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Abstract

This study aims to present that the most visible and drastic changes in the life of modern humans are caused by the globalization process. The main thesis through which are analyzed these changes are: (1) the globalization of the structure of social space (properties and manifestations); (2) the risk as a major category of a globalized social space; (3) extraterritoriality of the individual’s personal identity; (4) segmentation and the new boundaries of the global space; (5) the mobile man; and (6) mobility, as a new paradigm of the social knowledge. Because of the dynamic changes in our societies, it is increasingly difficult to use scientific instruments that have been working well in the past relatively more sustainable societies. The old toolbox will become inefficient in relation of the processes that directly affect the human psyche. The more adaptable among us will deal easily with the challenges of everyday life, but people who struggle with quick adaptation will experience mental disorders and will be more likely to suffer from mental diseases, with never seen before sizes.
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1. Introduction

One of the central concepts of the social philosophy, political philosophy and the social psychology is the notion “social space”. Under this term we must generally understand: the immediate natural, social and existential environment of human. There are many factors influencing the social space and its development – political, economic, and cultural, etc. That latter is inextricably linked to the place and the behavior of the person in it. These same factors change the person himself – his physical and mental behavior. Changes in today’s social space, compared to previous historical times, are extremely dynamic and distinct.

These changes are the result of the emergence and influence of many factors – the growing spatial freedom of movement and networking, the intensive communication links, the transnationalization of economic interactions and labor, the acceleration and decline in transport, the great social mobility, the possibility of virtual tours, etc.
2. Globalization of the social space structures (properties and manifestations)

The change of a social space is possible because it is something different from the abstract, homogenous physical space. Georg Simmel (Simmel, in Wollf, 2014), one of the first social thinkers to distinguish social from physical space, points out that social interactions fill with content and sense the physical space that would otherwise be deserted and negatively determined. The social space is not a “empty void” (Wollf, 2014: 302), it is the place of the social actor’s interactions. In other words, the social space has a content and structure that is determined by the nature of society. Interactions in the social space, both politically and economically, can also be cultural, educational, emotional. Jose Ortega y Gasset (Gasset, 2005: 471) describes how city topography is being restructured if viewed through the optics of changing human relationships: “While Madrid’s space remains the same, it is already sharply altered if the beloved human with which is the city was lived – has already left him there: Now I perceive to what extent my love for Soledad was irradiated all the city and my life in it ... Now I paid attention to the fact that even the farthest things I did not think they might have something in common with Soledad, to have gained an additional connection with her, and that is precisely what they are doing for me their determining quality. Although ones and the same the geometric, topographic attributes of Madrid have lost their validity. Before this city had for me a center and a periphery. The center was Soledad’s house, a periphery – all those places where Soledad never appeared. Some things were close, others far, depending on their distance to where I expected to see my beloved” (Koprinarov, 2010: 43). Here we are talking about sentimental relations that change the dimensions of urban space. But, in fact, all human interactions are factors that, in their change, produce restructuring of the social space. For example, if a settlement is located hundreds of miles away from a different location, the distance between them is great. But if an airport is built in the same city, then the distance between these cities will be quite different from the one that separated them before. It turns out that the distances between two points in a space are not absolute, but they change with the change in the nature of the interactions between the social actors located at these points of space. That is why the social space in which man lives changes the character of society together, because the people themselves are the ones who form the type of social space, model its essence but also on the basis of choices of behavior and action in it, bear the consequences from the choice of behavior. For example, alongside the positive opportunities that transport technology brings us – fast transport from point A to point B - these vehicles are just as detrimental to protecting the environment.

Even the clearest view of the different stages of the social development shows that the social space is changing and carries the characteristics of the era in question. And that changes in a social space are changes in / of the human beings. In the context of the globalization, the social space acquires a number of new properties, shaping specific forms of blending, hybridizing to different characteristics and elements, which by themselves create the structure of a network. This is what Ulrich Beck understands as “polygamy in the place”, or else to put it somewhere with its identity – the “deteritorialisation” of individual identity (Beck, 2002: 17-44). The latter as a concept leads to marginality. The characteristic of the term marginality is undergoing its historical development. In the second half of the 1940s and early 1950s in Western sociology, the second generation of immigrants, which are considered the most typical marginal community, is being studied extensively. At the same time, the study of marginality is becoming more and more connected not only with “ethnic and racial groups” (Beck, 2002: 17-44).

3. The social space as a network

One of the hallmarks of the social space today is its network structure. The Spanish social thinker Manuel Castells (Castells, 2004) describes modern society as a network society. It shows how technology changes the world we live in, turning it into a network based society. M.
Castells (see Castells, 2004) describes a decentralized model of the world in which the vertical hierarchy is transformed into a network society. According to this author, networks build new social morphology, visibly modify the social space of our societies, and the rapid spread of network logic greatly alters the functioning and results of production processes, experience, culture.

According to Castells (2004), networking form of a public organization has existed in other times and spaces, but the new information and technological paradigm supports and provides the material basis for its large-scale expansion throughout the public structure. Castells (2004) writes: “I would say that this networking logic gives rise to a social determination at a higher level than that of the specific social interests expressed through networks: the power of the flows is superior to the flow of power. The presence or absence in the network and the dynamics of each network in relation to others are key sources of dynamism and change in our society: a society that we can safely call a networking society characterized by the primacy of public morphology over public action” (Castells, 2004: 451). According to Castells (2004) societies are increasingly struggling around the opposition “network” and “I” (Castells, 2004: 374), that is, the person has to be a part, a bundle in and out of the net, its body over its individual elements, its structure, otherwise risk being in the position of an outsider, out of the network flow system, respectively social space.

The network is the notion of new networked forms of organization where “I” is involved in various attempts to establish identity. Castells (2004) focuses on various manifestations of the network organization of modern society. One of the most noticeable manifestations of this networking he finds in the changes in the urban landscape around the world. World cities such as New York, Tokyo, London, etc. are becoming global command and control centers. They become social spaces which are capable of coordinating, modernizing and guiding the solutions of global finance societies as well as in most consulting and business services internationally. The social space of the standard, traditional type of city is structured so that the movement of the population is directed from the periphery to the center and the social strata are concentrated according to their status, with the upper class in the center of the city, in the urban areas - the middle class in the periphery, in the ghetto – the working class. In the global city type (big cities or so-called “smart cities”), the trend of movement is from the center to the periphery. In the central parts of the city are administrative-public institutions and business offices, but as a living space are inhabited by the poorer working population, as well as by immigrant groups seeking entry into these global megacities.

The middle class has withdrawn into the so-called suburbs, which are connected with the city highways, metro and rail transport and form some kind of mobile streams in which the working representatives of this class move to get to their jobs in the city center or in industrial zones. The richer part of the population or the upper class has chosen as a place of privacy for suburban or extra-urban areas. Castells (2004) notes the crucial role of the city-region and, in general, the process of regionalization on a global scale “The construction of a range of service in European cities shows the increasing interdependence and complementarity between the average urban centers in the European Union. The relative importance of large city-region relations seems to be decreasing compared to that of relations that connect different cities from individual regions and countries” (Castells, 2004: 375).

From the examples given above, we can conclude that the phenomenon of the global city cannot be limited to a few urban clusters that are at the top of the hierarchy of urban or world city centers. On the contrary, it is a phenomenon of a process that links modern services, manufacturing centers and markets to a global network of varying intensity and on a different scale, depending on the relative importance of the activities localized in every region from the point of view of the global network. Within the territory of each country, the network structure is replicated in the form of regional and local centers that are indissolubly linked at a global level.
The economy is also globalizing and it is irrevocable. Its features are a rapid flow of information, capital and commodities. The big and the small markets are interdependent if the big economies are sick, the small economies are collapsing: The banks are in common networks, and human cannot figure out how dependent on what is happening for example on the Wall Street Stock, while accidentally, the company in which he works has gone bankrupt by its fallen shares on the stock exchange. Thus, entangled in the financial dependency network, which is entered with the credit card bank account, we can understand that we have bankruptcy – this is how the collapse of the financial markets, in seconds, becomes a personal, often psychic, collapse without wherever we are in the world.

The dependence on new forms of information movement gives immense power to those who are able to control them to control consumers. On the other hand, due to the processes of globalization, much of the poorer regions of the planet, as well as many peoples and states, are threatened to be isolated and feel redundant and even excluded from economic information networks and flows. This is also the difference between M. Castells’s perception (Castells, 2004) and the position of the British sociologist John Urry (Urry, 1999), according to which peripheral regions will be able to preserve and actively participate in the general flow of globalization through the “network”. According to Urry (1999), the global flows are rather shifting from the western part of the world to its southeast. Which of the two interpretations of the geo-prospects of the network society will be more relevant to reality, it will show the future. But it is a fact that, in the context of globalization, modern social space is increasingly becoming a network instead of its traditional hierarchical organization.

4. Extra-territorialization of individual human identity

Beck (2002) called “polygamy on the place” (Beck, 2002: 17-44), the process of extra-territorialization. The globalized social space is causing profound changes in the identity of modern man. How and why does the process of extra-territorialization, which affects the core of a human identity?

For modern man, his fixation in space, in the context of the “HERE”, referring to his own bitterness, is increasingly lacking in stability, in the sense of long-lasting staying and immobility in space. Globalizing man’s being as a place without a specific place created a person who decontextualizes his activities: he maintains fleeting relations with relatives, relatives, friends and/or neighbors, and at the same time intensively interacts with people who are strangers, strangers and too distant from him.

5. The risk as a major category of a globalized social space

Petrol from Iran, castoff computer from Japan in the roadside gully, the plane from New York departs two hours late because of the overflown air traffic at J. Kennedy, from which a plane takes off every minute. In fact, this is part of real globalization, which is as interesting as analysis as a scientific phenomenon, so sometimes it is painful as a presence in the reality of the real person. As the social space is globalized, the risks in it are globalizing. They arise at one point or another in this space, but because of its connectivity they resonate easily and unconditionally in all of them.

Beck (2001) is author of the term “global risk society”. “The risk is not harmed, it is an expectation, a guess, a calculation for damage. It is an expected state of events after a certain activity, the consequences of which would eventually be detrimental” (Beck, 2001: 8). Beck writes: “The risks, however, threaten with destruction. The risky discourse begins where trust in our security ends and ceases to be adequate at the time of the onset of the potential disaster” (Beck, 2001: 201).
Scott Lash refracts risk through the prism of “risky culture” (Lash, 2000: 47). The culture identified as a risky could be understood in the cultural context of the society in which the potential risk poses a risk. It is thought to be a state between security and destruction when the perception of impending risks determines the thinking and action of society and even of the individual. Our perception of risk involves the temporal constructs and states - past, present and future.

The concept of risk reverses the relationship between time structures. Its place as a reason for the experience and the action of today is occupied by the future, videlicet, from something non-existent, fictitious or projected. We think, we analyze uninformed fictions, our consciousness continues to constitute a possible existence. Human consciousness is set to “promote” the apocalyptic perspective or the possibility of realizing a risky situation that is just an assumption, such as the assumption of drastic changes in the climate and expectations for events that would occur in the natural and social world. On the other hand, today’s societies are trying to predict every event that could and should happen in social and personal space, to calculate it in time and place. The risk of confusion, failure or postponement of a particular event or condition causes discomfort and collapse in predicting the future, defining a negative attitude towards the expectation of the future. Koprinarov (2013) combines the initial perception of risk with the a priori experience of uncertainty or even fear. “Despite the changing contexts, into the root of the risk stands a mandatory quality of the situation which causes the awareness of risk – the need to make a decision with available uncertainty in the future” (Koprinarov, 2013: 97).

The existing risks – are fears, risks associated with the preservation of life from the complex social, emotional, natural and physical situations in which man/society falls. Existential risks are a relatively new phenomenon. This is also part of the reason we learn to distinguish them from other types of threats. We still do not have mechanisms – if only biological or cultural – to manage these risks. Our intuitions and strategies have been formed on the basis of our long-standing attempts to combat conventional threats such as dangerous animals, hostile individuals or tribes, poisonous food, car crashes, Chernobyl, volcanoes, earthquakes, the First World War and the Second World War, influenza epidemics, smallpox, plague, spin, etc. Disasters of this kind are commonplace, and in the course of their evolution, man has developed mechanisms – successful or not – to deal with them. The tragic outcome of such events relates to those directly affected by them, not to humanity as a whole. Even the most devastating of these crashes are like “wrinkles on the surface” (Bostrom, 2002) in the great sea of life. Wars, natural disasters and diseases affect an important person or a group of people, but in general the total amount of human suffering and happiness has no lasting effect on the fate of our species. Except for comet or asteroid-related earth-related collisions (an extremely rare event), they usually do not carry significant existential risks to man until the middle of the 20th century. “The first person to put humanity at risk is the inventor of the nuclear bomb. At that time, it was assumed that the explosion could come out of control and ignite the atmosphere. Although today we know that such a result is physically impossible, this assumption itself makes the risk of existential” (Bostrom, 2002: 4). For there to be a risk at a certain level of knowledge and understanding, it is sufficient to assume the possibility of destructive consequences, even if later it turns out that there really was no chance or danger of something bad, tragic or apocalyptic. When we are not sure if something is actually an objective risk factor for the whole, the probability of being a risk factor at least at a subjective level is great. Subjectivity, of course, is what underlies our decisions. At any moment we need to use our best subjective assessments of objective risk factors. Because subjectivity anticipates the possibility of crash or problem.

The existing risks threaten all people and the fight against them requires international efforts. The respect for national sovereignty is not a legitimate excuse “to refuse” to take countermeasures against great existential risk. If action is taken in the prospect of future generations, the damage caused by existential risks increases under the influence of another factor.
whether or not we calculate the future benefits. The geopolitical decisions taken today to work tomorrow are crucial to the future of the social space and the people living in it. Future risks globally are the fruit of our decisions for action we take today.

6. Segmentation and new boundaries in the global space

The globalization encompasses the world in a unified system, but it does not make it unproblematic and conflicts. It unites but also segmented the social space. Segmentation in the social space of modern societies has another reason – mass emigration. Emigration, this most massive manifestation of modern man’s mobility, is a factor that is caused by the dropping of some of the traditional frontiers around the world, but at the same time it is a factor that produces new boundaries. The problem is that the West is particularly attractive for mass emigration from the poor. There are millions of people coming to the rich West, who are most often holders of religious values and cultural traditions that differ sharply from those of the “local” population. Thus, the social space of these societies is highly segmented, with difficult boundaries between communities.

The mass mobility in the form of emigration flows most often leads to the emergence of new-type boundaries in modern societies: “The modern mobility is marked by a distinct antinomy: removing borders and at the same time generating other boundaries (both in the space of human coexistence and inside in man). Through its three major contemporary ingredients – mass tourism, migration and virtual surfing – mobility produces physical, social and cultural contacts with historically unprecedented scale. But at the same time, mobility drives this turbulent giant “mix” with strong conflict potential” (see Koprinarov, 2010a).

The concomitant living together of extremely different social groups is a difficult process. It very often and even inevitably leads to conflicts. Thus, globalization seemed to stir up the “spirits” of the political-religious-ideological doctrines that were at the root of human division and which seemed to have been “frozen” and “quenched” for a while. The problems arise from the fact that as a result of the great emigration mobility, life in rich globalized societies begins to acquire the character of life among foreigners. And this life turns out to be tangled with difficulties and conflicts. It often turns out that it is easiest to live tolerantly and confrontally, on both sides of a clearly marked line. Living in “cohabitation” is inevitably caused by difficulties, dramatic events, conflicts, but that does not mean that we should not seek common ways of dialogue and compromise.

The stranger is a person who for some reason is very different from the values of the society in which he resides. It is a person who lives in a parallel reality of presence and absence, of alienated presence in the social space of a society. The image of the alien is a generalizing characteristic and denotes any specific environment and space that is different from the acquaintances that place a particular social group in its development and history.

The social group generally appears to be a “closed society” type in which every outsider, everybody coming from outside, is a foreign element that is slowly admitted within the group (Schutz, 1999). Schutz (1999: 54) writes: “In every social group, at some point in its history, is appeared a stranger. The stranger is the bearer of the different, unknown”. The stranger is not a person in his own right, on the contrary he has very clear coordinates for where he’s gone. The clearest and specific thing the foreigner realizes is why he has left somewhere, not “a purposeless wandering hermit” (Schutz, 1999: 67). This awareness of the departure, departure, abandonment, even the attempt to erase the existence “before” and “there” in the previous group is experienced as a drama. This is the drama of the abyss of the lack of familiarity, of the fit to the stranger. Drama even from the fact that it no longer speaks its own language directly. On the other hand, today, the mobile person “successfully” overcomes the drama of the lack of the presence of “theirs” through virtual social networks, mobile telephony and the Internet. But this type of communication is
related to another drama about the personality - the inability to “touch” your interlocutor or the purely tactile feeling of lively presence.

When the stranger enters a foreign social group, he appears as a stranger, a stranger, the one who engages in a kind of invasion of the alien group or group. “Initially there is a common confusion and a rejection of the stranger to be accepted, then a gradual rearrangement of positions, relations and priorities within the group takes place, eventually leading to gradual normalization, calling with the position or positions.” (see Dichev, 2008). This peculiar experience of “intimacy and proximity” brings a stranger to the perpetual state of a guest, a “tourist,” to someone who is here, but perhaps for a while. According to Schutz (1999), the stranger is a disinterested spectator, just an observer on the stage, which is actually the social group. She joins her but does not belong to her.

Ivaylo Dichev (Dichev, 2008), in an article published in the e-journal Liberalen pregled (Liberal Review) identifies four phases through which the individual migrant passes before it can permanently settle in the foreign social group.

The normalization, however, is a long and difficult process because both the stranger and the group in which it integrates are carriers of group memory. In the history of the band there are so many things, memories, emotions, traditions, customs that in most cases remain very distant to an anonymous. Just as every human has his own personal story that communicates with the band as part of group history, the stranger tries to understand this story in part, but in most cases instinctively tries not to fit it completely. This peculiar experience of “intimacy and closeness” brings an anonymity to the perpetual state of a guest, a “tourist,” to someone who is here, but perhaps for a while. For Schutz (1999), the stranger is an uninterested viewer, just an observer on the stage, which is actually the social group – to which he joins but does not belong to it.

Dichev (Dichev, 2008) identifies four phases through which the individual immigrant passes before being able to settle permanently in the foreign social group.

The first phase is a “Dream”, which is an idealized image of the “foreign” place in the stories of people who to a certain extent have managed to realize their own social existence without any particular complications; or the fruit of the media presentation of the facts of the “other” reality. Consequently, it is most often that you are left to live, work, learn, or even just integrate into the completely unknown environment, it is not as easy as, for example, “go on a trip.” Dichev (2008) writes: “We did not encounter a case of a person who had previously tried to learn the language of the country where he would emigrate. Language preparation takes years and the decision to depart according to our stories is taken within the limits of the month” (see Dichev, 2008).

The second phase is a “Period of invisibility” - this is a period when the immigrant has not yet become part of a social group, has no social group space, is not yet the official “stranger”. He is an anonymous, silent observer of social processes (he does not pay taxes and insurances, he has no address registration, walks with a phrasing in his pocket, and makes naive attempts to learn the foreign language correctly). Anonymity sometimes does not end, even if the immigrant has started work. “The question is not just to survive, but to save money, and it is only with extra load. Social or labor rights are only for the locals, not for the newcomers who incite contempt with their obedience and undermining civil standards in the host country, from where the anti-immigrant sentiments” (see Dichev, 2008).

The third phase is an “Ambiguous Integration” – during this period of stay abroad the immigrant swings like a boat into “stormy waters”. This is the state, and the period in which, in principle, it is most clearly preserved in his mind as a possible end to the transition to legal naturalization, to the already well-known social space. On the other hand, during this period, the
purely psychic immigrant tries to preserve and retain his intact mobility, i.e. he leaves open the emotional door to return “back” to his home, acting in his mind as a firewall to be lean on hard times without being ready to go back home, although he clearly realizes that the place abroad will forever be and will remain a mobile territory to which the stranger will always be.

The fourth phase is a “Triumphant Return” – it does not always look like a prospect, but for those immigrants who have failed to find their way out for one reason or another, this is the most appropriate option. “At home” (see Dichev, 2008) – is initially experienced as a crisis or defeat, no matter even when the purpose of “outdoors” was simply financial migration – making money. Often, in the migrating / mobile person there is the feeling that he/she may have “gotten” more. There is a new moment of crisis – integration into the “old” community, the accustomed to previous habits, and the fact that man is forever “there” at some point on the border, between different realities. At the boundary of memories and images, of the lived and missed moments of one’s own life, a field of timelessness is formed in his mind which he will never again experience, but will always be up to date. This emptiness is also the immigrant’s drama – stranger. While in the above cases the immigrant’s situation is analyzed as a case study of the mobile person, Bauman finds the figure of the mobile person under other characteristics - as a “tourist”, “a wanderer” and a “neighbor” (Bauman, 1999: 201-208).

7. The mobile human

The world in which we live is a world of movement, a world in which everything is dynamic and often leaves in our minds the image of chaotic and disordered in our happenings. The world today is mobile, highly mobile. This peculiar definition of reality carries at least two meanings:

- On the one hand, “this” world is a world of continuous, rapid change. Perhaps the hallmark of this movement is the words of Toffler (1970: 7), who defined the life of modern man as a life in a permanent “shock of the future”, which brings renewal that makes it difficult human adaptation;

- On the other hand, Anthony Giddens (in co-authorship with Michael Duneier and Richard Appelbaum) illustrates the mobility of the modern world with the definition “If we imagine the whole history of mankind as one day, agriculture is invented at 23.56 hours, and civilizations – at 23.57. The development of modern societies begins only in 23 hours, 59 minutes and 30 seconds! Still, over the last thirty seconds of this “human day” perhaps more changes have occurred than all the time before them” (Giddens, Duneier & Appelbaum, 2011: 123). The dynamics of change in our times is so great that two “neighboring” generations live so differently as if they were living in different centuries.

But when our time is defined as a time of mobility, this designation is not only in a metaphorical sense. The modern world is mobile in both the transport and the direct meaning of the word - today people are as if they are constantly on wheels, on airports, on high-speed road or on electronic highways, and so on. Bauman says that the life ambitions of today’s man “Most often are expressed in the terms of mobility, freedom in choosing the place, traveling, exploring the world” (Bauman, 1999: 145).

However, tourism and occupational mobility are only one of the many dimensions of modern mobility. Meanwhile, millions of people emigrate from native places and countries to bring their lives to other parts of the planet. Each of these mobility trends produces dual effects - on the one hand, it leads to the mutual opening of the world, to the dropping of many of the traditional borders between states and people, but on the other it produces new frontiers and conflicts.
Bauman (1999) provides a good example of the human dimension of globalization, outlining the emerging new sociality among some modern people. He cites Agnes Heller (see Bauman, 1999), who in turn tells of a business woman who speaks five languages and has three apartments in three different places. “The type of culture in which it participates is not a culture of a certain place, it is the culture of time. This is the culture of the absolute present. Let’s accompany her on her constant journeys from Singapore to Hong Kong, London, New Hampshire, Tokyo, Prague, etc. She stays at the same Hilton hotel, eats the same lunch sandwiches, or if she eats Chinese food in Paris and French – in Hong Kong. It uses faxes, phones, computers, looks at the same movies and discusses the same problems with the same people” (Bauman, 1999: 114-115).

The contemporary man, though still not at the scale Bauman’s character (Bauman, 1999), is relieved of locality and of his “statehood”, gradually acquiring a cosmopolitan consciousness. In other words, a state of consciousness that challenges any territorial, national, state, or geographical confinement. Cosmopolitanism denotes the feeling of belonging to the world and the commitment to universal values. It is a sign of the moral maturity of mankind, overcoming the limitations and intolerance of such antipodes as racism, irrational patriotism and nationalism. The cosmopolitan personality is or, at least, is making ever more serious attempts to engage in human causes, while also enjoying deep respect and recognition for existing cultural practices. But it is also necessary to say that cosmopolitanism is eclectic in its own way: its forms of expression are constantly changing, as if without its own center, the cosmos of the cosmopolitan consciousness is a center which is in constant motion. At the same time, the cosmopolitan consciousness of man does not release him from calling them non-cosmopolitan attachments. Even cosmopolitan in spirit, individual human subjectivity will always be a carrier of specific characteristics derived from origin, from bio-anthropological affiliation, from value and moral specifics. But they are not leading. These specifics are rather the individual nuances in the richness of the cosmopolitan personality. The criticism of the global cosmopolitan community is that it is not enough to simply be imagined and propagated by the various calves, info and mass media. And it is necessary for mankind to put the strong foundations of wider political unions, to embrace more and more diverse types of cultural communities. This criticism is reasonable.

Indeed, the process of cosmopolitanism is in its beginnings, but in general it is irreversible in its idea. This process is and will be accompanied by inevitable contradictions and difficulties coming from different directions. There are many problems that will be encountered and which must be overcome. Some of them are the following: the post-nationalist movements and the confrontation in the social communities implanted by them; ethnic xenophobia; historical prejudices that are remnants of distant ages in the consciousness of people living in the 21st century.

Along with all the challenges (positive and negative) arising from globalization, which change people’s way of life, with a history that is unknown in history so far, this dynamism first reflects on the human soul. It turns out that globalization, mobility, the dynamics of time, as they are subjected to sociological or philosophical analysis, are so much the subject of psychology. Today we talk about mental disorders such as anxiety, panic, depression, etc., which show how uncertain the modern man is from this dynamically changing setting around him. A person now lives in a compressed time, often having to perform several operations – for example, by talking on the mobile phone to search for information on the Internet and at the same time often reading in a foreign language by considering the information he reads. All of this is extremely heavy on our minds. Such accumulated over-fatigue and over-stress have led to the creation of a concept like burnout.
8. The mobility – Theme and paradigm of social knowledge

The mobile person becomes more and more important as a topic of modern social research. In connection with its study, specialized academic centers are created, scientific journals are published, congresses are held. At the same time, mobility is beginning to impose a new paradigm in the social sciences. One of its first authors is the well-known British sociologist John Urry (Urry, 1999). Urry considers it necessary to formulate such a paradigm because, in his view, the mobile person with his continuous spatial mobility modeled and modified modern societies so that they became difficult to reason in the framework of the present paradigm. Urry believes that any attempt to analyze or study globalization and global change is the same as analyzing and exploring “mobilities” and “mobility” (Urry, 1999: 49), which “are the basis of social life and should be the basis of sociological analysis” (Ibid.: 49). The author believes that previous sociology has neglected people’s “mobility”, such as compactness or mass, as well as autonomy or “self-mobility” (Urry, 1999; 49). This lack of interest in the prior sociology of an autonomous personality could be explained by the lack of unregistered, important social personal interactions. Still, this new mobile person lives in some societies that are less likely to “reshape”, so Urry (1999) allows himself to continue to use traditional concepts and ideas for the civil society. But the image of this society through his gaze is more refined. The difference, he says, is that: on the one hand, this society allows for a greater and more easily achievable opportunity for political change as well as for more active participation of the autonomous mobile individual and his influence on real politics; and to release from the sphere of state control and to create a kind of mobile technological social control from or through “mobilities” or through all those new boundaries and dependencies that originate from them. The latter are new forms of habiting man and the space around him from: a light car that radically changes the social spatial human being, through the media (mobile or virtual) to ideas, possessions and information, as well as the resources needed for their production, and then for their exploitation. These nobilities form the need for the already mentioned new paradigm for social research.

This, so to speak, a new “sociology beyond the enduring societies” (Urry, 1999: 10) through the “mobilities” (Ibid.: 49) broadens the latest debates on the globalization and theorizing for and on the modern way of life. By providing analysis, it is revealed how mobilities rebuild social life in terms of inequalities in it (inequalities that arose from the difference in time, space, space, objects, etc., in terms of travel, changes in their ideas, images, messages, waste products and money across international borders, as well as the consequences of these mobilities, which we will have to break through our experience gained over time, space, our way of living, or Ignorance us). The changes that globalization has brought about in our societies have led to “Dismissing the roles of the traditional definitions of the notion society - it is increasingly difficult to give some static definition of it” (Urry, 1999: 15).

The societies increasingly need to be characterized by flexible expressions such as: organic, functional, integrating and reproducing entities. And what imposes these flexible terms is the dramatic increase in the flow of trans-and over-national forms of associations, so the traditional notion of society becomes even less plausible. What then happens with regard to the function of sociology, since it is the science that can best answer the question of what is happening to human sociability? For Urry (1999: 7), this is the challenge to the new sociology. It offers a peculiar manifesto to create a scientific social paradigm for the study of what is emerging as “post-society”. The mechanism, and perhaps the language in which we can read the coordinates of this “post-society,” are the so-called “metaphors” (Urry, 1999: 10). Urry argues that some metaphors are “scientific” (Urry, 1999: 29) more useful than others. He intends to overcome the static and centered concept of “society” more useful than others. He intends to overcome the static and centered concept of “society” (Urry, 1999: 29) with the help of metaphors indicating different forms of mobility. The metaphors developed in the theory of J. Urry reflect the movement not only of humans but also of “non-human hybrids” (Urry, 1999: 29): for example, “information,
commodities, even the crises” (Urry, 1999: 30). The most important of these mobile metaphors in Urry’s project are “networks, streams and periphery” (Urry, 1999: 32). It can be said that Urry is the first since Castells (Castells, 2004), a social thinker who shows that thinking through concepts like “network” (Urry, 1999: 32), provides a number of advantages over large structure ideas that are more centralized and less flexible than networks themselves. These networks “produce” and are derived from complicated and long-lasting connections that pass through space and time between peoples and “things” (Urry, 1999: 34).

The flow of people, money, information, commodities, crises, etc. are “moving”, “entering” and “coming in” (Kingsley & Urry, 2009: 64) in the social landscape, “travel” (Kingsley & Urry, 2009: 64) inside and outside the societies.

In Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty. J. Urry (Urry, 1999) uses these (and other) mobile metaphors to address various issues related to travel, senses, time, housing, citizenship, etc. The common thing here is that there is a constantly changing worldview. Urry gives considerable room to explore the means for human mobility, highlighting the extremely important “role of the vehicle” (Urry, 2009: 98). Unlike all other times, in the modern age man can rely on fast-moving vehicles – trains, planes, cars, etc. As if they allow a person to live a little longer, saving him from time to carry your own body from point A to point B at a faster speed. It would not have happened to the same degree of security, speed, possibility of carrying additional luggage if the man relied solely on his own strength. Vehicles are at the root of modern human mobility by reducing the lost in ineffective times that man can carry himself “here” and “there” into space. At the same time, they expand and divide social spaces, making them more accessible and unlimited. Moving through social space, labor, or any other kind of human activity is about ‘staying’ or living in a place. The idea for “housing” (Kingsley & Urry, 2009: 67) is somewhat close to that of Martin Heidegger (Heidegger, 2010). As far as the dwelling is a place in which “the man remains, he finds himself and manifests himself freely, without any worries, his own intimacy” (Heidegger, 2010: 20) or expresses and feels comfortable – “the dwelling is a kind of human continuation” (Ibid.: 20).

Urry and Kingsley (Kingsley & Urry, 2009) point to the following problematic processes that will disturb the future of our mobile societies: global warming and the global consequences of it; oil supply problems, as well as the distribution of spheres of influence over it in the future; enhancing digitization in many different aspects of economic and social life as well as problems surrounding the recycling of unnecessary electrical products; massive population growth in the world, etc.

The theory of Urry has had a serious criticism lately. A debate in his theory provokes the theses related to the idea of “forming a new paradigm” (Urry, 1999: 5), with which to explore the social space in the conditions of accelerated and mass mobility. According to Andrew McKinnon and Marta Trzebiatowska (2014: 67), Urry has not sufficiently clarified what these post-societies will be beyond the static. McKinnon and Trzebiatowska are analyzing Urry’s Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the Twenty, and wrote: “In discussing travelers, John Urry (Kingsley & Urry, 2009) makes a significant analysis of tourists, traveler and tourists, but without valid reason refuses to theorize the various types of “forced” migration that causes at least 150 million migrants worldwide” (McKinnon & Trzebiatowska, 2014: 69).

On the other hand, part of the comparisons that Urry makes purely social, using examples of mobiles such as “marching soldiers”, “fighter jets” (Urry, 1999: in McKinnon & Trzebiatowska, 2014) should not be used as the key moves themselves, “They would sooner rather than be” launching a missile ” (Urry, 1999: 79) are social activities or activities” (McKinnon & Trzebiatowska, 2014: 75).

In other words, it could be said that Urry presents a peculiar manifesto of a sociology adapted to the 21st century, using as an example the mobilities that the 20th century people used.
McKinnon and Trzebiatowska (2014) also criticize the lack of a clear statement, which is only implied by Urry (1999) regarding the movement of cash flows in the global financial system. And the latter is certainly one of the most dramatic and important spheres in the post-social space of global societies. Irrespective of the critique of Urry’s theoretical platform, it is a good incentive for activating search in modern social theory. The mobility of man in the age of globalization becomes a factor that will increasingly change the characteristics of social space and, with it, the structure of society. The scientific toolkit, which has worked well in a relatively sustainable society, will become increasingly inefficient in view of the ongoing and deepening changes due to the increasing mobility of modern human.

9. Conclusion and discussion

The theme of a globalization as a process causing drastic changes on human beings is up to date, controversial and problematic. The term “Global Problems of Human” is increasingly used. These global problems to or in front of the mobile are happening in social spaces, the most dramatic ones being:

- Climate change, climatic cataclysms and environmental problems – climate migration;
- Increasing the population of the planet and reducing natural resources, a problem feeding the population of the planet.

It is difficult to find definite solutions to the problems that arise now and in the future. Many of these problems are unknown to this extent for which humanity has not had any practical experience so far. For example, climate change and the natural disasters caused by them, which are yet to generate huge migratory waves, give rise to both political, legal and economic as well as psychological, cultural and educational issues. For example, questions such as:

The climate Migrants. To what extent are the social spaces of some countries ready to accept unreservedly the citizens of social spaces to other possessed? With the climate change and the climate migration, is it possible in the future to talk about state borders? How much globalization can the human soul suffer?

10. General conclusions

The article presented an analysis of the reminiscences of a globalization on the life of a modern human. How the structure and characteristics of the social space have changed under the influence of a globalization; how human has become a totally mobile or mobile object. In conclusion, we could summarize. The social space has been dramatically changed under the influence of a globalization. The latter creates the conditions and gives a chance to the unknown mobility human so far. But alongside this, in equally unknown scale, it produces random occupations that are the source of alienation among people. The globalization ruins many of the boundaries typical of traditional societies. But it also ruins the limits of the risks, forcing the modern human to live in a society that is labeled with global risks. From the point of view of its anthropological implications, globalization cannot be judged by the terms of comfort or apocalypse.
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