The Post-Modern Era Spirituality Crisis: Values of Ideals a Post-Pandemic Day

Nataliya SALNIKOVA[1],
Oleksandra KHLTOBINA[2],
Iryna GAVRYSH[3],
Oksana ALEKSANDROVA[4],
Viktoriya GRYGOR'YEVA[5]

[1] Donetsk Law Institute of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Mariupol, Ukraine
ssfaculty77@yahoo.com

[2] H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University, Kharkiv, Ukraine
berestigor1@i.ua

[3] H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University, Kharkiv, Ukraine
irina_gaaaavrysh@gmail.com

[4] Kharkiv Humanitarian Pedagogical Academy, Kharkiv, Ukraine
aleksokss7171@gmail.com

[5] Donetsk State University of Management, Mariupol, Ukraine
googchyyaa@ukr.net

Abstract: In the postmodern era, the fundamental foundations of the human soul swayed. In accordance with this, in scientific approaches, there is a complex and controversial process of reassessment of the axiological orientations of modern man. Despite the painful collisions of this process, in the conditions of postmodernity, a person of a creative warehouse gets an unprecedented freedom so far, based on the constructive basis of spirituality, thanks to which a person acquires the ability to distance himself from society and independently critically comprehend all aspects and spheres of his life. The intensification of the search for the meaning of life on an individual-personal level is a characteristic sign of the development of society not only in the West, but also in societies with the preservation of traditional specifics. The effectiveness of the search for the meaning of life in the real world is directly dependent on the development by people of the new islands of freedom, life forms and directions of creativity, corresponding to the realities of the break of millennia. The purpose of the article is to identify the main problems of modern society, such as: globalization challenges, problems of attitude to the world, the environmental perception of the world in particular, and the problems of educating spirituality as a spiritual attitude to the world and to a holistic personality.

Keywords: *spirituality; postmodern; postpandemic society; crisis of modernity; environmental problems; globalization.*

How to cite: Salnikova, N., Khltobina, O., Gavrysh, I., Aleksandrova, O., & Grygor'yeva, V. (2020). The Post-Modern Era Spirituality Crisis: Values of Ideals a Post-Pandemic Day. *Postmodern Openings, 11*(1Supl2), 100-114. https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.1sup2/145

1. Introduction

From the point of view of the development of society, the crisis of spirituality represents the transition of a society with one qualitative characteristics to a society with other qualitative characteristics, thus protecting it from the final destruction of the system. The crisis in statics, for example, provides for a fixed stable state of society at its upper point — the limit, the cessation of development, or vice versa — the state of society at its lower point, which provides for the beginning, a new round of development. A large number of etymological dictionaries interpret the concept of crisis as a sharp, sharp turning point, due to contradictions in the development of society due to the frustration of economic life.

The term "crisis" comes from it. "Krisis", lat. "Crisis" and means "decision, resolution, revolution." Spirituality as one of the main characteristics of the social system also found itself in a crisis situation. The word "spirit" comes from lat. "Spiritus" and Greek "Pneuma" and means "driven by air, breathing." Often the concept of spirituality is understood as immateriality, spirituality, fullness of the spirit of creativity, as a process of harmonious development of a person's spiritual abilities and the like.

2. Theoretical aspects of the crisis of spirituality of the postmodern era

2.1. The essence of the basic concepts

In the modern interpretation, spirituality looks like a craving for people to the heights of culture and the improvement of their creative abilities. Frank (1992) pinned great hopes on the "spiritual" for the creation of a full-fledged modern person. The scientist dealt with the problems of society at the end of the 19th - beginning of the 20th centuries, which was in spiritual frustration and cooling, not knowing why it should serve, what to strive for and what to devote its strength to.

Postmodernism interprets the concept of "personality" existing in the world in its own way. From his perspective, a person is a mosaic of multiple identities, social roles, masks that a person can choose and invent at will. In the paradigm of postmodernism, the very concept of personality has been called into question.

World religions differ from ethnic religions in that they are addressed to the individual and suggest the presence in the person of the beginning and root, given as a kind of internal image, or voice. Christian anthropology distinguishes three realities in man - the body, soul, spirit and insists on the need for a holistic vision of human nature, in the unity of his bodily, spiritual

and spiritual life forms. Since the Christian existence is personally and dialogically related to the being-communication of man and God, Christian anthropology claims to be a leader in interpreting the mysteries of the emergence and development of man as a person. According to this, the world was brought into existence by the will of God as a result of the act of creation, and man as the central being in the Universe, put on the verge of two worlds: material and spiritual, combining them in himself.

Christian anthropology does not abandon the vision of man as a "microcosm", as evidenced by ancient philosophy, however, it significantly changes the meaning and content of this expression. The anthropology of Christianity boils down to the fact that man is an image and likeness of the universe, but its real greatness is that it is involved in the likeness of God. The image of the Creator in man is revealed in the fact that man is a personal being, like God. In the ancient understanding, in order to achieve a higher goal, a person must overcome the individual personality principle in himself, but Christianity indicates a completely personal character of man's relationship with God. Through union with God, man is called to transform himself and the world. The freedom that a gifted person possesses along with the mind also implies the possibility of separation from God (Deleuze & Guattari, 2009).

The culture of the Middle Ages singled out the spirit, soul and body in a person, and the New European - only the soul and body. Modernity or modernity creates a humanistic culture based on its own strengths, develops technical power, social institutions, and liberal democracy. In modern times, as a result of secularization, a culture centered on a person and his worldly needs arises, and the comprehensively and harmoniously developed person becomes the ideal. Thus, under the spirit, spiritual, spirituality is understood no longer the connection of man with God, but culture, cultural development of man (Foucault, 1993).

Postmodernism proceeds from the fact that a person as a phenomenon cannot be an "explanatory principle" in the study of any "social unity." Regardless of the individual's consciousness and will, through him, on top of him and besides him, forces, phenomena and processes appear over which he is not in control or in relation to which his power is relative, this circle of phenomena includes social processes, speech, and those spheres of spiritual activity, he serves the area of unconscious desire as a projection of collective unconscious impulses.

Postmodernism explains the "I" in various forms, the main of which is the "I" as its own circumstances and functionally different reactions to them. Among the many "I-forming" structures, an important place belongs

102

to information structures, but since the formation of cognitive processes is quite slow, there is an illusion that they seriously depend on "consciousness" or "thinking". But as soon as access becomes practically unlimited, the illusion of autonomy and sovereignty of the "I" dispels, giving rise to "death of the subject."

Classical European philosophy saw God as an indispensable component of our world. Nietzsche's philosophy was the first attempt to ascertain the death of God and radically revise the problem of man (Kanke, 2003). During the twentieth century. Attempts were made to radically revise and transform the classical philosophical concepts associated with the disappearance of God from philosophical considerations. As Baudrillard (1998) noted, nihilism today is the nihilism of transparency, and in this way it is somewhat more radical, more critical than its previous and historical forms, since this transparency, this fluctuation, inevitably means the transparency of the system, as well as the transparency of any system, encroaches on her analysis. The author believed that after the "death" of God Nietzsche remained - a big nihilist in the face of Eternity, who covered this problem.

Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (2009) draws attention to the fact that in the classical era, all human forces were correlated with one power - the power of representation, which claimed to extract from a person everything that is positive or that relates to infinity . The result was not man, but God, man could appear only between orders of the infinite.

Regarding the "death of God," postmodern philosophy states that the death of the subject, of man, also ensues. Foucault (1993) believes that the use of the term "subject" is a tribute to the classical philosophical tradition, since the human subject is a product of cultural adaptation, so far as an absolute subject does not exist. The author believes that we are always obliged to specify in which field the subject is the subject and subject of what: discourse, desire, economic process. Foucault argues that in the course of their history, people changed their subjectivity, formed themselves with the help of various subjectivities, not related to any finite "essence" of a person. He was interested in how the subject was formed in a particular historical era, which was the relationship between the formation of the subject, the practices of power and the "games of truth." The subject in it is not a substance, not an entity, but a form, not identical with itself. Speaking about the "death of the subject," Foucault implies an abstract subject, since the real subject, according to the author, seeks to elude the dogma of "pure thinking", declaring his sensuality, physicality, irrationality. The author is convinced that as long as humanity exists, it will produce concepts of

subjectivity, and any new form of the subject will resist them. It follows from this that freedom is nothing but another change of discourse. The situation of being outside the discourse is impossible as long as humanity, society, and communication exist. The subject is constituted by power discourse, becomes the subject at the moment of support of power, therefore, "liberation" from any power would mean death for the subject (Schreider, 2016).

In his scientific works, Lacan (2002) argues that an individual independent consciousness is impossible, because the individual is constantly and mainly unconsciously determined in the process of his thinking by the linguistic structures that determine his mental structures. The man of the new time is an "individual", and the subject does not have a center at all, he "becomes" in all possible directions, but this formation has no main direction.

Postmodernism rejects passive madness, encouraging active, which consciously rejects the repressive canons of culture, declaring impulses and desires coming from the depths of a human being, trusting which, a person learns to live in harmony, harmony, harmony with nature, society and himself. The main characteristic of human existence in this case is freedom. In a postmodern society, it becomes a reservoir of uncertainty and creative diversity, demonstrating its arbitrariness in the context of a communicative-game social life.

The phenomenon of "individualism" in postmodernism takes a person beyond his body. In the terminology of Foucault and Deleuze, the inwardly human appears as a component of the outwardly social process. Since a person is not a purely biological being, but also has a "metaphysical" environment and a human dimension - human qualities in a person connect it with society in interaction, in communication and mutual understanding.

Modernism as a historical epoch is characterized by individualism, which details historical reality, the social fabric of being. The maverick in this era is the social atom of society. Classical Art Nouveau, which replaced traditional society, proclaimed the priority of dynamic values - development and improvement, movement towards the mind and light, which were an indicator of freedom, but had certain directions for movement in a strictly established direction. Modern replaced the old order with another, more suitable for realities.

In the post-industrial era, attention is focused on self-expression and self-affirmation, on one's own significance, and cultural meanings and values are translated into individual ways of understanding personal existence. Postmodern keeps the individual from social danger, from identification and

assimilation to another spirit and the like. Postmodernism seeks to reveal the infinities of the finite human being, but it is deprived of reliance on the transcendent, otherworldly, eternal, because there is not only another world, God, collective mind, absolute values, but also personal immortality, as well as the immortality of a nation, ethnic group, family, state of the world (Rather, 2014).

The subject as an autonomous, self-sufficient instance of modernity for itself is the basis for existence. In the postmodern era, a person's individuality is mosaic, mobile, fluid, mobile and fragmented, because the postmodern "individual" moves from one life project to another, doing this both under the pressure of life circumstances and with the aesthetic enjoyment of the game of his physical and intellectual forces. A person of this period proceeds from the fact that each person in life has its own individual, limited potential, which you need to develop at your own discretion.

Communicative phenomena in postmodern conditions take on peculiar forms, since with the development of the Internet and mobile communications, it becomes easier for people to communicate via Skype, phone or via a social network than in real life. Thus, a person's life unfolds in the plane of the immanent, because for it there is no more transcendental, and spirit and spirituality in their former meaning are not very popular and are unclaimed in modern society. The disclosure of the individual's potential is measured not by proximity or remoteness from the ideal, but by the situational realization of the available forces and capabilities. Under the conditions of modern realities, a person becomes a hostage of fashion for his personality, for his life lived, for his life project, for "taking care of himself", despite the people around him, to society.

The postmodern interpretation of the being of the personality is highlighted in the writings of Deleuze and Guattari (2009) who hold the opinion that there is no reason for a person to think that modes of existence need transcendental values that would allow them to be compared, selected and determined which one is better than the other. Scientists, on the contrary, believe that the criteria are only immanent, and this or that life opportunity is evaluated on its own by the movements that are crossed out, and by the intensity of this possibility itself. According to the researchers, the mode of existence is good and bad, noble and vulgar, complete and empty, regardless of Good and Evil, therefore there is only one criterion - existential capacity, intensification of life.

Summing up, we can say that a post-pandemic society will deal with "fullness" of individual life projects, the implementation of which can only

be carried out in a society that is set up for a post-modern game and aesthetic pleasure. The main condition for such a phenomenon is a willingness to come to its own border, even if such a task does not contain any special novelty. Such a task in unlocking one's potential forces makes people equal in dignity.

In the era of globalization during the XXI century. spirituality as a public institution and a social phenomenon makes people look for a solution in favor of identifying common foundations, leading and directing forces of society. The first problem that spirituality faces is caused by the contradictory nature of the values that were formed in the centuries-old cultural and civilizational period and the values that were only born during a long global crisis.

2.2. The main problems of spirituality in the period of globalization

The spirit of the era in globalization is an integrated integrity of meanings, meanings, ways of thinking, values, norms and ideals, stereotypes and attitudes inherent in society. An analysis of the works of classics, they studied spirit and spirituality, give an understanding of what spirituality rules the world, forming a relatively independent ideal substance. With the work of Sorokin (2012), we learn that "the method that directs the spirit according to the norm of the true idea will be good", according to the work of I. Kant, we understand that "the benefit of any philosophy of pure reason is only negative, and on the way of practical application pure mind can hope for greater happiness". Hegel (2017), exploring the spirit, wrote: "Spirit is consciousness, which includes sensory certainty, perceiving the mind too ... Spirit is an absolute real essence that supports itself". According to the foregoing, we can conclude that the spirit, first of all, is a concept with the help of which the whole variety of forms of the social whole is revealed in a single image; secondly, - the spirit is revealed in the mind, aimed at the subject and itself. Thirdly, since the spirit has the mind, the spirit also has morality, that is, it has the ability to become aware of itself. Thus, the spirit is not only subjective, but also objective, it encompasses the space of individuals, people and the whole of human history, moving through itself. So, spirit is the story of the spirit itself, of society as such, as well as of a specific people (Peceei, 2019).

The second problem that spirituality faces in the period of globalization is the lag in the pace of spiritual development of society from material development. Having appeared once, spirituality was formed as an independent branch of ideal being, and gradually began to influence the material being, which gave birth to it. According to the researchers, the

situation of the public environment during the crisis is an unstable structure, and appears in the form of "activity-support" and "organization-disorganization". In this case, the role of spirituality in society, expressed in linguistic form, cultural heritage, worldview, is more durable than material and man-made environment. However, in the context of globalization, the situation has changed dramatically, since the history of society and public consciousness "shrunk" in time and "expanded" in space to such limits that today the spiritual lags behind the material, not having time to influence the latter or direct it in the right direction (Tsvetaeva, 2019).

The third problem of spirituality is the contradiction between the objective and subjective principles in society. Since society alternately undergoes periods of improvement and decline, he has to fight for those achievements of spiritual life which, it seemed, had already been firmly won through intuition as a specific connection of the subject with the object, forming a unity of the spiritual type, supra-space and timeless. The correlation of objective and subjective in the spirit has not been resolved so far (Agadzhanyan, 2016).

The fourth problem is caused by the contradiction between civilization culture, goes into the historical past, and the new globalization culture, forms the present and future of mankind. In this regard, the general meaning of the crisis of modern culture is obvious: the mind, in its refined, scientific form, seized autocracy, that is, usurped the rights of a holistic spirit. The crisis began when the whole spirit rebelled against the usurpation of the mind. This uprising is only a new stage in one big work - the eternal struggle between the existing and the proper, between the law and the norm. So, the culture of civilization, based on the mind, gives way to a culture based on total sensuality, which displaces the mind in its branch of existence (Abakarova & Gadzhimirzoeva, 2018). The fourth problem also leads to the fifth, which is determined by the conflict between the processes controlled (public) and not controlled (globalization).

In order to solve the problems of spirituality in a globalized world, S.L. Frank (1992) suggests improving it immediately as a whole, justifying that work on life as an integral element is precisely spiritual work. In terms of long and lasting life, the level of public order, according to the author, lies in a functional dependence on the moral level of people. It should be added that the problems of spirituality can also be solved through various forms of global education and the system of training and education in the field of global affairs. For example, to overcome the spiritual and ideological crisis, it is necessary, firstly, to restore the sovereignty of moral consciousness as a specific form of life orientation.

The spirit of globalization is directly related to the formation and implementation of worldview positions in the structure of public consciousness. Solving the problem of spirituality in a situation requires a certain series of actions. The main ones are the development of common worldviews for intercultural interaction of agents of social ideal and material production; in identifying the crisis potential of the contradictions of the era; in increasing the responsibility of officials to regulate the processes of globalization of public development management. It is also very important to note that the systematic reduction of the anthropogenic burden on nature through resource-saving technologies and the reasonable reproduction of society will be successful in solving the crisis situation.

The environmental problem occupies an important place among the global problems of recent decades. The ecology of both the external and internal environment of man and society is of concern among researchers of our time. The sharply increased scale of the impact of industrial development on the environment led international organizations in the late twentieth century. to the realization of the threat of turning her crisis state into a catastrophic situation, since human influence on the environment was recognized as destructive and irreversible. Thus, preventing the destruction of the natural environment is one of the main problems in the world.

Since we are both inside and outside of nature, we should trace how much it has changed with the development of culture.

For the first time in approaches to solving global problems several decades later, priority was given to the role of values and moral norms in various spheres of human life. This issue was the main subject of controversy, and it is precisely it, according to scientists, that will be the basis for solving problems in the future. In a number of new ethical constructions, the ethics of nature has come to the forefront of the modern world, which requires further exacerbation of global problems, expressed, in particular, in a sharp change in climate throughout the world, the current systemic global crisis, which reduces not only to financial and economic components, but also to erosion of values and moral standards.

The process of globalization today is different from what the futurologists and theorists of world problems wrote about this in the last century, since over time serious difficulties have been added in implementing the principle of solving global problems. Instead of striving for unity of diversity and power, which determine the movement of global processes, modern canons act in the direction of uniformity and destruction of global integrity. Forces that once seemed the bulwark of global thinking today diverge in understanding what the expression "think globally" means. Some

108

of them, focusing on their historically established cultural and civilizational value systems, consider them an absolute good, in contrast to global values as common, and therefore relative. Others, taking the general as the absolute, are trying to overcome disagreements in understanding universal goals and values by relativizing spiritual and moral orientations. Thus, new factors emerge for the emergence of a crisis of spirituality and the erosion of the moral standards of human society, including the ethics of nature.

Theorists and practitioners dealing with global issues should solve new scientific and philosophical issues requiring in-depth research and development. To do this, they need to deepen and detail their understanding regarding nature and man, their environmental and ethical interaction. For the first time the concept of "environmental ethics" arose in the twentieth century. It denoted the spread of moral relations in nature, which subsequently gave it a global scale in the scientific world. The term "global" in this case has a double meaning: in the first case, the global acts as comprehensive, universal, in the other - complete, general, universal. Through global processes, environmental ethics has also become one of the main sources of global ethics.

Classical philosophical ethics, the object of moral relations between people, is not a general science in the sense that it does not extend to nature. But environmental ethics qualifies as an applied discipline - it has an object defined on a common object that includes a person, nature and society. The main issue of ecoethics is the moral relationship of man and nature - the relationship of man to nature. Understanding the relationship between man and nature helps the understanding of general ethics as a philosophical science and philosophy, which are revealed through the relationship not only of man to the world, but also of the world to man. Thus, environmental ethics is not only an applied discipline, but even a more philosophical science than classical philosophy. The extension of moral relations to nature presupposes not only endowing it with ethical value as an object, but also considering it as a subject of morality, is one of the most controversial issues in the eco-economy. In the understanding of modern scientists and philosophers, the subject-object relationship of man and nature is recognized as one of the fundamental principles of anthropocentric environmental ethics.

Environmental ethics originates from the principle of "think like a mountain", formulated by Leopold (1968). In the understanding of the author, man puts himself in the place of the natural system and thinks like it. He put forward this principle under the influence of the idea that everything in nature has its own mind. Following another American ecoethics, Henry

Thoreau A. Leopold speaks of the need to protect not only human freedom, but also the freedom of nature.

The forerunner of the emergence of the principle of subject-object relations of man and nature was a large number of works and poems, which traced the idea of removing self-interest by social relations between people and man's relations to nature, and reducing these relations to mutual love. It was believed that harmony can be achieved only when nature lovingly obeys man, and man lovingly cares for nature. It is in the mutual love of man and nature that the essence of environmental ethics is. The subjective-material relationship of man to nature requires its overcoming by creative interaction with it, since the ecologization of natural science forces one to go beyond the limits of the subject-object position and become more critical of the one-sided centrifugal activity of mankind. The first steps towards learning to listen to the "needs" of nature itself are expressed in the fact that the subject and object complement each other.

A systematic and philosophical approach, while remaining in scientific positions, helps to understand the subjectivity of nature. Developing dialectics, scientists created an alternative to the traditional organo-systemic approach - a polyphonic or harmonious systematic approach, within which non-anthropocentric ecoethics is possible only if there is a subject-object relationship of man and nature, which was mentioned above (Rolston, 1992).

Today, there are serious objections to endowing nature with environmental and moral values, which boil down mainly to accusations of ethical naturalism and the mythologization of nature (Gusev, 2015).

In a number of his educational and reference publications V.A. Kanke, (2003) analyzing the difficulties faced by one of the classics of ecoethics H. Rolston (1975), endowing the ecosystem with moral status, the author notes that nature itself does not have values and does not set any goals (Rolston, 1975, p. 102). He believes that if values are attributed to nature itself, then an anthropological error occurs, because a person imposes his own specificity on nature, and thereby likens it to himself.

Attempts to overcome difficulties by introducing traditional ethical systems into the field of environmental knowledge led ecologists to the idea that they should not rely on philosophers as well as theologians, but rather rely on their own strengths. In this regard, various ecological systems were developed, two of which V.A. Kanke (2003) considered in his works - the concept of the President of the Ecoethical International Union A. Konnoe and his follower, the American scientist J. Cairns (1977). The first concept, reducing ethics to knowledge, leads to faith in the omnipotence of the

scientific mind, and the other sees environmental centrism, reducing the Eco-ethical principles to increasing environmental literacy. As a result, both of these concepts implicitly lead to anthropocentrism (Gapanovich & Levchenko, 2017). Ecological centrism is an extreme that opposes anthropocentrism and comes down to nature-centrism and, in particular, to its kind - biocentrism. This approach equates the value of a person's life with the value of the life of any other creature, which is common in modern ecotetic.

Biocentrism, ignoring the exclusivity and absolute value of the spiritual nature of man, reduces it to one of the types of living creatures. The most radical forms of nature-centrism proclaim man as the main enemy of nature, since the vacuum of human spirituality can fill a completely different spirit. This approach turns environmental and any other ethics into the exact opposite of morality without the right to a "middle ground". An alternative to two extremes, one of which is anthropocentrism and the other biocentrism, is theocentrism, which is perceived only by people who believe in God. Researchers believe that environmental centrism can be considered the "golden mean" in this case, which can be accepted by almost everyone - researchers, society, and believers. Man's involvement in nature, the world and communication with them is the key to understanding the natural basis of values and morality.

In the world, nature is the object, and man and society are the subjects of moral relations. Intersubjective relations are seen only between people about nature management. If nature is not only an object, but also a subject in relations with man and society, then ecology, as V.A. Kanke (2003), moral requirements are attributed by a person or society. This is a typical method of proving a thesis to the point of absurdity, since it becomes clear that nature cannot follow any moral principles and be responsible for their fulfillment or non-fulfillment before a conscience that does not exist in it. Thus, norms are requirements imposed on the subject, and when nature is the subject, they implicitly apply to it.

A moralizing attitude towards nature or towards man is considered to be a typical manifestation of one-sided object-material relations, transforming another subject into an object of influence on the part of this subject. The true moral, spiritual attitude on the part of man is love for his neighbor, not demanding love from him in return, even if he acts in a hostile manner, brings misfortune and misfortune (Rather, 2014). But nature has no morality, and its influence on man is not evil and an attempt to "re-educate" it. Nature is not in the grip of our morality; therefore, it cannot be the object of moral pressure from people. And if people turn it into an object of their

production, consumer, cognitive activity, then only to the extent that they are in its power and act within the framework of the laws of nature. So, we can conclude that we take power over nature, and it is over us. Given that nature and everything that is connected with it does not obey the requirements of human moral systems, humanity is dealing with a subject of a special nature.

The creation of a new type of moral relationship of man to nature is a prerequisite for the formation of a new type of morality in relations between people, as, for example, in religion - love, Christianity and pedagogy - cooperation, have come to be a saving force in a world that has lost its "harmonious attitude".

According to researchers, a systematic approach to the problems of environmental ethics and ecology of spirit is able to develop a new, productive approach, consisting of two aspects: environmental, which focuses on the analysis of the environment of the social system, and contextually, which focuses on the internal environment of the system. The problems of ecological ethics related to the attitude to the natural environment, are, therefore, in inextricable unity with the problems of the ecology of the spirit, related to the attitude to the internal environment of the social system, concerns the spiritual world of man.

3. Conclusions

The internal environment, as well as the external, is a combination of non-systemic influences on the social system, while having a transcendental nature. Consideration of the spiritual sphere of man and society as an internal environment allows us to interpret the inner freedom of the subject. Embodying in acts of external freedom, a person's spiritual freedom is refracted through human rights and culture, which relate to the social system. The characters of the internal and external environment of society allow us to consider their interaction through the social system, that is, as a subject-object relationship, and directly, as an object-subject.

So, the extraordinary number of problems of modern postmodern society has a single feature - the lack of unity in the interpretation of these problems. Perhaps the vector of a post-pandemic society should be the recognition by the world community of objective complete spirituality, consisting of traditional basic elements - faith, reason and feeling, plays one of the leading roles in overcoming all the problems of the spiritual crisis in the globalized world.

References

Abakarova, R. M., & Gadzhimirzoeva, O. S. (2018). Problema nravstvennosti v ekologii [The problem of morality in ecology]. *South of Russia: ecology, development, 3*, 10-15.

Agadzhanyan, N. A. (2016). Ecology of the soul: culture, morality, spirituality. *Human ecology, 2*, 35-38.

Baudrillard, J. (1998). *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*. SAGE Publications Ltd. 224 p.

Cairns, J. (1977). Quantification of Biological Integrity. In R. K. Ballentine, & L. J. Guarraia (Coord.). *The Integrity of Water: Symposium* (pp. 171-187). Washington D.C.

Deleuze, J., & Guattari, F. (2009). *What is philosophy?* Moscow: Columbia Academic Project.

Foucault, M. (1993). *Istoriya bezumiya v klassicheskuyu epokhu* [The history of madness in the classical era]. St. Petersburg, 576.

Frank, S. L. (1992). *The spiritual foundations of society*. Moscow: Republic.

Gapanovich, S. O., & Levchenko, V. F. (2017). K voprosu ob informatsionnoy antropoekologii [To the question of informational anthropoecology]. *The principles of ecology, 4*, 4-16.

Gusev, M. V. (2015). Obrashcheniye k chelovechestvu [Appeal to humanity]. *Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 16. Biology, 1.* 3-5.

Hegel, G. (2017). *Filosofiya istorii* [Philosophy of History]. Strelbytskyy Multimedia Publishing, 622 p.

Kanke, V. A. (2003). *Fundamentals of Philosophy*. Moscow: Logos, 288 p.

Lacan, J. (2002). On the nonsense and structure of God. *Advisory psychology and psychotherapy, 10*(1), 36-50.

Leopold, A. (1968). *A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There*. Oxford University Press, 226 p.

Peceei, A. (2019). *Human qualities*. Moscow: Progress, 304 p.

Rather, J. (Ed.), (2014). *The Philosophy of Spinoza*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 262 p.

Rolston, H. (1975). Is there an ecological ethic. *Ethics, 85*(2), 91-109.

Rolston, H. (1992). *Philosophy Gone Wild*. Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 269 p.

Schreider, Yu. A. (2016). *Global problems and universal values*. In Utopia or organization (pp. 7-25). Moscow.

Sorokin, P. (2012). *Man. Civilization. Society*. Moscow: Politizdat, 543 p.

Tsvetaeva, M. N. (2019). Ekologiya kul'tury: priroda, chelovek, tsivilizatsiya v khudozhestvennom i informatsionnom prostranstve russkogo mira

[Ecology of culture: nature, man, civilization in the artistic and information space of the Russian world]. *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana, 2*(26), 240-243.