ECONOMICS
& Sociology

THE BIRTH OF "NORMAL TRAUMA": THE EFFECT OF NON-LINEAR DEVELOPMENT

Sergey Kravchenko
MGIMO-University,
Russia
E-mail: sociol7@yandex.ru

ABSTRACT. The article critically analyzes the approaches to different manifestations of traumatic development and the theories of trauma in historical and cultural context: P. Sztompka's theory of becoming displaying the effects of "society in action" and "pathological agencies"; J.C. Alexander's theory of cultural construction of trauma diagnosing the role of mystified meanings in the deformation of social consciousness; Zh.T. Toschenko's theory of "the society of trauma" that substantiates a new specific modality of development. Relying on the postulates of these approaches the author of the paper proposes further investigations, showing the formation of a new phenomenon in the form of "normal trauma", which is understood as a 'normal', emergent, and significant deformation of socio-technical-natural realities due to the effects of non-linear development. It is stated that traumatic development leads to the increase of such "systemic uncertainties" as "normal accidents" (Ch. Perrow), 'normal' "climate turbulence" (J. Urry, A. Giddens), "normal anomie" (S. Kravchenko) that in fact give traumas determined by non-linear development a 'normal, natural' character. The author sees the minimization of the consequences of "normal trauma" in a special type of reflexivity, which includes both "humanistic" and "rigidity" turns aimed at achieving a more humane society and counteracting turbulences.

Introduction

Under the conditions of relatively linear development, a trauma was understood as *local deformations of biopsychic matter* occurring under the influence of *external* factors. In medicine, it means body injuries as a result of a contusion or burns. In psychology, it is the suppression of an experienced negative unexpected event, as a result of which this fact is distorted in the imagination and memory of an individual (Caruth, 1995). These types of traumas, which affected individuals, did not significantly change the functioning of social institutions.

With the emergence of capitalism, which was accompanied by active urbanization and radical influence of man on nature, the subject of trauma is increasingly becoming part of social

and political sciences. Scholars considered the influence of *a wide variety of external* factors on changes in the social body – people's lives, their consciousness, behavior, and conditions of existence, although the term 'trauma' itself had not been used for a long time. E. Durkheim's theory of anomie is devoted to the analysis of value deformations caused by the abnormal division of labor. The concept of K. Marx's alienation considers social and economic factors that form "alien will" in people. F. Engels points out that the barbaric attitude towards nature is destructive for the society itself: "The people who, in Mesopotamia, Greece, Asia Minor and elsewhere, destroyed the forests to obtain cultivable land, never dreamed that by removing along with the forests the collecting centres and reservoirs of moisture they were laying the basis for the present forlorn state of those countries" (Engels, 1925: 452). Ch. Gilman studies the socio-psychological upheavals of women coming from a man-made world (Gilman, 1971). M. Weber – the latent effects of rationalization on economic and religious life (Weber, 1968). G. Simmel – the nature of threats to culture from the expansion of the monetary economy (Simmel, 1990). One of the first to point out the emergence of "social neurosis" was Z. Freud, who called on scientists to start "research into the pathology of civilized communities" (Freud, 1953: 142). The "pathological" society was central to the works of E. Fromm, who noted that the pressures of social structures deform intimate relations and produce false consciousness: "The fact that millions of people share the same vices does not make these vices virtues, the fact that they share so many errors does not make the errors to be truths, and the fact that millions of people share the same mental pathology does not make these people sane (Fromm, 1955: 14-15). In all these cases, traumatic effects were considered in the *local* space-time realities. P. Sorokin was the first to study *large-scale* social disintegration, which he defined as a "civilization crisis" (Sorokin, 1941).

1. Literature review

According to P. Sztompka, now social change takes place in the form of *becoming*, the essence of which is expressed in the permanent incompleteness of the development of structures and their functions that reproduces the effect of "society in action": "society is nothing else but change, movement and transformation, action and interaction, construction and reconstruction, constant *becoming* rather than stable *being*" (Sztompka, 2004: 155). Social trauma, as an attribute of becoming, is an active, driving force of social change inherent in human collectives. Traumas also arise as a result of the "pathological agency". An example of this is the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe. The becoming is a dynamic process involving a "traumatic sequence" in the form of a series of stages: structural foundations facilitating the emergence of trauma; the traumatic events themselves; special ways of interpreting them; the emergence of traumatic symptoms expressed in a shared pattern of behaviour in the context of accepted opinions; post-traumatic adaptation; ambivalent trauma overcoming – the final phase or beginning of a new cycle of traumatic sequence. The nature of trauma is *ambivalent*: despite the directly negative painful consequences, it demonstrates positive, functional potential as a force of new social formation. Accordingly, people have to constantly reflect on traumatic changes by reassessing values. In this process, also a number of stages can be traced: the development of distrust after raptures and enthusiasm; a gloomy view of the future that manifests itself in fears and anxiety; nostalgia for the past – people believe that under socialism they were more satisfied with life; the spread of political apathy, electoral absenteeism, the absence of civic initiative; post-communist deformations of collective memory, the revaluation of the communist past and the role of people in it. However, over time, the trauma enters the stage of "healing", which is manifested in the growth of public trust in the institutions of democracy, market, and church, resulting in *new cultural consolidation* (Sztompka, 2004).

As it follows from P. Sztompka's theory, the becoming is a new type of social change occurring in the form of social traumas and corresponding reflections of people on their consequences. Formed through traumas the new reality is characterized by structural and functional incompleteness, uncertainty, and social development without a prominent guiding principle – it paradoxically combines centrifugal tendencies (escape from the past) and manifestations of centripetal forces (nostalgia, attempts to return to the previous life). However, this theory does not explain what concrete actions social actors need to take in order to purposefully move towards a new cultural consolidation to achieve a more suitable society for life.

J.C. Alexander has devoted three prominent studies to the problem of *cultural construction of trauma*, each of which brings significant innovations in the understanding of the nature of trauma. In *"The Meanings of Social Life"* the example of cultural construction of trauma is used to justify the subject of cultural sociology – the production and dissemination of social meaning. In this paradigm, trauma is not treated as a real social fact but as the *result of coding evil* through the prism of certain cultural values and norms. "For a traumatic event to have the status of evil is a matter of its becoming evil. It is a matter of how the trauma is known, how it is coded ... I would like to suggest that the very existence of the category "evil" must be seen not as something that naturally exists but as an arbitrary construction, the product of cultural and sociological work" (Alexander, 2003: 31, 32). What is especially valuable in his theory is the discovery of the mechanism of symbolic production of meanings that can make *great changes of traumatic type*. The principal innovation of the second book "*Trauma. A Social Theory*": trauma is not a condition, but a *process* detrimental to the functioning of the collective, identifying the victim and imposing responsibility (Alexander, 2012). In the third book "*The Drama of Social Life*", trauma appears in the form of the *"dramatization of consciousness"*, a process that leads to the breaking down of the past and the formation of *new solidarities*. This process is based on the *transition of the society from ritual to performance*. "Symbol and rhetoric can break through into modern life, but the narrative of rationalization claims such extra-rational intrusions are deployed for spectacles whose drama is empty and whose purpose is merely mystification. In the spectacle of modernity, everything is top-down; nothing comes from the bottom up" (Alexander, 2017: 2). The author reveals and analyzes the latent aspects of the mechanism of consciousness dramatization that could be vividly demonstrated in the revolutionary performance in Egypt. When wages and unemployment, corruption, repression, and urban decay "enter into the tumultuous back and forth of revolutionary social strife, they do so as signs, folding these empirical facts ("signifiers"). But while their materiality is an illusion, their factuality is not: it is a useful fiction. The apparent naturalness of signified social facts gives symbolic constructions their extraordinary pragmatic and performative effect ... For participants and observers alike, revolutionary conflicts are experienced as a life and death struggle between not just social groups but social representations, one representing the sacred, the other the profane" (Alexander, 2017: 40, 46). The result of this is giving up the previous solidarity, and reassessment of values. "Drama is fundamental to the search for meaning and solidarity in a post-ritual world... Drama displaces yet also encompasses shreds of the premodern religious order". And further: in the modern world "without drama, collective and personal meanings could not be sustained, evil could not be identified, and justice would be impossible to obtain" (Alexander, 2017:102-103; 141). Some individuals may not even realize that their consciousness is being traumatized – they accept performative values, showing willingness to passover to a new solidarity with mystified notions of life chances that are unlikely to be materialized.

J.C. Alexander's theory reinterprets the role of trauma based on the production of *short-lived meanings and mystified notions*, which, however, can *radically change the character of society*. At the same time, there analyzed the references to the fact that the "premodern

religious order" is preserved though to a certain extent. There shown the importance of other factors in the maintenance of *long-lived meanings* that form the basis of "ontological security" (A. Giddens) – a very important condition for passing over to a sustainable development.

Zh.T. Toschenko justified *the theory of the society trauma*. If before traumas were interpreted as a rather significant, but, nevertheless, *separate* social phenomenon, in his theory the trauma is seen as a factor of deterministic character of *the whole society*: "it is possible to extend the interpretations of the changes to the concept of 'the society of trauma'", if to take into account the contradictory, turbulent and deformed character of social processes" (Toschenko, 2020: 25). If earlier traumas, in essence, were treated as a specific manifestation of the crisis, in this theory, these concepts are divorced, and each of them gets its own definition. "Attempts to describe these new phenomena by means of the concept of 'crisis' did not give a proper answer to the processes taking place in many countries. The crises regularly occurring in the capitalist world had quite distinct causes, were limited in time and were exposed to the impact that led to their overcoming. But along with them, a number of countries have been and/or are still in recession and stagnation, which have not been able to overcome the causes of such a specific phenomenon as the absence or very slow growth, political instability and, as a rule, an increase in social inequality". Another fundamental innovation of this theory: all previous notions of crisis, catastrophes, and various manifestations of social destructiveness were interpreted in the context of two main types of development – evolution and revolution. In the author's opinion, the society of trauma is "the third modality along with evolution and revolution" (Toschenko, 2020: 25, 27).

Thus, the innovation of this theory manifests itself in the *rediscovery of social reality*, possible *alternative ways* of its development in a nonlinear universe, which is an indicator of the validity of sociological knowledge (Kravchenko, 2014a: 27-37). At the same time, we would not rank the modalities of development, believing that its *new, specific* form is actually justified. Apart from evolution and revolution, P. Sorokin singles out "social fluctuations, which are, processes that are repeated from time to time in social and cultural life and in human history, which means any kind of movement, modification, transformation, restructuring or 'evolution'" (Sorokin, 1937: 159). U. Beck recently justified another possible modality of development in the form of metamorphosis: "metamorphosis is not social change, not transformation, not evolution, not revolution, and not crisis. It is a mode of changing the nature of human existence. It signifies the age of side effects" (Beck, 2016: 20). Metamorphoses can and in fact *radically traumatize* society and nature. The relevance of the challenges of all kinds of traumas encourages further research in this direction.

2. Methodological approach

There used the modern reflexive theories studying the effects of nonlinearity. The accelerated and increasingly complex development of nature and society due to the effect of the "arrow of time" (Prigogine, Stengers, 2018) has led to the recognition of the *dominance of nonlinear development*. It is manifested by instabilities at all levels, gaps in socio-cultural continuity, sharp increase in points of bifurcation, turbulences, and rhizomes (G. Deleuze, F. Guattari). This led to the *complication of traumas* which began to express themselves in the *glocalized contest,* defined as "the refraction of globalization through the local" (Roudemetof, 2016: 79). The new *complex traumas* undermine human nature, community life, institutions of society, and foundations of culture. Accordingly, in the social sciences there appeared *the theories of trauma* with innovative theoretical and methodological instruments of *reflexive type*, which make it possible to analyze the complex causes of traumatic changes.

3. Conducting research and results

The realities of nonlinear development objectively reproduce "systemic uncertainties" – "fluctuations, bifurcations, and instabilities at all levels" (Prigogine, 1997: 55), in particular, due to "normal accidents" (Perrow, 1999), "climate turbulence" that practically become a 'norm' (Urry, 2011; Giddens, 2009), "normal anomie" (Kravchenko, 2014: 3-10). All these and other phenomena give traumas a *'typical, normal' character*. So, these types of traumas can be interpreted as "normal traumas". Let us highlight the most significant factors producing traumas of this type.

The current non-linear transformations have brought the *end of the organized society* that demanded *innovative reflexive theories* studying *'normal' emergences* (Kravchenko, 2010: 14-25). Thus, S. Lash and J. Urry noted the transition from nationally organized societies to "global disorganization" (Lash, Urry, 1987) The traditional basic functions – adaptation, goal attainment, integration and pattern maintenance – which, according to T. Parsons, provide the vitality to social relationships and institutions (Parsons, 1953) are traumatized. No wonder, Europe has become "a turbulent continent". Here are some examples of its new 'normality': "anti-establishment parties can come from either the left or the right"; "a threat to the stability of welfare and educational systems, as well as to wider feelings of solidarity. The arrival of Muslims in large numbers has been a source of major tension"; "the division between the digital production – the universe of the computer – and the real world is becoming dissolved"; "many individuals – or perhaps the large majority – no longer feel themselves to have single identities" (Giddens, 2016: 39, 59, 76, 144). Whereas in *linearly developing societies* even social cataclysms did not lead to radical changes in the nature of society, the "*butterfly effect*" has now emerged and operates under the conditions of *nonlinearity*. Its essence is that even seemingly insignificant actions are capable of causing avalanche-like traumatic consequences. Small changes in the past, J. Urry writes, can potentially produce enormous consequences in the present or future. "Systems are characterized by a lack of proportionality, or 'non-leanerity', between apparent 'causes' and 'effects'. There *can* be small changes that do bring about big, non-leaner system shifts, as well as converse" (Urry, 2011: 41-42).

The causes of "normal traumas" can be *side effects of actants* (a machine, a computer network, etc., functioning on the basis of artificial intelligence with the aim of *formal efficiency*) capable of getting out of human control, as if showing their own "will". This prompted scientists to re-discover the role of technology in social development in the context of a *materialistic turn* (Latour, 2005; Latour, Woolgar, 2013). From the point of view of this paradigm it was shown that complex technological realities, "smart machines" and "digital cities", bear both desirable innovations for human activity and at the same time *'normal' latent consequences* that traumatize man, society, culture. S. Greenfield argues that computer "alter our brains" and real empathy becomes next to impossible without the opportunity to get full experience of eye contact and body language (Greenfield, 2011). According to W.H. Vanderburg, the digitalization has led to "*our war on ourselves*" (Vanderburg, 2011). A. Giddens also states that the digitalization affects institutions of our society: "Some online universities, such as the University of Phoenix in Amazone, had a period of dramatic success before more recently entering a period of decline" (Giddens, 2016: 111). The principle problem is as follows: "We are trying to improve human life and the world as if they were built up from separate and distinct domains dominated by a single category of phenomena". As a result, "mutation occurred when all kinds began to interpose themselves between individuals, groups, and societies" is influenced by "cults of fact and efficiency". Studies of educational programs in Canada and the USA conducted by the author show that "future engineers learn almost nothing about how technological influences human life, society, and biosphere". As a result, there takes place the traumatic transform of the economy into "anti-economy" and a society into "anti-society".

What is more challenging that a person is converted into "anti-person": "we are beginning to see glimpses of the emerging anti-person who lives if our being a symbolic species can be ignored most of the time, only to surrender ourselves to becoming *homo informaticus*" (Vanderburg, 2016: 6, 16, 101, 142, 223, 333). V. Mosko argues that the transition from the post-industrial and post-Internet worlds to the *digital society* is accompanied by the trauma of human communication, humanism, and social justice. This is expressed, in particular, in the production of new violence against humans in the form of "electronic surveillance"; against the society – the creation of military drones that are "effective killers". The environment is deformed: "most people in the developed West have very little awareness of the e-waste issue because companies have managed to ship most of it to the developing world, often illicitly" (Mosco, 2017: 143, 144, 154-155). All these processes that seem to be 'natural' in fact manifest "normal traumas".

Radically new mobilities of worlds, people, things, places with ambivalent functionality have emerged: on the one hand, these forms of movement are very important for a better organization of work, study, leisure, travel, family life, but on the other hand, they *'normally' traumatize the functionality of many social institutions*. Thus, globalization, the development of world tourism led to the appearance of "unplanned and unanticipated side-effects of 'negative globalization'" which is "itself the prime cause of injustice" (Bauman, 2007: 7). In the complex socum, according to J. Urry, there important not only the mobility of social actors themselves, but also "moving places". They "are like ships that move around and are not fixed within one location. Places thus travel, slow or fast, greater or shorter distances, within networks of human and non-human agents" (Urry, 2008: 42). In a relatively simple, linearly developing society, the role of material infrastructures in economic, political and social daily life (roads, railways, telegraph lines, water pipelines, train stations, etc.) was low in influencing the nature of horizontal or vertical mobility. Today, the development of *complex* material infrastructures determines the quality of life of people and their life chances. The factors of new mobilities allow for a critical review of the postulate that people's consciousness and behavior do not depend on the dynamics of their material environment and also take into account traumatic changes. Whereas previously the social mobility was largely structured, now there are appeared *unstructured mobilities* in the form of flows of people, knowledge, money, risks, which are almost beyond the control of states. Mobilities outside national societies are developing. The right to mobility on a global scale is now an inalienable right of the individual; accordingly, not only is the concept of "citizenship" changing, but it is becoming different and complex: in particular, "mobility citizenship concerned with the rights and responsibilities of individuals to other places and other cultures", "post-national citizenship". However, the unstructured mobilities lead to *unstructured traumas* that are, in particular, expressed in the formation of the "global panopticon", the shifting from "face-to-face security" to "e-security", and the "privatization of leisure time" (Urry, 2008: 189-190, 196, 202-203). So, new complex mobilities latently cause certain challenges to humans, produce nonfunctions and dysfunctions in the form of "normal traumas".

Climate turbulence has a 'normal' traumatic impact on the economy, tourism, technology, and the livelihoods of people in general. The traumas are vividly expressed in vulnerabilities in the climate and atmosphere systems. Their specific manifestations include not only global warming, but also periods of abnormal heat, sharp frosts, and the so-called "extreme weather events" (floods, droughts, storms, tropical cyclones, tornadoes, devastating fires, strong snowfalls). These phenomena 'normally' lead to negative social consequences, that is, the emergence of a "damaged community", i.e. a community characterized by a loss of trust and social capital, as well as fragmentation of social groups and the breakdown of social relations, both personal and institutional (Thomas, Phillips, Lovekamp, Fothergill, 2013: 405). Another example is hurricane Katrina, which struck New Orleans and other US coastal

settlements in 2005, when the dams protecting the city, 70% of which is below sea level, were destroyed. But it didn't get along with simply "traditional" flooding: the water carried pesticides, oil, fertilizers and other pollutants. In this regard, a whole group of scientists initiated the "*Sociology of Katrina*" treating modern catastrophes as a 'norm' (Brunsma, Overfelt, Picou, 2010). In addition, the ozone layer in the stratosphere is constantly seasonally changing, with its area decreasing/increasing during the periods of temperature fluctuations that 'normally' traumatizes the whole atmosphere.

Today, there is no single science on climate turbulence, although there are groups of scientists who compete with each other. According to J. Urry, "this fragmentation of science" has slowed down the understanding of how climate change is actually occurring around the world. He argues that "'warming' is a simplifying term since what may happen in different parts of the world may be very different, with possibly significant cooling occurring in some places. Indeed the problem of the term *warming* stems from the sheer difficulty in predicting long-term future climates". It seems that this is actually a scientific interpretation of the traumas caused by changes in the climate system, the one which emphasizes turbulence, unpredictability of climate change, as well as possible unintended consequences arising from innovation activity of the humanity. He also notes the interdependence of climate change and the future of mankind, advocating the study of the complex causes of the emerging vulnerabilities in the climate system that "make 'climate' the key category of the twenty-first century" (Urry, 2011: 23, 24). Some scientists state that traumas of socium caused by climate turbulence lead to environmental catastrophes that are inevitable. They draw attention to the dramatic increase in the social and natural spheres in which traumas occur, particularly those resulting from invasive inequalities. These new inequalities are linked to a change in the status of nature, which is taking on a societal character. These processes have essentially divided people into those who live in an "environmentally friendly" territory and those who are forced to live in places that are environmentally hazardous to human health (Hannigan, 2014). Others argue that alternatives to climate change are possible and it is crucial to overcome the consequences of traumas (Klein, 2014). In any case people have to do with 'normal' traumatic impacts of climate turbulence judging by the increasing frequency of this phenomenon.

The meanings constructed through performances and fake news *'normally' traumatize values, referees, authorities and, most importantly, public consciousness and morality*. Through performances political opponents and economic competitors are demonized, which in essence becomes a "norm" of the modern life. These processes contribute so much to the dispersion of morality that Z. Bauman speaks about the coming of "moral blindness" (Bauman, Donskis, 2013). J. Baudrillard has shown that the side effects of political and media performances, as well as fake news, lead to the spread of "non-events" that might be "true rather than true" (Baudrillard, 1995) – the references of the reality to the truth are practically disappearing. "Those watching the performance don't see it as a performance; they identify with the protagonists and experience enmity toward the antagonists on stage; they lose their sense of being an audience, experiencing not artificiality but verisimilitude" (Alexander, 2017: 3). Performative meanings are in fact "functional alternatives" (R. Merton) to the real meanings of the human life-worlds. In the political field, it is becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish between parties and movements that are focused on the essence of the cause, that seek to develop real goals and achieve them, and those that conduct performative activity, using 'democratic' meanings that can gather huge protest masses of people who are increasingly relying on "happy chances" rather than on achievements in their life strategies. At the beginning of the 21-st century, U. Beck notes, "global domestic politics – protests and projects are typically justified in the name of 'humanity' and 'the planet'. The universality of such claims, moreover, is not conjured up out of thin air or a merely utopian aspiration" (Beck, 2012: x). However, people may start thinking that politicians' performances are true and their statements

may be materialized. The 'truthfulness' of performances is particularly evident in the traumas of political reality. It does not matter who Obama or Trump actually is, only what their character seemed to be. "Whatever the practical failings of Obama-the-President, however, Obama-as-campaigner was still viewed as idealistic and honest, devoted to helping others than feathering his own nest" (Alexander, 2017: 93). The same might be said about the Trump phenomenon and its performative value. "Supporters viewed Trump as a successful businessman, a take-charge guy, someone who understood and spoke for "the forgotten" men and women of America – and it was that view, those narratives, that, of course, won out in the end". Ordinary people find it difficult to sort out fake from real news though they realize the existing problem: "According to a post-election survey conducted by Rew Research Center, nearly two-thirds of Americans think that fake news is causing "a great deal of confusion"" (Kivisto, 2017: 11, 45). However, performative meanings and fake news tend to generate in people mainly *short-lived reflexions*. This suggests that their negative consequences can, in principle, be minimized and overcome.

Conclusion

We believe that these and other factors of the production of "normal traumas" caused by the *trends of non-linear development* will remain in the foreseeable future. The becoming new realities are *not just chaos*, but essentially "*global complexity*", which began to function *in a new and different way*. The complex socium is organized in an unusual way, there is no simple growth of disorder. Societies are innovatively functioning by moving towards *information and communication regulators* (Lash, Urry, 1994), and by creating *global networks* (Castells, 2010). However "normal traumas" in their essence are *non-linear changes*. They *cannot be completely overcome*, being *attributes* of modern life (along with "normal accidents", "normal anomie", becoming, points of bifurcation, rhizomes, etc.), but their consequences can and should be minimized. It seems to us that a special type of reflexivity of the traumatic changes, which includes the following directions of activity, can be the key to this. This reflexivity should be based on the *humanist turn* in the development of *all* sciences. First of all for dealing adequately with traumas it is necessary to integrate theoretical and methodological approaches from different areas of scientific knowledge (Kravchenko, 2011: 11-18). But it is not enough: without the *proper humane ethics* the scientific knowledge is very often opposed to the civil society, life-worlds and even facilitates the production of "pathological agency" as a factor of social trauma (P. Sztompka). Humanistically oriented science rejects *pragmatic* solutions of the challenges of the unanticipated consequences of traumas – *humane approaches* are needed. One of the main problems of establishing the humanistic turn is that digitalization and other technological innovations implemented in the context of globalization are in fact *unstructured* or *partially structured* and only on a *national* level. They have undoubtedly programmed for intended, desired results, which make the life of the modern man more comfortable. However, in an accelerated manner unpredictable consequences appear that are often highly dysfunctional for socium, traditional community life and even for nature. This presupposes the demand for human decisions with *humane character*. Something is already being done. Under the influence of the traumatic effects the subject matter of many sciences is being changed in the *humane direction*: more and more scholars pass over to the problems of unintended consequences of scientific innovations, climate turbulences, side effects of new mobilities, the production of fake meanings that dramatize consciousness. The humanistic turn deals with the acceleration of socio-cultural and environmental dynamics, synergetically takes into consideration risks, vulnerabilities, and traumas, searching for new forms of humanism, based on man's existential needs. Passing over to the humanistic turn is not realized spontaneously, without an active conscious effort on the part of social scientists and

sociologists. Here the principle of *laissez fair* simply does not work, there required a *scientific agency* including both the non-linear and humanistic components: *critical reflection* of the becoming complex realities. In this case the criticism is directed to the seriously distorted account of the *humanistic essence* in modern life; *rediscovering* the potentials of the human capital under the condition of digitalization, social and climate turbulences, mass production of performative and fake meanings. There appeared social movements trying to "turn fear into outrage, and outrage into hope for a better humanity" (Castells, 2015: 3). Measures are now being taken in different societies to preserve traditions, cultural, and religious values, to return to conservative ways of life, to form *long-lived meanings* to achieve a more *sustainable society*. At the same time the corresponding trend in sciences is needed in the form of a *rigidity turn*. The essence of its subject area is the *interdisciplinary study* of factors contributing to the stable functioning of society, sustainable development, *routineization*, understood as guiding the practical conduct of our life that facilitates *ontological security* (Giddens, 1984), and the minimization of the effects of riskophilia (Kravchenko, 2017: 3-13), i.e. everything that counteracts turbulences and traumatic development.

References

Alexander, J.C. (2003). *The Meanings of Social Life. A Cultural Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alexander, J.C. (2012). *Trauma. A Social Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Alexander, J.C. (2017). *The Drama of Social Life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Baudrillard, J. (1995). *The Gulf War Did Not Take Place*. Sydney: Power Publication.

Bauman, Z. (2007). *Liquid Times. Living in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z., Donskis, L. (2013). *Moral Blindness. The Loss of Sensitivity in Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beck, U. (2012). *Twenty Observations on a World in Turmoil*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beck, U. (2016). *The Metamorphosis of the World*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Brunsma, D.L., Overfelt, D., Picou, J.S., editors (2010). *The Sociology of Katrina. Perspectives on a Modern Catastrophe.* 2-nd ed. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield publishers.

Caruth, C. (1995). *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Castells, M. (2010). *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. Volume I: The Rise of the Network Society. Second edition. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Castells, M. (2015). *Networks of Outrage and Hope. Social Movements in the Internet Age.* Second edition. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Engels, F. (1925). Dialectics of the Nature. Vol. 20. London: Wellred Books.

Freud, S. (1953). *Civilization and Its Discontents* / translated from German by J. Riviere. London: The Hogarth Press.

Fromm, E. (1955). *The Sane Society*. New York, Chicago, San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (2009). *The Politics of Climate Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (2016). *Turbulent and Mighty Continent. What Future for Europe?* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gilman, Ch. P. (1971). *The Man-made World or, Our Androcentric Culture*. N.Y.: Johnson Reprint Corporation.

Greenfield, S. (2011). 'Computers may be altering our brains – we must ask how'. *The Independent*, 12 Augest.

Hannigan, J. (2014). *Environmental Sociology*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kivisto, P. (2017). *The Trump Phenomenon*. Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited.

Klein, N. (2014). *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. the Climate*. London: Allen Lane.

Kravchenko, S.A. (2010). Dynamics of contemporary realities: innovative approaches. *Sociological Studies. Monthly,* 10, 14-25 (In Russian).

Kravchenko, S.A. (2011). Sociology on the move to interaction of theoretical and methodological approaches. *Sociological Studies. Monthly,* 1, 11-18 (In Russian).

Kravchenko, S.A. (2014a). Re-discovery of social reality as an indicator of sociological knowledge validity. *Sociological Studies. Monthly,* 5, 27-37 (In Russian).

Kravchenko, S.A. (2014). "A normal anomie": Contours of conception. *Sociological Studies. Monthly,* 8, 3-10 (In Russian).

Kravchenko, S.A. (2017). The coexistence of riskophobia and riskophilia – An expression of "normal anomie". *Sociological Studies. Monthly,* 2, 3-13 (In Russian).

Lash, S., Urry, J. (1994). *Economies of Signs and Space*. London: Sage.

Lash, S., Urry, J. (1987). *The End of Organized Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Latour, B., Woolgar, S. (2013). *Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Mosco, V. (2017). *Becoming Digital. Toward a Post-Internet Society*. Emerald Publishing Limited, Bingley.

Parsons, T. (1953). *Essays in Sociological Theory*. Glencoe, Il: Free Press.

Perrow, Ch. (1999). *Normal Accidents: Living with High Risk Technologies*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Prigogine, I. (1997). The End of Certainty. New York: Free Press.

Prigogine, I., Stengers, I. (2018). *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature*, Verso.

Roudemetof, V. (2016). *Clocalization. A Critical Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.

Simmel, G. (1990). *The Philosophy of Money*. London: Routledge.

Thomas, D.S.K., Phillips, B.D., Lovekamp, W.E., Fothergill, A. (eds). (2013). *Social Vulnerability to Disasters.* 2nd ed. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Sorokin, P. (1937). *Social and Cultural Dynamics*. Cincinnati: American Book Company.

Sorokin, P. (1941). *The Crisis of Our Age*. New York: Dutton.

Sztompka, P. (2004). The Trauma of Social Change. A Case of Postcommunist Societies // Alexander, J., Eyerman, R., Giesen, B., Smelser, N., Sztompka, P. (eds.). *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity: Toward a Theory of Cultural Trauma*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Toschenko, Zh. T. *The Society of Trauma: Between Evolution and Revolution (the Experience of Theoretical and Empirical Analysis).* Moscow: Ves Mir, 2020.

Urry J. (2011). *Climate Change and Society.* Malden: Polity Press, 2011.

Urry, J. (2008). *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Vanderburg, W.H. (2016). *Our Battle for the Human Spirit*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Vanderburg, W.H. (2011). *Our War on Ourselves: Rethinking Science, Technology, and Economic Growth*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and Society*. New York: Bedminster Press.