

**POSTSOCIETY, POSTSOCIOLOGY AND MONDOLOGY
(ON THE RADICAL PARADIGM CHANGE IN THE 21ST CENTURY)**

UDC 316.2 : 316.32

Ljubiša Mitrović

University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy, Serbia
E-mail: ljubisa@filfak.ni.ac.rs

Abstract. *The paper analyses the changes that occurred in the scientific paradigm at the turn from modernism to postmodernism, pointing thereby to radical transformations from community via society to postsociety. It especially focuses on the gnoseological and ontological aspects of the processes of transformation of sociology into postsociology and mondology.*

The paper pleads for a tighter cooperation between sociology and mondology and for a major new synthesis of science and philosophy in the development of knowledge and consciousness of man and mankind.

Key words: *paradigm, community, society, postsociety, postsociology, mondology.*

**ALTERING THE PARADIGMATIC IMAGE OF THE WORLD IN THE LAST TWO CENTURIES
(PROTO-MODERNISM, MODERNISM AND POSTMODERNISM)**

In the last two centuries alone, mankind has made a radical leap from the agricultural to the industrial revolution and from it to the scientific-technological and IT one, i.e. the „third wave revolution“. The ontology of the social world was altered in these radical changes: from the *commune, society* to *post-society* and the paradigmatic cultural theories spanning from *pre-modernism*, through *modernism* to *postmodernism*.

The paradigm of the pre-modern society accounts for the pre-capitalist forms of social consciousness embodied in the *commune*, which is (according to Tennyson, Durkheim, and even Marx) an expression of the underdeveloped division of work and social consciousness, the connection and interaction between which rests on blood-familial relationships and forms of mechanic solidarity, with the powerful influence of the collective consciousness (morality, customs...) or the power of the military-political factor. The following represent a dominant form of the ethno-social community: kin, brotherhood, tribe and people. The social consciousness (in this developmental phase) is in the sign of a cultural hegemony of religions.

The spirit of the rationalism of the Enlightenment and the civil revolution paved the way for *modernism*, the creation of the civil *society*, which rests on the developed capitalist division of work, interests and professional configuration – i.e. on interest aggregation, rationalization, modernization and market competition. Durkheim elaborates on this type of society as of a society of organic solidarity which rests on differentiation, division of work and the professional complementation and interest integration¹. The dominant form of the global social group in this era of Modernism is represented in the *nations*, i.e. the state, social classes, political parties, which represent forms of illusive social consciousness. Science and ideology have taken the place of religion in the system of social consciousness.

In such social conditions, sociology gets differentiated in the system of study and flourishes. For Comte, *Sociology* has marked a sort of post-religion and represents the queen of all social sciences. As the child of enlightenment and the civil revolution, it has marked the spiritual emancipation of man by stressing that civil society is neither a gift of the Gods nor a leader, but an expression of the social action system through which society produces itself. In the 20th century, sociology shall represent the „common intellectual denominator of cultural modernity" (R. Mills).

The revolution of science and the IT revolution of the late XX century marked the transition from the industrial to the IT post-industrial civilization. The forces of the „third wave" were to alter the structure, the dynamics and the culture of the modern world. Globalization processes are at work, forming the networked *post-society*, the global age and the age of post-national constellations. It is an *era* of the emerging *postmodern* planetary mankind, of the future that has already begun, i.e. a global age punctuated by radical cultural change². There is an emergence of processes of forming a new synthesis of science, philosophy and religion; a form of planetary consciousness, planetary culture, planetary bio-ethics, post-ideology, post-science, post-sociology – mondology/globalogy – as a trans-disciplinary science of the world and of man.

POST-SOCIETY AND POST-SOCIOLOGY

If the notion of society and sociology were the product of the spirit of *modernism* and the civil revolution, then in modern times – in the most developed countries of the world centre and postindustrial civilization, we are now faced with the phenomenon of *postmodernism*, which signifies a new civilization, new culture and the era of *post-society*.

Under the influence of the scientific-technological and IT revolution and globalization, the processes of forming the world of post-national constellations, and of humanity as the global world community, are at work. The notion of the classical society from the epoch of Modernism, with its institutions and culture, is radically altered. Let's take the key phenomena and notions such as society, nation, class, society, culture, party, ideology. Today, they are all in the process of transformation. We speak of the phenomenon of national transmutation, of the occurrence of the era of post-national constellations; of the

¹ See K. Turza, *Da li su modernost i društvo sinonimi?* [Are Modernity and Society Synonyms?], The Third Program, issue 1/2 Belgrade, (2003), p.163-192.

² For details see M. Pečujlić and R. Nakarada, *Globalno doba* [Global Age], Faculty of Political Sciences, Belgrade, 2010.

detritorialization of the state's sovereignty and the radical change of a modern country's functions, of social class transformations, of repressing the role of the parties through the activities of novel social movements and agents of civil society, of the replacement of institutions of the representational democracy through the affirmation of participative democracy, of the radical cosmopolization of culture and the occurrence of the age of post-ideologies and post-sciences; of the necessity to form a new synthesis of philosophy, science and religion; of the intensive creation and permeation of natural, social and humanist sciences. A new synergy of spirit and the actions of numerous agents are about to emerge in the field of spiritual creativity.

In this context of social and cultural change, *contemporary sociology* has also experienced its own crisis. On the one hand, it is faced with the need to overcome the disciplinary chaos in its system; on the other hand, it is faced with the globalization of the subject of its study. The depth of social and cultural change in the era of *postmodernism* have led to the disruption and fragmentation of the very subject of sociology, which was aimed at studying the nation, class and groups of the classical society during *modernism*. Today, we find ourselves in the era of a globally networked society – we are faced with post-national constellations and humanity in the making. Certain sociologists have dealt with this great mutation as the *death of classical society* and the occurrence of the phenomenon of *post-society* (A. Touraine),³ and others as the creation of *post-sociology*.⁴

In the era of *postmodernism*, sociology has been subjected to a radical disassembly of classical sociological notions and principles, relativization of its theory and method, fragmentation of the classical subject framework and approach. The category of the social mind as a totality and the notion of structure and social laws have been suppressed. Sociology is radically psychologized. There is an increasingly dominant ethno-methodological, phenomenological, cultural and functional approach to it. There is a decline in the deep structural and holistic dialectic analyses of modern society and man. Man has been reduced to social roles and a "cultural idiot". The focus of post-sociology is a technologically highly networked, but socially dispersed society of minimized, lonely individuals and groups. In sociology, we are faced with the implosion of theories of the large format and the appearance of a new fragmentation of subjects and disciplines, with the dehumanization of work and a certain *sociological nihilism*.⁵

For the time being, the "story" of postindustrial revolution, i.e. of post-society, is a truth which is, above all, valid for the highly developed countries of the global center, i.e. for the global megatrends which dominate this part of contemporary society. Unfortunately, two thirds of humanity still live in the countries which are in the semi-peripheral or peripheral zone of the world's system. Due to their underdevelopment, they are faced with classic forms of social consciousness – a particular type of society and community and their appertaining structures, institutions and agents of social change. For the purpose of understanding the dialectics of social life in these domains in modern times, sociology is still needed as a form of scientific study, instead of the escape into utopian futurism or the uncritical chain of paradigms from developed civilizations of the world center of their imagination.

³ See A. Touraine, *Un nouveau paradigme, Pour comprendre le monde aujourd'hui*, Paris, 2005, p.116.

⁴ A. G. Dugin, *Sociologija u preobražaju [Sociology in its Transformation]*, Academic project, Moscow, 2010, p. 503-555.

⁵ A. G. Dugin, *Ibid*, p. 532.

We need to face the hard truth of the split of the modern society of the world into the rich "north", which is becoming richer and richer, and the poor "south", which is becoming poorer and poorer, thereby bearing in mind the fact that neoliberal ideology and developmental strategy produce greater developmental disproportions in terms of region and class by drawing the world into a new *civil war* between the rich "golden billion" and the poor *lumpen-planet* (A. Panarin)⁶.

The sociological analysis of any phenomenon needs to account for these disparities and asymmetries in the process of modern global development. The hard truth, emphasized by Alvin Toffler, and considering the technical development, quality of life and standard, is that only 5% of the population of today's world lives in the future, 25% in the present, while 70% still lives in the past. In such a reality, there can be no global peace without global justice. Without realizing the ideals and goals of the incomplete civil revolution – i.e. without the unity of freedom and equality, there is no brotherhood, i.e. humanity as a free community of equal citizens and peoples. In the research of the contradictions in the contemporary world and the global society, and of the roads towards building a humane future society – sociology still has an indispensable mission and role as a critical and humanistic science of society and man.

POST-SOCIOLOGY AND MONDOLOGY

For more than half a century, *Jaspers and Husserl* wrote about the crisis of modernism of Western science, while Spengler wrote of the downfall of the Western civilization before them. In their writings, they announced the future crisis of analytical scientific spirit, as well as the society of instrumental rationality and one dimensional man based on it, by giving a warning about the consequences that *devastation and the eclipse of the mind* may have not only for the development of philosophy and science, but also for the dehumanization of society and jeopardizing the process of man's emancipation⁷.

In modern times, this crisis seems to have achieved its peak. It manifests itself in the form of neo-positivist fragmented work, specialist autism and disciplinary chaos. The wholeness of the scientific image of the world has been broken, and the researchers have been reduced to people blindly involved in their own tiny area of interest only and to indifferent "sweet robots". Numerous negative consequences stem from such a scientific fragmentation of the world view: not only in terms of the epistemological nature, but also the socio-practical one, as well as the one related to the deontology of the scientific calling in modern society. Science has been reduced to a pragmatic activity in the service of social engineering for the current and partial needs of institutions, social groups, without the awareness and responsibility of long-term goals and the interests of society as a whole. Scientists are searching for a way out of this crisis of modern science in three directions:

⁶ See A. Panarin, *Savremeni rat kao borba bogatih protiv siromašnih* [*Modern War as a Struggle of the Rich against the Poor*], Nova Evropa, Belgrade, 2007.

⁷ For details see E. Husserl, *Kriza evropskih nauka* [*The Crisis of European Sciences*] ("Dečje novine"), Gornji Milanovac, 1991.

1. The radicalization of the process of further *fragmentation of sciences* – which leads to further particularized fundamentalism and retraditionalization;
2. Striving for the *globalization and transformation* of the subjects of numerous sciences;
3. *Searching for a new synthesis of science, philosophy, religion and fact* – constituting *mondology* as a transdisciplinary science of the world and man.

The following question arises: *What is happening to sociology* in the world of such turbulent drama and mutations of the modern world – on the road from *modernism* towards *postmodernism*? It can roughly be stated (answered) that sociology itself has changed.

It first needs to be stressed that sociology achieved its culmination and advent during the seventies of the twentieth century, asserting itself as a "common intellectual denominator of cultural modernity" (R. Mills) as well as a critical and humanistic science of the modern society and man. As such, it was a critical reflection engaged in the search for alternative paths, projects of further development, humanization of society and the emancipation of man. Such sociology, in the domain of understanding the calling of sociology and its deontology, asserted Kant's principle of the role / the mission of science as public knowledge in action. In the paper entitled "What is enlightenment?" Kant states that "the public use of man's mind must be free at any time; it is the only thing that can achieve enlightenment among people... By the public use of man's own mind, I refer to that which one, as a scholar, makes of it before the vast readership"⁸.

In the conditions of transition from *modernism* to *postmodernism*, i.e. the postindustrial civilization and IT sub-society, sociology has also found itself at a crossroads. In this global age, which some authors describe as post-society, both sociology and sociologists act in several ways in profiling their roles:

1. Regression i.e. return to proto-sociology, ethnology and other pre-scientific forms of gaining knowledge, which can be marked as the retraditionalization of sociology;
2. Others have continued to perfect the pragmatic empirical sociology of the fragmented work (fragments) and the spread of disciplinary chaos;
3. Rise i.e. movement towards global sociology of contemporary postmodern society;
4. They have abandoned the sociological approach by radically turning to *mondology* as the transdisciplinary science of the world and man.

The following question arises: *What is the productive response of contemporary sociology/post-sociology to the challenges of modernity?* Regardless of whether it "crawls" or "flies" i.e. follows the logic of methodological individualism and methodological cosmopolitanism (U. Beck's distinction), contemporary sociology/post-sociology is faced with challenges related to globalization as a process, and postmodern civilization.

The identity of the subject and calling of contemporary sociology are under fire and are jeopardized by two tendencies in modern science. On the one hand, there is the expansion of the disciplinary chaos, which has led to a sort of fragmented work in sociology and the partitioning of its subject into numerous scientific fields and a "jungle of disciplines" of the pragmatic "sociology without society". On the other hand, there is a tendency of globalizing sociology, radical expansion and transformations of its subject, as an

⁸ For details see: Immanuel Kant, *Um i sloboda* [*The Mind and Freedom*], Ideja-Mladost, Belgrade, 1974, p. 41-49.

expression of the world's historic process of globalization and the creation of post-society, i.e. era of post-national constellations. The first tendency insists on the pluralism of disciplines and its furthest reach is interdisciplinarity, while the second insists on new syntheses, i.e. multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary.

In the modern world, sociology is torn between fragmentation and globalization. Its position and role are different in the different zones of the global system (global center, semi-periphery and periphery). While it is preoccupied by global processes in the countries of the global center due to the spirit of the global age and networked humanity, as well as the post-modern civilization as a post-society, and is considered a global science and post-sociology, it is in the midst of disciplinary chaos in the zones of the global semi-periphery, while it returns to the research of the pre-modern forms of life in the peripheral zone, due to the prominent retribalization of society, with sociology reduced to ethnic sociology.

Sociology is undoubtedly a positivist science, since it studies social facts. However, it also presents an expression of the theoretical-empirical study of society. Therefore, it is not simply the sociography and phenomenology of society. It is an explicative science, which strives for the discovery of laws governing society. It is for this reason that people speak of it as a genetic, structural, profound and global science of society. As such, it studies social events in their totality, their structure, as well as historical dynamics. Beyond the phenomenological and the manifest, it strives for the discovery of latent functions of events, profound layers, hidden meanings and regularities.

Parallel to the phenomenon of the creation of a *global post-society*, i.e. humanity as a new historical form of the postmodern community (which itself represents a contradictory process of universalization and differentiation), changes occur, i.e. metamorphoses in the world of science. There is talk about the age of post-sciences. Namely, instead of the disciplinary chaos, we are increasingly faced with the need for the affirmation of multidisciplinary research. The requirements for a new synthesis of science, philosophy and religion are expressed more and more openly.

In this context, sociology is itself enveloped by these processes: parallel to the process of its division and fragmentation, there is a process of affirmation of transboundary fields, objects and disciplines. There is a visible tendency to overcome the sociology of fragmented work and reassert the need for a new global approach to society from the standpoint of *methodological cosmopolitanism* (U. Beck). There is word of *the globalization of sociology's subject*, of new global sociology and the need for founding *mondology/globology/globalistics*, as a transdisciplinary study of the world and man.

The following represent the focus of this post-sociology and globalistics: globalization as a multidimensional process, contemporary global phenomena, transnational corporations and classes, global movements, post-national constellations, global regimes, global media, global culture/ethics, global politics, global administration (through supranational and suprastate institutions) in the global fight for peace...

This context of consideration rightly poses a question: *Does sociology have a future in its competition with mondology/globalistics?*

The subject framework of sociology in the XIX century were classes, nations, and the state as a global form of society. In modern times, at the transition from *modernism* into *postmodernism*, there is a change in the social ontology of the very subject of sociology. In the era of globalization, forming post-national constellations, networked society, *the*

subject of sociology has been radically expanded. Today, it is a *global world system*, as well as its structure and dynamics.

In the meantime, it needs to be stressed that this is not simply a matter of the quantitative expansion of the subject of contemporary sociology (judging by the registry of the problems it studies), but also of the qualitative one, in terms of the levels of analysis and the theoretical-methodological approach. From the sociological point of view, we are experiencing a global post-society of the world, a global system in the world, global age of post-national constellations and the networked postmodern society. In the paradigmatic sociological sense, the following has come to the surface: global systematic analysis theory, globalization theory, paradigm of IT development, theory of the IT networked post-society.

Contemporary sociology is described as a global sociology. Its subject in Postmodernism has been radically transformed, which is expressed not only through the new subject framework, but also through the appearance of new paradigms and new transboundary fields and transdisciplinary approaches in science.

Traditional sociology studied: archaic societies (communes) and the role of religion, in comparison with the modern civil society.

Modern sociology studied the industrial society and the dominant role of the nation and science.

Contemporary sociology is post-sociology, studying the postmodern society, i.e. the occurring postmodern society in the era of globalization. In this context of the metamorphoses of the scientific world, numerous post-scientific disciplines appear as the expression of synergy within the system of sciences. They are not simply multidisciplinary, but transdisciplinary as well. The very sociological system has been enveloped by these mutations. This is supported by the appearance of the sociology of transition, sociology of globalization, appearances of social anthropology, cosmopolitics. These and other sciences study the relationship between the process of globalization and glocalisation (R. Robertson) more and more, as well as the global network and local culture, hybridization of cultures, and other contemporary global processes.

In the modernity of the postmodern society – sociology gets a strong competitor (not only it, but other sciences as well), in *mondology/globalogy/globalistics* – as a transdisciplinary science of the world and man, which realizes the synthesis, synergy of different forms of scientific knowledge of the world, society and man.

MONDOLOGY AND GLOBALISTICS

Although globalization, as an objective process, is an expression of the development of new production forces and the expansion of global work division and integration, in modern times, due to the antagonistic system of the distribution of the social power of mega-capitalist class monopoly, it is realized as an asymmetrical process: which, on the one hand, produces wealth for the few – "the north" and poverty for the rest of the world – "the south"⁹. The neoliberal globalization, whose agents are transnational corporations, i.e. mega capital, therefore represents their expansion and hegemony on the global mar-

⁹ For the globalization phenomenon, see studies by U. Beck, J. Grey, J. Stieglitz, A. Panarin, as well as M. Pečuljić, Z. Vidojević and D. Ž. Marković, V. Vuletić and Lj. Mitrović.

ket, but in the domain of symbolic and military-political power. Among other things, *Pierre Bourdieu* writes the following on this matter: globalization represents the hegemony of group interests of transnational corporations, which wish to present their vested interest as a universal one¹⁰. This type of globalization has conditioned the retention of the antagonistic form of the division of social power in the world as a whole. It is for this reason that I have made the distinction and typology of two forms of globalization in my study "*Globalization and the Contemporary Left*" (2000): the *antagonistic type* (neoliberal - asymmetrical) in the function of mega-capital's group interest and the *associative type* (socio-democratic) which is in the function of the world's democratic integration. While the asymmetrical globalization type leads to new forms of exploitation, authoritative domination and world division, associative globalization paves the way to the globalization of solidarity, understanding and the democratic integration of contemporary society.

In his studies, U. Beck also forms a distinction between *globalization* as an objective-historical process in the form of an expression of the development of new technologies, and new productive powers and their power to network, connect, and integrate the world; *globality*, which signifies new structural forms which are constituted and the network in this process, while *globalism* represents a new project and the system of inequality and hegemony (which we colloquially call the "*new world order*").

For the purpose of making a clear distinction between *globalization* as a form of group hegemony and *mondialisation* as a process of universality of basic values, leading to the spread of the process of freedom, equality, solidarity, attempts have been made to make a difference between these notions and processes¹¹. In the present universe of sciences, there is a distinction between mondology and globalistics. In a new synthesis, *mondology*, as the transdisciplinary science of the world and man in the great synergy, envelops and transforms the modern knowledge of philosophy, anthropology ecology, sociology, genetics, bioethics, cosmology, culture of peace, futurology and other sciences. Unlike this science, which strives for explaining the world in its entirety, interdependence and seeks the answer to the question of the sustainable, humane development of the world as a whole (cosmos, nature, society and man), *globalistics* more or less deals with the global problems of the modern society of the world (global economy, global politics), but without a wider context (cosmos, nature, society, humanity).

However, there are authors who consider that such a debate is unnecessary and that this distinction is terminological by its nature. Namely, the term globalization is derived from Anglo-Saxon literature, while mondialisation stems from francophone literature, although, in essence, it is a single science. However, in his study of *Cosmopolitics*, Jacques Derrida makes a clear distinction between mondialisation (a French word) and globalization (which is of English and German origin). The first one is broader since it contains the concept of the world and speaks of the world as of a brotherly community of people, unity of nature, society and man, while the term globalization is linked to the globe, i.e. earth.

¹⁰ See the study by P. Bourdieu – who writes the following on the matter: "As a process, globalization is not homogenization. Instead, it is an extension of power and influence of a small number of dominant nations over the entirety of the national markets" (P. Bourdieu, *Contre – feux – propos servie a la resistance contre linvasion neoliberale*, Dagair, Paris, 1998, p. 43.).

¹¹ See Lj. Mitrović, *Globalizacija i savremena levica [Globalization and the Modern Left]*, Institut za političke studije Belgrade, 2000, p. 14.

The first concept is wider and more universal, while the second one is narrower and frequently signifies globalization as the homogenization "which hides old and new inequalities which we need to battle". In this respect, J. Derrida warns that: "celebration and demonization of the phenomenon of mondialisation in practice often replace the interests and strategies which we should learn to distinguish"¹². There is a lot of material in Russian literature today that deals with globalization as the subject of transdisciplinary scientific research, especially in the works of Ernest Kochetov, Arkadiy Fedotov and other authors, within the studies of global processes and *Globalistics*. Fedotov writes of this science in the following manner: "*Globalistics* is one of the youngest sciences, which studies the general regularities of the development of humanity and the models of governing the scientific and spiritually organized world in the unity and interaction of three fundamental global spheres of man's activity – ecological, social and economic, in the realistic conditions of the world and its final scope and limited natural resources in the upcoming epoch of anthropogenic pressure on the earth"¹³.

In the studies: *Globalization – Consequences to Man* (1998) and *Fluid Life* (2005), Zygmunt Bauman, as a representative of postmodern psychology, primarily warns us about the consequences that globalization has for man, development of society and humanity. He specifically writes of the globalization of risk in modern times, of the need to affirm the logic of planetary responsibility for the purpose of solving the problems of modernity, of the spread of globalization of understanding and solidarity among men and peoples, of global problems in modern times and the necessity of building a new approach in their resolution. In this respect, Bauman writes that "Our present misfortune and current problems in all their numerous forms and tastes have *planetary roots* and *require planetary solutions*."¹⁴

In domestic literature, see the studies of professor Danilo Ž. Marković on the relationship between sociology and globalistics, as well as globalistics and ecology, and globalistics and economics.¹⁵

MONDOLOGY AND FUTUROLOGY

The emergence of the technologically hyper-developed and networked, but socially sub-developed and individualized post-society in the form of humanity as the community of post-national constellations, various cultures and civilizations, is the result of the „third wave" revolution (A. Toffler). In the future, this revolution shall lead to the emergence of *cyber-communism* (A. Dragičević), in which the automated forms of manufacture, i.e. the robots – shall represent the working force of new technologies, massively replacing the work of people. Man will be strongly individualized and will withdraw not only from the

¹² J. Derrida, *Kosmopolitike* [*Cosmopolitics*], Stubovi kulture, Belgrade, 2002, p. 157.

¹³ See Fedotov, A. P. *Globalistika – načela nauke o savremenom svetu* [*Globalistics – The Principles of Science of the Modern World*], Moscow, Aspekt-pres, 2002, p. 18-19 and E. Kochetov, [*Globalistika*] *Globalistics*, "Norma", Moscow, 2002

¹⁴ See Z. Bauman, *Fluidni život* [*Fluid Life*], Mediteran-publik, Novi Sad, 2009, p. 179.

¹⁵ Danilo Ž. Marković, *Sociologija i globalizacija* [*Sociology and Globalization*], Prosveta, Niš, 2002, *Socijalna ekologija* [*Social Ecology*], Prosveta, Niš, 2002, *Globalistika i kriza globalne ekonomije* [*Globalistics and the Crisis of Global Economy*]; Grafiprof, Belgrade, 2010.

"realm of necessity" but public life as well. Man will become solely a historical agent, and not a Promethean one, writes Anderson. F. Fukuyama, and other dystopians write of such a post-society of the biotechnological age (J. Rifkin) as the automated Orwellian post-human technocratic society. Humanity, mankind and civilization shall find themselves at a crossroads once more, and we will remember Miljković's verses once again: *Will freedom be able to sing, as the servants sang about it?*

The future which started and which can be found in highly developed, postindustrial societies, is partly already to be found in the present, and will be filled with uncertainty related to the development of mankind and man's fate. In the scientific universe today, many researchers seek the answer to the challenges of the future: engineers, anthropologists, sociologists, transitologists, ecologists, psychologists, doctors, bioethicists, culturologists, cosmopolitologists, mondiologists and futurologists.

Today, an integral response to the future of the world, man and humanity can be provided by *mondology* and *futurology*. As transdisciplinary post-scientific syntheses, they may find and have to find the answer to the following question, along with philosophy: What kind of future awaits mankind and humanity?

As opposed to Marx's progressive vision of the classless association of free manufacturers and the socialized humanity in modern dystopias, social and technical dystopias, there are a lot of negative prospects of the future of the world, warning catastrophic and apocalyptic visions of the "brave new world", as the virtual cyber-world and "animal farm", new outcasts comprized of highly individualized people, minimized and socio-Darwinian post-society prone to conflicts. Which of these visions, drafts, scenarios of man's and humanity's possible future will be realized and claim victory in practice, shall depend on numerous factors; among others, on the moral and political participation of social agents in the forthcoming present and future struggles for the uncertain future of the world and man. In this struggle for the discovery of future paths and formulating alternative visions and projects – science, philosophy, especially mondology and futurology play an indispensable role.

For the time being, it is only certain that the future will be no simple repetition of the past (E. Habermas), nor will the struggles of tomorrow be solely modern versions of the old ones (A. Touraine), or that the future strategies of development will rest on common modernization or imitation of the ones from the past. The struggle for sustainable development and humane future of humanity will be uncertain. It shall depend on various factors and on the moral and political participations of us alone, i.e. the new generations of social agents, from the selection of goals, vision and the tools of alternative projects. Science and philosophy have a lot of work in this respect. They can successfully provide an answer to the big question, i.e. future challenges, only if they realize a new integral synthesis of science, philosophy and religion and if they are governed by the principles of Truth, Righteousness, Kindness, Freedom and Humanism.

* * *

In this consumer age which envelops humanity with the social and spiritual plague of restoration, it is natural that contemporary sociologists strive for the study of phenomena and forms of life from past epochs (both living tradition and mummified creations) within

the deep and historical sociology, and in this context realize interdisciplinary communication with history, ethnology and religious sciences. However, it is even more natural that they are preoccupied with the challenges of fluid modernity and future, facing the new forms of scientific practice: futurology, cosmology, anthroposophy, social ecology, biotechnology, social and cultural anthropology, globalistics/mondology, i.e. the very forms of multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary knowledge whose results and scopes form the basis for new blueprints of the future in the present, and design developmental alternatives for society and man.

As the dialogistic and dialectic science of society and man (E. Morin), *sociology* is a *par excellence* poliparadigmatic science (J. Ritzer), which naturally strives for the exploration of its own subject of study and the preservation of its own professional identity of the sociologist's calling, as well as the establishment of permanent communication and cooperation with new forms of study in the domain of philosophy and all other modern sciences. In this context, it also needs to cooperate with *mondology*, as a transdisciplinary science of the world and man and form self-awareness not only of its individualism but also of the possibilities and tendencies of surpassing itself in the context of further development of human knowledge, development and the emancipation of man and humanity.

POSTDRUŠTVO, POSTSOCIOLOGIJA I MONDOLOGIJA (O RADIKALNIM PARADIGMATSKIM PROMENAMA U 21 VEKU)

Ljubiša Mitrović

Rad se bavi promenama koje su se dogodile u sferi naučne paradigme na prelasku iz modernizma u postmodernizam, ukazujući stoga na radikalne promene od zajednice preko društva, do postdruštva. Posebna pažnja posvećuje se gnoseološkim i onološkim aspektima procesa transformacije sociologije u uslovima postdruštva i globalizacije.

Autor se u radu zalaže za intenzivniju saradnju između sociologije i mondologije, odnosno veću sintezu nauke i filozofije u razvoju savremenog saznanja i društvene svesti čovečanstva.

Ključne reči: *paradigma, zajednica, društvo, postdruštvo, postsociologija, mondologija*