

Ethnosociology. Part III. Post-society

Hello, we are continuing to deliver the lectures on the Ethno-Sociology and today we are going to speak about post-society. In the previous lectures we observed different stages of the ethnic society from the purest and simplest forms of the ethnos through people's form of social organization, traditional society with social certification. After that, second derivative of the ethnos identified by us in the national society, national statehood.

And the last lecture was dedicated to the civil society, post-national society and global society based uniquely on the individual identity. It seems that we have arrived logically, if not historically, because we are living precisely in the moment of the final transition from the national identity to the global society. So, to the absolutization of the individual identity.

But, theoretically, logically, we arrived to the final point. So, we have considered any possibility of the social identity from the ethnic, collective and organic up to the individual identity. It seems that we have exhausted all possible choices of the identity.

But, we could, theoretically, transcend the limits of the global, liberal and civil society and to look forward beyond the borders of this society that is not yet fully realized in the reality. So, we could think something other, something beyond what is going on. We could consider, for example, the creation of global society as accomplished fact instead of the consideration that it is not fully accomplished.

But, we could recognize that it is something that should be done in some time. But, we could also ask, what else? Can we make a new step beyond the frame of the global society based exclusively on the individual identity? So, we have postmodernist doctrines and philosophical constructions that theoretically think about what else could we imagine after the final victory of the bourgeois civilization that is becoming global, universal and the only one on the Earth. So, what next? So, this is no more than theoretical construction.

But, we could also call that the fourth derivative of the ethnic. So, what is a society that we could count as the fourth derivative of the ethnic? So, if global society is based on the individual identity, so, the next step, logically, if we consider the main direction of the involution of the identity and the ethno-sociological vision of the historic process, so, we could call it approximately as post-society. So, after global society based on the individual identity should logically follow or could logically follow post-society and continuing the idea of the involution that should be society or post-society based on the post-individual identity.

But what could be this post-individual identity? Where not only any kind of collective identity is overcome and now the individual identity should be also overcome. So, it is a kind of destruction of the individual as normative unit. Precisely in the manner as

precedent identities were destroyed by the process of the involution.

So, we have told in the last lecture that in the global civil society the individual accepts on himself the burden of the society, of the ethnos. Individual becomes ethnic unit, but he represents the whole ethnos. One individual, one ethnos.

One individual, one society. One individual, one whole. Not a part of something, but unit as absolutely self-sufficient and sovereign.

That is a concept of sovereign individual that is auto-sufficient in any senses. Precisely as the ethnic society or traditional society were considered to be auto-sufficient. Or nation state was considered also to be auto-sufficient in the previous historic stages.

So, the individual in the third derivative, in the stage of the third derivative of the ethnos was considered precisely as auto-sufficient as ethnos, the people or nation were before this ethno-sociological state. So, if we continue, if we prolong the same attitude beyond the limits of the individual, but not outside of individual, but inside of the individual, we could consider individual to be nothing more than concept. The concept, social concept or socially imposed identity that also presupposes a kind of agglomeration of different parts and its hierarchy.

For example, we consider the brain as a kind of ruler of the individual. We consider normative individual as rational entity. And we consider that feelings or emotions should be ruled by the brain, by rationality.

And so, the body should follow the orders of the brain. So, we could consider the individual with its body, with its brain, with its heart, with its different functions and organs of the body, a kind of empire, a kind of society, a kind of state, a kind of collective organization with clear social stratification, because the brain is above and the body or sexual impulses are beneath, under the pressure from the highest instances in this organization. So, we are dealing with an image of the traditional or national or ethnic society.

The individual, as a final point of involution of the society, conserves many important features from the previous kinds of identities. And they become inner hierarchies, but before they were external. So, individual is liberated from the external hierarchies and inter-arises these hierarchies inside of himself.

So, it is a very paradoxical conclusion. Individual is completely free from the society and the global civil society, from the other. He is given to himself.

He is considered normatively completely auto-sufficient. He is completely free. But being completely free from the external obstacles or external instances that should dictate to him what is good or what is bad, what is higher and what is lower, what is possible, what is prohibited, it is alright with that.

But finally, being alone, being at his own disposition, he discovers that the same situation of the hierarchy, of the rule, of the dictatorship is repeated on the microcosmical level. So, individual becomes a kind of hierarchical, traditional or maybe totalitarian or authoritarian state. So, he is free from the external limits and rulers, but now he discovers that the ruler and the king and the oppressor and the dictator and the authoritarian ruler, the king is inside of himself.

So, the brain is a kind of junta, a kind of politburo, a kind of leaders or bosses of National Socialist Party that have taken power over the whole population of the individual as a kind of new land, new discovered land. And this authoritarian instance tries to dictate what is good and what is bad, what is highest and what is lowest. So, the situation is repeated.

And the freedom gained by individual in the course of the historic evolution becomes also a kind of slavery, new kind of slavery, a new kind of dictatorship. That is the first conclusion of the postmodernist attitude to the individual. And the logical solution of that is to free, liberate the individual from the individual.

So, we should come to a new concept of the individual. Not individual, dividual. Individual in Latin means something that could not be separated, could not be divided.

But individual is something that could be divided. So, for example, when we discover in the classical physics subatomic level, from etymological point of view, it is a kind of contradiction. Because the atom in Greek is something that we could not divide.

If we have something subatomic, that means directly that atom is not atom. Individual is not anymore individual if we could divide it. If it is individual, it is completely different entity.

And if we consider individual to be hidden individual, if we could recognize the existing of sub-individual entity, we could logically continue the process of evolution and claim the freedom to these sub-individual units and try to defend the rights, not of human rights anymore, but sub-human rights. The rights of the parts of the individual to be free from the brain, from the highest level of the organism and the freedom of the desires, the freedom for the body, the freedom for the physiological feelings and the possibility to behave of different parts of the body as they wish. For example, now our hands or our eyes or our legs and the other organs are completely in the slavery of the brain.

They are slaves of the brain. And it is not absolutely democratic organization of the body or the individual. It is a kind of dictatorship.

Dictatorship when only one part of the body, the brain, dictates to the other parts what is good or what is bad. What they should do or what they shouldn't. So, that is completely unjust way to be free.

Because this is limited freedom. There is freedom in some limits and under control of some hierarchical instance. So, the idea of the post-society is based on the creation of something individual.

When, for example, we could exchange different organs between the kind of market of organs. For example, exchange real hands against artificial hands, because it could grasp better, for example. Or we could exchange the eye, that is human eye is not so performant as, for example, the eyes of different species.

The eyes of some eagles, for example. They see better. Or, for example, if you exchange human eyes against the eye of the owl, you could see in the night.

So, you could enlarge your possibility and also you could, obviously, exchange the bad organ or insane organ, ill organ against the new one. So, obtaining a new possibility and maybe you could divide genome of the future human being. And to improve something inside of that, you could make artificial entities.

That will be free from this repetition of the same body form, of the same psychic organization of the people. You could enlarge the possibility of the life, precisely. And so, you could liberate the body from dictatorship of the brain and claim for democracy of the organs.

The different organs could create a kind of parliament of the body and to take decisions together, not relying on the will of the brain. The brain could be in error. So, we need testimonies of the ideas of the other participants of the human constitution.

And so on. So, there is an idea of transhumanist perspective, where we could imagine cyborgs, clones, genetic engineering, the idea to improve the nature of human species. It is obvious that such form as gender, for example, is becoming obsolete.

You could choose your gender whenever you want. In any sense, you could undergo different kind of sexual operation, changing the gender anytime when you are tired from being woman or man. So, it is completely optional.

But it is not only the last definition or limit of the individual. Because the fact to belong to the human species also is a kind of collective identity. And we should liberate individual from belonging to only one species, human.

So, the idea is to liberate individual from itself, from gender, from humanity. And from the idea of unchangeable, constant nature of the individual. So, we could suggest a kind of genetical experiments to enlarge, to create, for example, different species from the individual, human-individual, post-human species, including chimeras, kind of mermaids, satyrs, sealings, and different imaginable giants, catacombs, hundreds of hands, beings mentioned in the ancient Greek mythology.

So, this kind of post-society could be regarded as a fourth derivative of ethnos. Because when we go one step further from the purely individualistic identity, this post-society or this society, as French writer, has called it, this society. Because society presupposes a kind of association, unification, integration of the elements.

And this society is a kind of possibility to dissociate any kind of association. Dissociate organic, or historic, or artificial state identities, collective identities. But also, this society in the sense to dissociate the parts of the human organism from themselves.

To divide them. And to exchange, or develop, or make a progress in the genome. So, that is a theoretical perspective, how we could use ethno-sociology beyond the limits of the global society.

Ethno-sociology is a purely conceptual construction. This kind of fourth identity, fourth derivative of the ethnos. But if we regard philosophical development and achievement of post-modernism, and if we consider the success of the scientists in the field of biology, of genetics, of new kind of physiological researches, and also some artistic creation, for example, of films of Quentin Tarantino, where there are different post-human entities and units acting with more or less common classical human units, but where the human units are losing their normal codes of behavior, becoming more and more crazy, more and more drug addicts.

And transforming little by little something other than human. So, on the artistic way, on the biological way, on the scientific way, on the philosophical way, we could dream the possibility of the creation of such post-society. It is not so distant, not so far from us.

If we are making the reality check, we are in the transitional stage from the national society toward global civil society, that is the process of globalization. But the next step is already more or less near to us. It's not so far.

And after the global society, we could imagine the horizons of the post-society. That will mean the end of the man and the kind of post-human or post-individual, post-society. So, it is a kind of something that awaits us in the near future.

So, in this situation, if we consider from the ethno-sociological point of view, these artificial constructions of post-society, we could say that the identification and the equation between individual and the individual-based civil society with the ethnos up to the certain limits is valid here in the consideration of the possibility of the shift to the post-individual, post-society. Because there, in this shift, in this change from the individual identity toward post-individual, individual identity, there will repeat the same process that was the main meaning of the transformation from ethnic society to the individualistic civil society. So, ethnos being divided, split and being involved only in one individual unit, that was the meaning of the historical creation of the derivatives of the ethnos during known history.

And new history, new page of social history will be repetition of the same process, but on the basis of the destruction, reconstruction of the individual. But that is purely futuristic, logical and theoretical construction that is already previsible in some particular branches of modern science, modern philosophy and modern culture. But here we have reached the limits of our discipline, ethnosociology.

We have described more or less all the possible kind of society, where ethnosociological methods is applicable and could give important scientific results to study these societies from ethnosociological point of view. Now we are at the end of the course and we see how the human society was developing through the main stages you described. And we see that if we look at the current state of the human society, we are staying at the intermediate position between nation state and the global state, global union, global society.

But if we look so, we see that the structure of nation is still living now and the nation agenda is still in job, in life. But if we do so, can we say, if we regard this as the normal thing that the traditional nation is already in the past and the ethnic society already in the past, their agendas are already dead. So now we have to do only with nation agenda and the global agenda.

Is this right or so? Completely right. There are only two agendas. National agenda and global agenda.

But what is important? Very important is the sense or the meaning of the nation. The nation was created artificially to hold together the elements that have nothing to do with each other normally. Completely dispersed and completely autonomous elements.

And also the nation in the liberal sense, the meaning of the nation was designed to prepare these individual units to live by themselves, to educate them to be individual. So, the citizenship, civil society has its origin in the national society. Because the national society was the first matrix for education of the wholly developed individual identity.

So, national agenda is working now only because this process is not considered to be finished. So, there is something, the rest of ethnic identity, the rest of religious, of people's identity that are not transformed enough in the individual identities. For example, in India, in China, in Arab world, in the third world, they are living the millions and the billions of people who have not individual identity.

They are member of the national statehood, but they are normatively, legally considered to be individuals by the law. They lack their fully developed individualities. They are not yet civil enough to be considered really individuals.

So, it is a kind of delay in the agenda of the enlightenment of the national statehood.

And that is delay before coming to the global society. That is precisely what Francis Fukuyama affirmed in his last writings.

That we could not dismiss today the national states because they didn't finish, didn't fulfill enough their task, their goal. Because we are living in the national states with the individual identity, but it is a kind of normative and formal definition. And in majority of the modern society there is not enough elements of the civil society.

So, we could not destroy nations today. Precisely, it is opposite to what Fukuyama himself affirmed in the 90s. Because after reconsidering what we have today, after making reality check, he himself discovered that many national societies, modern societies are not modern, not democratic.

And there is a considerable huge lack of individual identity fully accepted and developed and responsible in these societies. So, national society exists, national agenda exists only because the work, the great work of the preparation of the civil society on the global scale is not finished yet. And the other aspect of your question, what ethnic or people's agenda.

There is ethnos, there is ethnic society, there are ethnic societies today. They exist as well as the institution of the traditional society, pre-modern society. For example, religious society or ethnic group or highly stratified social societies.

All that exists and all that is not changed from the pre-modern situation. So, national society, national state has a big deal of work in front of it. Above all in the non-European area and zones of the world to transform its population in the sense of civil rights, individual consciousness and so on.

And that is the reason why we will not have global government, world government in the nearest future. So, this work is not fulfilled yet. So, that is the reason why we have really national agenda and we have also global agenda.

Because in the certain parts of the world, in the United States of America, in Western Europe, this process of the creation of the civil society are more or less finished. So, we have civil society in the western parts of the world. And this civil society could not develop by other way than by expanding itself on the global scale.

Because the next step is globalization of this situation. That is precisely where the clash of civilizations appears on the global scale. Because civilization is something that is different from western civilization.

And it is a kind of society in delay precisely of their transformation in the sense of creation on normally or western type modern nations with the individual identities. So, civilization represents a kind of challenge to globalization. But if we see this to process the globalization and the work of nation today that still have something to do with all

these ethnic communities and common agenda of the religion societies.

So, we can see some kind of desynchronization. Because the global agenda tells us that the nation is something artificial, something that has to be put in the past or thrown away. Because it has own limits that must be overcome.

But the communities is an object of the nation work with collective identity that must be destroyed for the nation. So, the nation are looking for this criticizing of the nation. And they don't believe in the nation at all today.

And their own ethnic groups are much more stronger in the nation state. For example, in the France, in the European Union. Because even the nation state today looks not so solid because of this desynchronization.

I agree completely with that. And I think that we are dealing with a kind of sociologic abstractions. So, the western society in itself has reached the kind of creation of civil society.

And the next step for the western society is global society. So, it is logical. Because all that is more or less empirically evident in the western society.

But dealing with the different types of society through emigration, through presence of ethnic or national society of non-European type inside of western society creates a problem. Because, theoretically, in the west there is no more ethnic, religious, traditional or national identity. Only civil society, only individual identity, only ideology of the human right.

That is a kind of individualist global identity. And that is a kind of norm of political correctness accepted in the western society as something taken for granted. So, something existing and that really exists.

But the western society considers to be universal. So, what is achieved here, it should be achieved elsewhere. So, the idea is that any other society should repeat the western way in the history.

So, for the representatives of the other cultures and civilizations it is strongly recommended to repeat swiftly European or western example. Follow with example and repeat the same experience. And the conservation of ethnic identity or traditional religious identity is regarded as an obstacle, as a kind of delay in this process and not the challenge.

So, it is considered to be something that should be improved. But they shouldn't insist because it's so obvious that human identity is the individual one. Everybody is invited to take it as an axiom, to take it as something global and absolute truth.

So, the existence of persistent group of population inside of Europe or organized on ethnic or religious principles is a kind of nonsense for Europeans. They could not understand, they could not recognize its existence. Because there could not be ethnic identity in the so high developed European society.

It could not be. It's something that could not be. It is unimaginable.

It is a kind of dream. Ethnic or religious identity should be exclusively individual affair and not collective affair. And that is the law of the western society.

And it is so obvious for the westerners that they could not imagine something who thinks otherwise. If someone thinks otherwise, he doesn't think at all. But he should.

There is a presumption. So, there is a kind of nonsense that should not be attacked or taken into consideration precisely because it's something devoid of the sense. So, ethos doesn't exist.

The ethos is purely artificial creation for the Europeans in the modernity. They don't recognize the ethnic identity as something organic. In present conditions, it is important to stress it, in present conditions there could not be ethnic identity.

Maybe in the past that was different. So, this negation to recognize the existence of problem creates more and more problem. Because ethnic identities and the people's identities in the non-European societies exist and still exist and continue to exist.

So, that creates conceptual anomaly. The gap between normative state of things as they should be and the realistic way of thinking, how they are. And they are in the way they could not be, theoretically, for the Europeans.

So, that really creates a kind of dis-synchronization as you have put it in this sense. And that is the reason why ethno-sociology is so important to understand this delay, this difference between society. Because if we accept ethno-sociology as the relevant and important method to study ethnic process, national process, the processes of the peoples of traditional society that are contemporary to us, not only in the history, but that are contemporary and continue to develop in our situation, we could understand better the world we are living in.