latour, B. Reassembly of the social: introduction into the Actor Network Theory. Translation from English by I. Polonskaya. – M.: Publishing House of the High School of Economics, 2014. – Page 355.
8. Aristotle. Politics. Works in 4 vol. Vol. 4. – M.: Mysl, 1983. – Pages 378-379.
9. Ritzer, G. Modern sociological theories. 5th edition. – SPb.: Piter, 2002. – Page 27.
10. Ritzer, G. Modern sociological theories. 5th edition. – SPb.: Piter, 2002. – Page 484.
11. E. J. Hobsbawm. From Social History to the History of Society. Source: Daedalus, Vol. 100, No. 1, Historical Studies Today (Winter, 1971), pp. 20–45. Published by: The MIT Press on behalf of American Academy of Arts & Sciences. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20023989>. Accessed: 23/03/2009 03:18.; Bruce Lincoln. Discourse and the Construction of Society: Comparative Studies of Myth, Ritual, and Classification. – Oxford University Press, 1992. – 238 pages.
Later I reconsidered this position and came to the opinion that concept “social nature” does not work in social sciences. Analysing sociality, it is better to speak not about laws and the nature, but about temporary regularities, trends of social changes, singular transformations.
12. Rozin V. M. Granting freedom to a person as a condition of formation of antique democracy and personality//Culture and Art. – 2018. – No. 1. – Pages 7-15; Rozin V. M. Culturology. 2nd edition – M.: Gardariki, 2003. – 462 pages; Rozin V. M. Culturology. 3rd edition – Urait, 2018. – 410 pages; Rozin V. M. Person and its studying. Edition 2, – M.: URSS, 2012. – 232 pages.
13. Rozin V. M. Nature of sociality: Issues of methodology and ontology of social sciences. – LENAND, 2016. – 288 pages.
14. Rozin V. M. Granting freedom to a person as a condition of formation of antique democracy and personality//Culture and Art. – 2018. – No. 1. – Pages 7-15; Rozin V. M. A road map of reconstruction of formation of ancient culture and sociality (the period of cities-states, before formation of empires)//Culture and Art. – 2018. – No. 3. – Pages 8-20; Rozin V. M. Studying and particularities of sociality of the Ancient World. Article first. Protosociality of the Ancient World//Culture of Culture. – 2018. – No. 2.; Rozin V. M. Formation of sociality of the Roman Empire under the reign of Octavian Augustus //Culture and

15. Art. – 2018. – No. 2. – Pages 22-32.; Rozin V. M. Prolegomenon to reconstruction of sociality of the Middle Ages//Culture and Art. – 2018. – No. 3. – Pages 21–32.
16. About schemes please see: Rozin V. M. Introduction to schemology: schemes in philosophy, culture, science, design. – M.: URSS, 2011. – 256 pages. There are two types of schemes – graphic and narrative. However a scheme is not just a semiotic construction, but an element of structure: schemes are invented by a person, solve problem situations facing the person and the culture, set new reality within which the person starts understanding, seeing and acting in a new way. A scheme differs from the reality that is schematized. For example, a metro map is referred to graphic schemes, it is schematic with respect to the subway as a complex engineering object, it was created by designers to order passenger flows and to enable a passenger to navigate better in the subway, this scheme sets the subway as an ideal object.
17. Cf.: Neretina S. S. Tracks and concepts. – M.: Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 1999. – 278 pages. “CONCEPT (from lat. conceptus – assembly, perception, conception) is an act of “grasping” meaning of a thing (problem) in integrity of a speech statement ... In the 20th century of ideas of concept are traced in personalistic philosophies regarding the idea of a work as being of paramount importance (M.M. Bakhtin, V. S. Bibler) ... The idea of concept again brought to life an appealing to the idea of creativity which “always is something singular”, and to the idea of speech connected with creativity presented in “steady conglomerations of sense” and opened by the Middle Ages ... A concept in post-modernist understanding is a field of suggestive signs distributed in space. Besides, since in speech objective and language forms of expression are being observed, terminologically “concept” is hardly distinguished from “notion”, becoming an ambiguous term” (Concept (Neretina) <http://ponjatija.ru/node/459>).
18. Plato. Republic. Collected works in 4 volumes. Vol. 3. – M.: Mysl, 1994. – 654 pages.
19. It seems that governors, scribes, soldiers, farmers and handicraftsmen of the Ancient world do not differ in anything essential from our experts acting within the framework of division of labour. But it is not so. All these occupations and roles were hereditary: for example, in a family of a soldier a soldier was born, and in a family of scribe – a scribe. The second difference is impossibility to change profession. The third one is an inclusiveness in another system of economy and social life. Specialization unlike division of labour is based not on a rational organization of production activity and training, but on a certain way of life.
20. Rozin V.M. Studying and particularities of sociality of the Ancient World. Article first. Protosociality of the Ancient World//Culture of Culture. – 2018. – No. 2.
21. Rozin of V.M. Culturology. 2nd edition 2018. – M.: Gardariki, 2003. – 462 pages. When today V. Volodin claims that Russia is Putin (“If there is Putin, there is Russia, if there is no Putin, there is no Russia”), he involuntarily reproduces syncretism of the Ancient world culture considered here. And our elite ruling the country regards itself not just as elective representatives of the people, but as autocratic owners of the country.
22. See the author's concept of origin of a human: Rozin V. M. Culturology. 2nd edition – 2018. – M.: Gardariki, 2003. – 462 pages; Rozin V.M. Semiotic researches. – M.: PEPER SE; SPb.: University book, 2001. – 256 pages; Rozin V.M. Engineering and technology: from stone tools to the Internet and robots. – Yoshkar-Ola, 2016. – 280 pages; Rozin V.M. Culturology. 3rd edition – Urait, 2018. – 410 pages.
23. Rozin V.M. Culturology. 3rd edition – Urait, 2018. – 410 pages.
24. Let's remember, for example, the myth of Gilgamesh. Why people have to submit to the tsar, priests and their servants? But because the tsar is a living god of people, priests are servants of gods, and gods created the human.

25. Rozin V.M. Studying and particularities of sociality of the Ancient World. Article first. Protosociality of the Ancient World//Culture of Culture. – 2018. – No. 2.
26. If at the beginning of the 20th century the Marxist idea of building socialism was quite working, it helped to create socialist society and socialist person in Russia, the search of national idea at the end of the 20th century gave virtually nothing. At the beginning of the next century it became clear why. In particular, for various reasons construction of constitutional, democratic state failed; the power occurred in hands of a small community which, according to Konstantin Remchukov, the editor-in-chief of “Nezavisimaya Gazeta”, built “state-and-KGB capitalism”; the imperial sociality was not dismantled (nostalgia for the USSR as a great power). Moreover, the authorities developed a campaign for restoration of this sociality (expansion with respect to Ukraine, articulating merits of Stalin, restoration of a number of institutions of the Soviet period, aggressive foreign policy, massaging of fight against the fifth column and the USA).
27. Plato. Republic. Collected works in 4 volumes. Vol. 3. – M.: Mysl, 1994. – Pages 417, 418-419. Territories with unstable borders because of wars, provided also integrity of feudal communities of “suzeraine – vassal” type; but patrimonial ties replaced here personal contractual relations.
28. Aristotle. Politics. Works in 4 volumes. Vol. 4. – M.: Mysl, 1983. – Page 506, 508.
29. Sergeyev V. S. An outline of history of the ancient Rome. – M.: OGIZ. Gosotseconomizdat, 1937. – Page 79. Id., Page 146.
30. Neretina S. Revival of political philosophy and political action. The Paris revolt of 1356-1358 – M.: Golos, 2012 – Pages 27, 92.
31. Latour, B. Reassembly of the social: introduction into the Actor Network Theory. Translation from English by I. Polonskaya. – M.: Publishing House of the High School of Economics, 2014. – Page 344.
32. Ritzer, G. Modern sociological theories. 5th edition. – SPb.: Piter, 2002. – Page 27.
33. Fedotova V.G. Good society. – M.: Progress_Tradition, 2005. – Page 10. Id. Page 491.
34. Fedotova V.G., Kolpakov V.A., Fedotova N.N. Global capitalism: three great transformations. – M.: Cultural revolution, 2008. – 608 pages.
35. Fedotova V. G. Good society. – Pages 9-10; Fedotova V. G. Anarchy and order. – M.: URSS, 2000. – Page 133.
36. Rozin V. M. Introduction to schemology: schemes in philosophy, culture, science, design. – M.: LIBROKOM, 2011. – 256 pages; Rozin V. M. Formation and development of European sociality: Essays-researches. Book 1: The Ancient World and the Middle Ages. – M.: LENAND, 2019. – Page 33.
37. Fedotova V.G., Kolpakov V.A., Fedotova N.N. Global capitalism: three great transformations. – M.: Cultural revolution, 2008. – Page 17.
38. Fedotova V.G., Kolpakov V.A., Fedotova N.N. Global capitalism: three great transformations. – M.: Cultural revolution, 2008. – Pages 230-231. Id., Page 137.
39. Rozin V. M. “Formation, development and the end of a new European sociality (thinking over the book “Global capitalism: three great transformations” by V. Fedotova, V. Kolpakov, N. Fedotova)”//Culture and art. – 2020. – No. 4. – Pages 29-43.
40. Ogurtsov A.P. Genetic methodology and transition from an individual innovation to its all-importance//Methodology of science and anthropology – M., 2012. Pages 54-55.
41. Kreveld M. Blossoming and decline of state – M.: IRISEN, 2006.
42. Rozin V. M. Formation and development of European sociality: Essays-researches. Book 1: The Ancient World and the Middle Ages. – M.: LENAND, 2019. – 182 pages.

43. Rozin V. M. Formation of economy in Europe in the 18th century as conscious scientific reality and discipline//Philosophy of science and engineering, 2020. No. 1. – Pages 81-95.
44. Wallerstein I. Mirosystem analysis//Time of the world. Issue 1. – Novosibirsk: Publishing house of NSU, 2000. – Pages 105-123.
45. Fedotova V.G., Kolpakov V.A., Fedotova N.N. Global capitalism: three great transformations. – M.: Cultural revolution, 2008. – Pages 116-117.
46. Kreveld M. Blossoming and decline of state – M.: IRISEN, 2006. – Page 145.Id., Page 11.
47. Kreveld M. Blossoming and decline of state – M.: IRISEN, 2006. – Page 165-166.
48. Fedotova V.G., Kolpakov V.A., Fedotova N.N. Global capitalism: three great transformations. – M.: Cultural revolution, 2008. – Page 290.
49. Belyaev of V.A. Self-consciousness of modernity: Between counter-modernity and post-modernity. – M.: LENAND, 2016. – 248 pages; Belyaev V.A. Designing modernity: Post-cultural and intercultural aspects. Design and system approach. – M.: LENAND, 2015. – 400 pages.
50. Belyaev V.A. Designing modernity: Post-cultural and intercultural aspects. Design and system approach. – M.: LENAND, 2015. – 400 pages.
51. Kreveld M. Blossoming and decline of the state. – M.: IRISEN, 2006. – Page 331.
52. Fedotova V.G., Kolpakov V.A., Fedotova N.N. Global capitalism: three great transformations. – M.: Cultural revolution, 2008. – Page 191.Id., Page 190.
53. Rozin V. M. Exploit and “fall” of Yannis Raynis (reflections inspired by reading the novel of R. Dobrovensky “Raynis and his brothers” and J. Shumpeter's books “Capitalism, socialism and democracy”)//Culture and art. – 2018. – No. 11. – Page 49-59.
54. Rozin V. M. “Formation, development and the end of a new European sociality (thinking over the book “Global capitalism: three great transformations” by V. Fedotova, V. Kolpakov, N. Fedotova)”
55. Kreveld M. Blossoming and decline of the state. – M.: IRISEN, 2006. – Page 269-331.
56. Rozin V. M. Social design and social technologies//Trends and management. – 2019. – No. 3. – Pages 1-14.