Social Philosophy

Социальная философия

Research Article / Научная статья

Utopian Consciousness: an Anthropological Universal and a Socio-Cultural Construct

Elena V. Zolotukhina-Abolina [iD] ✉

Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia
✉elena_zolotuhina@mail.ru

Abstract. The research is devoted to the status and role of utopian consciousness in society and culture. The author believes that the utopian component is inherent in any human goal-setting and design. A project is the result of dissatisfaction with the current reality; it carries within itself a desire for change, radical restructuring, but at first a person is dominated by desire and an as yet unformed image – both the goal and the path to its implementation. Therefore, the first phase of design is always utopian. In sociocultural design, this is the "image of paradise", which only later develops into realistic plans and selection of funds, taking into account circumstances. However, the utopian component as an ideal remains an inspiring moment with a clear distinction between ideal and reality. Utopian consciousness acquires the features of an illusion when the ideal is transferred to specific actual space and time. Then people try to either "move" to Eden, or transport it to themselves, or quickly realize it, in a hurry and getting tired. In the first case, one's own "project for the best" is abandoned; in the second, one tries to implement one's own project without taking into account real possibilities. In both cases, disappointment follows due to the lack of realism. The study also analyzes utopian consciousness as a social construct created by influential social groups to realize their interests. This construct is spread through the media. The author believes that ideologies, including those produced by existing power, are always at the same time utopias for the masses. Two powerful modern utopias are briefly examined – globalist-technocratic and conservative-archaic, noting their unrealistic nature, leading to subsequent disappointments.

Keywords: utopia, ideology, fantasy, realism

Утопическое сознание: антропологическая универсалия и социокультурный конструкт

Е.В. Золотухина-Аболина ⓘ ✉

Южный федеральный университет, Ростов-на-Дону, Россия
✉elena_zolotuhina@mail.ru

Аннотация. Исследование посвящено статусу и роли утопического сознания в социуме и культуре. Автор полагает, что утопический компонент присущ любому человеческому целеполаганию и проектированию. Проект – результат недовольства наличной реальностью, он несет в себе стремление к переменам, радикальным перестройкам, но на первых порах в человеке доминирует желание и еще не оформленный образ – как цели, так и пути ее реализации. Поэтому первая фаза проектирования всегда утопична. В социокультурном проектировании это «образ Эдема», который лишь позже перерастает в реалистичные планы и подбор средств, в учет обстоятельств. Однако утопическая составная в качестве идеала остается вдохновляющим моментом при четком различении идеала и реальности. Утопическое сознание обретает черты иллюзорного, когда идеал переносится в конкретное действительное пространство и время. Тогда люди пытаются либо «переехать» в Эдем, либо перевезти его к себе, либо стремительно его реализовать, спеша и утомляясь. В первом случае происходит отказ от собственного «проекта лучшего», во втором собственный проект пытаются выполнить без учета реальных возможностей. В обоих случаях в силу отсутствия реализма следует разочарование. В исследовании также анализируется утопическое сознание как социальный конструкт, создаваемый влиятельными социальными группами для реализации своих интересов. Этот конструкт распространяется с помощью СМИ. Автор полагает, что идеологии, в том числе производимые наличной властью, всегда одновременно являются утопиями для масс. Коротко рассматриваются две мощные современные утопии – глобалистско-технократическая и консервативно-архаическая, отмечается их нереалистический характер, ведущий к последующим разочарованиям.

Ключевые слова: утопия, идеология, фантазия, реалистичность

Introduction

The article's topic is utopian consciousness. The question concerning the author is the status and role of such consciousness in human life, society, and culture. The term "utopia" has long existed, following Thomas More's work *Utopia* (1516). From More's point of view, it describes an ideal society where there is no exploitation of people, and equality and well-being prevail. Derived from the book's title, the term "utopian" has acquired an independent meaning and, in most cases, is read as "desirable" but "unfulfilled" or "unattainable," for instance, in the expression "utopian fantasies." In the genre of utopia/anti-utopia, where utopia is desirable and dystopia is a frightening, undesirable future, many multi-genre works have been and are being written. At the same time, from the middle of the twentieth century to the present day, utopian ideas have been more inherent in publicist literature, while dystopia has become the field of creativity of fiction writers, screenwriters, and directors, apparently because horrors are always more vivid than prosperity. The theme of utopian consciousness in all its forms is connected with the theme of realistic consciousness. In our mediatized age, when a vast number of various alluring and enticing images, models, mottos, and slogans bombard every person daily, the problem of utopia becomes especially acute: how can we, both individuals and society, seek a realistic and not an illusory path? I will not answer such a question in this article, but I will at least try to understand the concepts.

The analysis of the philosophical and literary genre of utopia is present in the works of many authors, among them F. Ainsa [1], E.A. Arab-Oglu [2], E.Y. Batalov [3], E. Bloch [4], M. Lasky [5], K. Mannheim [6], G. Marcuse [7], T.S. Paniotova [8] and others. In the late 90s – early 2000s, a number of dissertations on the topic of utopia and utopian consciousness were defended: V.V. Kondratiev [9], E.O. Gavrilov [10], etc., there are also works relatively recent, for example, G.D. Leontiev [11]. If we summarize researchers' opinions, the utopian consciousness is understood, first, as a type of *social dreaming*, which can be considered a widespread but *private* expression of thinking about the fate of a particular society or humanity in general. Second, a type of *social modeling* of a somewhat abstract nature, but necessarily radically rejecting the present state. At the same time, despite the curtsies and reservations, the term *utopian* carries a considerable negative connotation, associations with something vain and unrealistic.

Let us see what positive and what harmful content the conceptualization of reality, to which the term "utopian" can be applied, carries.

The Utopian Project is an Anthropological Universal

I believe any *human project*, any social or individual aspiration to see an image of a desirable future, contains utopian features. In this sense, "personal utopias" and social utopias exist. Any goal-setting and projecting in the *first phase* of its emergence acts as a *utopian* project simply because a person is powerfully attracted by the desire to change the present situation. He wants to change his present position in the world to another, more satisfying one. This is why *negation* is always present here. Despite the participation of the dialectical moment, which preserves the connection with the previous stage, it is necessarily a *parting* with what "is now." But the future is still vague. It is thought of as "simply better." A detailed criticism of today, now rejected, may or may not be present. It does not matter. What is important is the very insistent need for change, which is not only expected but also wanted to happen, and one investigates the image of the best, beginning to *extract it from uncertainty*. The first moment of this extraction is precise "*otherness*," the *opposite* of what does not suit us today.

This is undoubtedly not about those programmed stages of human life when an individual, according to the accepted order, passes from one state to another, for instance, from study to work. It is about those situations when challenges come from life or from activity that force a change from an *exhausted attitude to another*. The contours of this "other" are not yet precise. Thus, any personal and social projects begin with a grasp of the "radical other," and it is accompanied by an *extended fantasy* of "how things will be," imaginary pictures of a better future to be achieved and which, of course, *will be fully implemented* to our satisfaction. In the first phase of the impulse to the future, the very *way* of achieving what we want is *often omitted*; the steps and efforts, the technology that should lead to the desired "better state," are not yet visible. The future appears to us as a happy and *inspiring picture*, as if the path has been traveled and what we have planned has been accomplished. Everything wrong has been left behind. And this yet-to-become future turns out to be desirable and *necessary* because *people should be happy*.

This is what a "utopian project" looks like: the first, energetically charged, stimulating phase of *any project*. These points are expected to social thinkers and ordinary people alike. Thus, young Marx, in his early works, builds his concept of future communism, directly denying the main characteristics of bourgeois society and glorifying the man who "creates according to any standards, including the laws of beauty" and only in later works, in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, in *Capital*, he will begin to think about the justification of his projects, and about the political forms of their realization. In the same way, a girl, tired of her parents' instructions, projects that she will get married and "then everything will be different," draws images of her family idyll, not yet knowing what kind of

fiancé she will have, where he will come from, and how exactly she will get along with him. However, things *must change drastically to be good*!

The "utopian projecting" phase is replaced by a natural phase of more *realistic* planning and strategizing to achieve desired results. The roots of the situation, the connection with the past, the complexity of circumstances, and the factors that hinder the realization of what is planned are being considered. However, it is worth emphasizing, without an enthusiastic and abstract period, when thinking and behavior are seized by the impulse to improve the state of affairs and spoil themselves with images of this "as if already available" perfection, no movement forward, to the natural improvement of the situation, is possible. The subsequent efforts based on common sense, patience, persistence, and risk *will continue to feed on the positive picture that was initially presented*. Indeed, it will be corrected, correlated with reality, adjusted, and rebuilt, but a person will retain the initial impulse for the sake of which everything began. Applying to difficult social and life circumstances and making amendments to the project being executed, a person will reflect on the original picture as an ideal, which, like a horizon line, is "always ahead." He will distinguish *between the ideal and reality*, although he will not separate them. Any realistic project conception that seeks to relate as much as possible to present circumstances sees the inevitable gap between reality and the ideal, current events, and the values we try to bring to life as much as possible. The first utopian impulse that takes the form of a realized ideal is a wise and sensible approach to life and activity because the dominance of nihilism, cynicism, despondency, and depression, as well as the tragic experience characteristic of *dystopia*, cannot lead not only to a "beautiful future" but to any future at all.

Types of Utopian Illusions:
A Borrowed Paradise and a Soon-to-Be Paradise

But it happens often that people, social groups, and political figures *stop at the first utopian phase of the project's design*. This is especially characteristic of those whose Utopia *seems to exist in reality but in another place*, like the Garden of Eden of delights in the Middle Ages, which was placed in the East behind the wall of fire [12]. The conviction that there is some "better world" right in our space-time makes us *stop our search for ways to reach it*. It is easier to move directly to the "islands of bliss" or to follow their example. Thus, one's personal, original project is discarded as obviously unnecessary. It is only requisite to leave imperfect edges or walk in someone else's shoes. Or one may transplant someone else's culture into one's soil, which will blossom wonderfully. The historical drama of Peter the Great was, in my opinion, that, wishing to strengthen and develop Russia, he planted adoration of foreign culture with fire and sword, and his efforts, on the one hand, gave a powerful military and technical-technological

effect, but, on the other, created that complex of national inferiority, with which "Russian intelligentsia" was permanently ill until very recently. Paradise is always elsewhere!

The utopia of "someone else's best" is very strong – it is fraught with a rejection of oneself and forces one to follow extraneous molds. So recently, many of our compatriots sincerely believed that the Garden of Eden would embrace us if we "join the civilized global community.".... Since there is an ontological gap between the state of affairs "here" and the "idealized there" in utopian behavior it is overcome by an attempt to follow someone else's being rather than one's own, and the result is a kind of unsustainable eclecticism – neither one's own nor someone else's. "Utopian," as Karl Mannheim writes, "is that consciousness which doesn't conform to the surrounding "being." This inconsistency is always manifested in the fact that such consciousness lies in experience. Thinking and activity are oriented to factors that are not contained in this 'being'" [6. P. 164]. On the theme of the inconsistency of the utopian dream of "becoming not self" back in the late 1990s, Andrei Parshev's book *Why Russia is not America* was published [13].

Nevertheless, you do not have to try to bring Paradise home from elsewhere. One can move to it because the soil at home is unsuitable. Utopian dreams of Western countries as a field of limitless opportunities for everyone were embraced from the 1960s to the 1980s by quite broad circles of Soviet citizens. Romantic jeans, the Beatles, and chewing gum beckoned with possible dizzying prospects. As before, the Garden of Eden was surrounded by a ring of fire – this time, the ring of political travel ban. The forbidden fruit phenomenon fired the imagination, but few people could, in fact, "Escape to Paradise." It is evident, however, that the meeting of emigrants with the harsh reality of developed but not always hospitable countries often destroyed hopes and was fraught with disappointment, which we can see at least in the fate of Alexander Zinoviev [14] or Eduard Limonov [15], who reflected the fact of the collapse of their illusions in their literary and journalistic work.

However, there is another version of *utopian consciousness*, which we also see in the history of the Soviet Union. In this case, the beautiful country of Utopia is located not in space *but in time*. It does not yet exist anywhere in reality. It has to be independently designed and persistently execute what has been conceived, working for years and decades so that new, just, humane relations replace the rejected old ones. The old rules and laws have been destroyed and denied, and the consciousness of the builders of the new life must powerfully rush into the future. Mannheim considered such consciousness utopian, linking utopia with the desire to "explode" the existing order of things. It implies active, creative behavior aimed at changing the current state.

Let us return to Russia's history. Up until the early 1980s, our country was living poorly, restoring what had been destroyed by the war, and experiencing economic and political difficulties. Yet, the majority of the people *made active efforts* to "bring communism closer," which was not considered a utopia at all but was seen as a very particular task. The strengthening of military power and the conquest of space greatly supported the positive mood of the masses. Communist ideas were indeed good and attractive.[1] – material benefits that would flow in fully, from each according to his ability to each according to his need, and the all-round development of the individual. Even with an inevitable reduction of the beautiful image, the replacement of communism by developed socialism with its friendship of peoples and the endowment of everyone with benefits "according to their labor" was accepted positively.

The country seemed to be moving towards the goal step by step, refining the current tasks. Yet the whole point is that, on the one hand, the *deadlines* set for the coming communism, which was not removed from the agenda, *were utopian*. On the other hand, the *dictates of the party bureaucracy and the failures of economic policy* made it increasingly less possible to hope for a personal speedy meeting with the beautiful future. In 1980, when instead of the promised communism, "the Olympics came," people were already quipping and joking in full force, and this was an expression of disappointment and a sense of being deceived in their expectations. "We tried our best! And nothing happened!" However, in the depths of the party elite, *a new utopia was already maturing* – the utopia of a strong "friendship with the civilized West" and entry into the world community. This utopia took more than ten years to take hold of the leadership and the masses. Heads were dizzy with the approach of a new version of Paradise, and then the hangover of the same masses was bitter.

Utopian consciousness, when it goes beyond "orientation to the ideal," is always *fraught with subsequent disillusionment*. It is stimulating and inspiring only as the first phase of a project, including when it is expressed in a fairy tale, a painting, a poem, a treatise, or a declaration.

Utopian Consciousness is the Result of Socio-Cultural Construction

A particular problem is the *conscious, purposeful construction of utopias and utopian consciousness*. The universal tendency to look for one's "Utopia" somewhere on the world map or to want to create it quickly is a feature of both individuals and everyday mass consciousness. Yet, it is used, exploited, and reproduced by *ruling elites, parties, and opinion leaders* who develop utopias and introduce them into public consciousness. Of course, in most cases, they do it not

---

[1] Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). Adopted by the XXII Congress of the CPSU. Available from: https://leftinmsu.narod.ru/polit_files/books/III_program_KPSS_files/062.htm (accessed: 01.02.2024).

СОЦИАЛЬНАЯ ФИЛОСОФИЯ

disinterestedly, but since such implementation, they receive huge profits and strengthen their positions of power. This has always been the case, but in the late 20th and 21st centuries, new opportunities for such widespread implementation have emerged. The mass media has become a powerful tool for implementing particular views, forming beliefs, and creating a picture of the world. The power structures of developed countries began to manipulate the fantasies of their compatriots and those of the inhabitants of other countries most thoroughly since information technologies provided practical tools for this purpose.

It should be emphasized that I do not fully agree with my respected Karl Mannheim on the fundamental difference between ideology and utopia, where ideology is a worldview model of ruling groups, and utopia is a set of ideas of those who wish to come to power themselves. I believe that *any ideology* understood as a set of values and goals offered to society and declared as a fundamental project *already bears the features of utopia* since it convinces the masses, first, of the *grace* of this project for "all good citizens"; second, promises the *speedy realization* of this just social grace. Ideologists do not say, "We offer you a number of ideals to which you will have to walk a hundred miles through the dark woods, and in the meantime, you will have to work in sweat and suffer." Any political elite, rising to the state and now transnational Olympus, wants to instill the *utopia of soon-to-be happiness* in the groups on which it relies. Another question is what kind of happiness. In this respect, perhaps only the early Bolsheviks were different, who proclaimed sacrifice for the triumph of future generations; however, history has evidenced that after a generation or two, the idea of sacrifice ceases to be attractive. Hence, the problem of "transition to another utopia," which was more accessible for the ruling groups of the USSR than trying to build a *realistic and inspiring* project for the development of Russia and the peoples it united around it.

Any ideology, especially one represented by literary works, movies, TV shows, or performances of popular singers and actors promoted by famous TV presenters, draws based on specific stories, impressive narratives, entertaining spectacles, a *utopian image of an utterly social system* where good necessarily defeats evil, where every "worthy citizen" necessarily defeats his opponents and becomes happy. Happy is he, who is a result of his adherence to the *very ideological vision of the world* for which he is ready to fight. It should be noted that ideology-utopia, based on the study of public opinion, considering the desires of people and trying to please them, is constructed in such a way that it turns out to be both *morally correct (preaches the proper)* and creates in the recipients a *sense of their importance, and even – ultimately – superiority*. A person thoroughly imbued with the ideas of the ideal-utopian picture of the world feels superior to those who profess other views because he knows precisely the only

correct approach to reality! Of course, it does not often come to whole fanaticism, but ideological disputes to the point of a fight are not uncommon either.

Let's glance at what ideologies are very influential today, acting simultaneously as *utopia projects widely embedded in the masses*. The moment of construction is also the *"setting of fashion" for specific views*, which in the post-industrial information world is often supported by a set of ritual moments, a particular type of clothing, tattoos, slogans, slogans, memes – the market nature of social relations allows us to instantly produce all the necessary entourage for the best introduction of utopian attitudes into everyday consciousness.

In the pages of this short article, I will not delve into disputes about the typology of ideology-utopias; I will offer the reader two generalized images. The first utopia, clearly constructed by economists, philosophers, and sociologists in the United States and Europe, discussed on websites and blogs, and heard in political polemics from television screens, is the *globalist-technocratic utopia*. It is, in general, historically born out of the *neoliberal project*. Yet, it transforms it by abandoning many of the values that had been revered as guiding values in the previous two centuries. The neoliberal project, philosophically substantiated by Karl Popper, actually assumed the necessity of the absence of any long-term social project. However, it was simply a project of infinitely long reproduction of the current economic and political situation, expressed in Francis Fukuyama's famous *The End of History and the Last Man* [16]. However, the social dynamics turned out to be so high that the utopia of "the absence of projects" was replaced by the concept of globalism.

The globalist-technocratic project is often associated with the Davos Forum and the name of economist Klaus Schwab. Schwab's texts [17], devoted to the fourth industrial revolution and new technologies, are written in a rationalistic and soft manner, with all the traditional humanist euphemisms, they speak of a new stage of capitalism – "inclusive capitalism," or "capitalism of all stakeholders." However, the author offers an iron fist in a velvet glove. In oral interviews, he is more relaxed and candid. Thus, in November 2015, Klaus Schwab gave an interview with the famous American journalist Charlie Rose, stating the following: "And you see the difference of the fourth industrial revolution is it doesn't change what you are doing, it changes you. If you take genetic editing just as an example, it's you who are changed. And, of course, this has a big impact on your identity. The new industrial revolution offers us many opportunities, raising manifold questions about the ethical and legal implications, and we have to be prepared for it."[2]

---

[2] Bio-eco-techno-fascism: a new social order as envisioned by Klaus Schwab. Available from: https://sozero.livejournal.com/8665345.html (accessed: 01.02.2024).

СОЦИАЛЬНАЯ ФИЛОСОФИЯ

Ultimately, those are no longer Schwab's words but the decisions that are being made by international organizations that are following in the U.S.'s footsteps, that are orienting people's minds toward such "good prospects" as:

1. States have disappeared as historically earlier forms of organization of social life and transition to a "global world" led by a "world government" based on transnational corporations, unifying lifestyle and culture.

2. Actual abolition of private property, mass use of various types of rent.

3. The disappearance of the "middle class" and the division of humanity into a narrow ruling elite that distributes benefits and the rest of humanity.

4. Population reduction to "save nature" and transition to the use of insecticides in food.

5. People are displaced from the production process by "smart machines," robots, and neural networks, and they transition to paying "unconditional basic income."

6. Introduction into the human body of numerous chips that control behavior and thinking and are connected with the world information networks.

7. Eliminating two natural sexes and orientation to "multiple genders."

8. Disappearance of religion.

Such an image of the future is widely advertised as an ideal and a "way to save the ecosystem" within the "green agenda," and it should be said that, according to many data, European young people share a very positive attitude toward such a project, believing it to be both rational and noble. However, the project is undoubtedly utopian for many reasons. First of all, the absolute majority of the world's people have no desire to give up their identity, culture, religion, and state, just as their elites have no such desire. People do not want to eat artificial food, to be idle and poor beggars, and the consequences of the introduction of chips still need to be discovered. Besides, they threaten the loss of free will. These are somewhat subjective factors, and there are also objective factors, in connection with which no artificial intelligence will be able to control such a global system of economy and culture, especially since "artificial intelligence" is not intelligence per se but just a more complex computer system programmed by specific people. It is interesting that, on some points, the ideas born by the post-liberal economic elite of the West coincide with communist ideas, such as the idea of no private property and no world government. We can read this in Ivan Yefremov's famous utopian sci-fi novel *Andromeda: A Space-Age Tale* [18]. However, the meaning of "utopian situation" is quite different for communists and globalists. In the Soviet utopia, people lived abundantly, gave birth to children, everyone worked creatively, and no privileged narrow elite ruled over everything. The composition of the leadership was constantly changing. In the globalist model, everything is exactly the opposite. Yet, the widespread propaganda of this utopia achieves its goals – it forms a mass consciousness that

wants to go to an "ecological-technocratic paradise." In Russia, the utopia of "inclusive capitalism" is considered a dystopia and harmful activity [19].

Another utopia, opposite to the previous one, can be called *conservative-archaic*. It is a situation where the "soon-to-be Paradise" must be somehow *transported from the past*. The personality types peculiar to it should be recruited from the same place. This kind of utopia is characteristic of many countries; a variant of romantic reading of archaic, mainly, can be found in Martin Heidegger [20]. In modern Russia, this type of utopia is developed partly by church-monarchical circles and partly by the followers of René Guénon's traditionalism. The standard for this kind of utopia, which acts as a morally correct and positive model of the desired society, is *the Middle Ages*.

That kind of utopia presupposes:

1. A return to monarchy and class society, where each person is engaged in a specific craft within the family tradition.

2. Reunification of the state and the church, where the church and its hierarchs play the role of spiritual guides and practical guidance of secular power, perform the role of "sacral guidance."

3. Deindustrialization, i.e., dismantling modern high-tech industry, curtailment of secular science, transition to an agrarian economy, deurbanization, and mass introduction of a rural lifestyle.

4. Restoration of a large family on the model of ancient Rus with patriarchal relations, the authority of the father, and the termination of the theme of "women's career" because in real large families, a career is possible only in exceptional cases.

5. Rejection of Darwin's theory of evolution, of scientific and secular views, the establishment of mass compulsory religiosity, and the displacement of secular arts.

6. Humanitarian thought concentrates mainly on national history and culture, contacts with foreign colleagues are narrowed, and ideological "self-locking" occurs.

All the above should lead to high morality and spiritual enlightenment, where the fatherland, associated with God and the king, becomes sacred under religious faith.

The conservative-archaic view at the beginning of the 1990s was vividly expressed in the first issue of the *Sweet Angel* magazine, which set forth the views of traditionalism. In particular, it said: "The third level of the Restoration of Tradition is the restoration of the class hierarchy. If some religious traditions (particularly Christianity, Islam, and Buddhism) do not speak explicitly about the necessity of social hierarchy, then in practice, where these traditions won at the social level, the class caste hierarchy was still entirely preserved, changing only

its ideological specificity."[3] The magazine also speaks of the Church as the supreme authority of the Anointed Monarch and the need to eliminate secular arts. This set of ideas often does not take the form of an officially published text but exists perfectly well in a personal narrative – a conversation, a sermon, a teaching.

It is evident that this is a utopia, and the one no less dangerous than the desire to turn everyone into cyborgs and transgender people. This is the "other extreme," which also has little correlation with factual circumstances and in no way considers the living people's interests, hopes, tastes, and habits. Let us flee from the contradictions of present life to the centuries long gone by! Let us revive the dead economic system! We should remember that this utopia, like globalist fantasies, does not contain the idea of *justice and human development*. There needs to be a detailed discussion about the nature of the property. The property is feudal, but it is not clear whether the newly formed peasantry should be serfs or not. Should it be able to read, or is it superfluous?

Nevertheless, such utopian ideas are *romanticized and preached*, in some ways converging with the "green ecological agenda." Of course, we would like to ask the proponents of archaization how they intend to preserve the country, which is inevitably included in technical, economic, and military competition with other countries and associations. Or should it, having become "agrarian and spiritual," fall under the blows of foreign weapons, which are being improved daily? We need to recognize globalism as a principle of world government to understand that the existing technical development has united the planet and permeated all corners of the globe with numerous ties and relations.

The problem for contemporary humankind is avoiding the danger of utopias, two extremes that tickle the average person's imagination. Utopias are favorable to certain social groups but equally destructive. It is crucial to understand how to build a worldview and ideology that is entire*ly realistic* while maintaining the impetus for development or common sense.

Conclusion

Let us summarize.

Utopian components are necessary and inevitable in any design. It is an image of the future, built *a contrar*y when the tangible ways of achieving the desired are not yet seen. However, it is a desirable and inspiring image, carrying the richness of the author's imagination, and it remains a shining beacon in the subsequent realistic deployment of the project. The most important thing is to evaluate it as an ideal and not to confuse it with reality.

Utopia can take on the negative features of unfulfilled and illusory when the inspiring ideal of a way of life or society is transferred to today's specific space

---

[3] Sweet Angel. Available from: http://angel.org.ru/1/mily.html (accessed: 02.02.2024).

or seen as the nearest, quickly achievable future. Then, faced with imperfect reality, this image discredits itself, and a person experiences severe disappointment.

Utopian consciousness is not only spontaneously born in the minds of laypeople. However, it is an instrument of consciousness manipulation, produced by powerful or power-seeking groups with the help of modern mass media.

Two potent strains of constructed utopianism are the globalist-technocratic utopia that rejects all norms and traditions "for the sake of a transhumanist future" and the conservative-archaic utopia that wants to return the world to the Middle Ages. Both approaches are far from reality. The big problem is to build such an ideology in modern Russia that would not bear the pronounced features of utopia but would build a realistic project for the future that will be equally connected with scientific and technological development, humanity, and justice.

References

[1] Ainsa F. *Reconstruction of Utopia. Essay.* Moscow: Nasledie publ.; 1999. (In Russian).

[2] Arab-Oglu EA. *Utopia and Anti-utopia of the 20th century.* Moscow: Progress-kniga publ.; 1990. (In Russian).

[3] Batalov EY. *In the Utopia World: Five Dialogues on Utopia, Utopian Consciousness and Utopian Experiments.* Moscow: Politizdat publ.; 1989. (In Russian).

[4] Bloch E. *Tübingen Introduction to Philosophy.* Yekaterinburg: Ural University; 1997. (In Russian).

[5] Lasky M. Utopia and Revolution. In: *Utopia and Utopian Thinking: Anthology of Foreign Literature.* Moscow: Progress publ.; 1991. P. 170–210. (In Russian).

[6] Manheim K. Ideology and Utopia. In: *Diagnosis of our time.* Moscow: Yurist publ.; 1994. (In Russian).

[7] Marcuse G. End of Utopia. *Logos.* 2004;6(45):18–23. (In Russian).

[8] Paniotova TS. *Utopia in the space of dialogue of cultures.* Rostov-on-Don: Rostov University; 2004. (In Russian).

[9] Kondratiev VP. *Utopia and Utopian Consciousness: The Experience of Sociocultural Analysis.* Autoabstract thesis of dissertation for the degree of candidate of philosophical sciences. 1998. Available from: https://www.dissercat.com/content/utopiya-i-utopicheskoe-znanie-opytsotsioltur-analiza (accessed: 01.02.2024). (In Russian).

[10] Gavrilov EO. *Socio-philosophical analysis of specificity of Russian utopian consciousness.* Autoabstract thesis of dissertation for the degree of candidate of philosophical sciences. 2006. Available from: https://www.dissercat.com/content/sotsialnofilosofskii-analiz-spetsifiki-sigoiskoutoutoutoheskogo-soznaniya (accessed: 01.02.2024). (In Russian).

[11] Leontiev GD. *Utopian invariants of "ideal society".* Autoabstract thesis of dissertation for the degree of candidate of philosophical sciences. 2019. Available from: https://www.dissercat.com/content/utopicheskie-invarianty-idealnogo-obshchestva (accessed: 02.02.2024). (In Russian).

[12] Lucitskaya SI. Earthly paradise. In: *Dictionary of medieval culture.* Available from: http://cult-lib.ru/doc/dictionary/medieval-culture/articles/32/zemnoj-raj.htm?clid8wx4b741817557 (accessed: 02.02.2024 (In Russian).

[13] Parshev AP. *Why is Russia not America?* Moscow: Rodina publ.; 2021. (In Russian).

[14] Zinoviev AA. *West.* Moscow: Alistorus publ.; 1993. (In Russian).

[15] Lemons E. *Disappearance of barbarians.* Available from: https://modernlib.net/books/limonov_eduard/ischeznovenie_varov/read/?ysclid=ls8wq8hvik7304196 (accessed: 03.02.2024). (In Russian).

[16] Fukuyama F. *End of story and last person.* Moscow: AST publ.; 2015. (In Russian).

[17] Schwab K. *Fourth Industrial Revolution.* Moscow: Exmo publ.; 2019. (In Russian).

[18] Efremov IA. *Andromeda Nebula. Ox Hour.* Moscow: AST publ.; 2023. (In Russian).

[19] Katasonov VY. *Great reboot: open plot against humanity.* Moscow: Tion publ.; 2023. (In Russian).

[20] Heidegger M. Thing. In: *Time and Being.* Moscow: Respublika publ.; 1993. P. 316–326. (In Russian).

Сведения об авторе:

Золотухина-Аболина Елена Всеволодовна – доктор философских наук, профессор, Южный федеральный университет, Российская Федерация, 344006, Ростов-на-Дону, ул. Б. Садовая, д. 105/42. ORCID: 0000-0002-5954-2758. SPIN-код: 5235-1588. E-mail: elena_zolotuhina@mail.ru

About the author:

Zolotukhina-Abolina Elena V. – DSc in Philosophy, Professor, Southern Federal University, 105/42 B. Sadovaya St., Rostov-on-Don, 344006, Russian Federation. ORCID: 0000-0002-5954-2758. SPIN-code: 5235-1588. E-mail: elena_zolotuhina@mail.ru