

The progress of science and industry is a useful tool,  
but the only goal of the civilization is the development of a human being.  
Ennio Flaiano

We all know that the 20th century was a period of unprecedented industrial and scientific progress. Humankind, formed by millions of years of complex and multi-layered processes, was used to slow and barely noticeable changes. And suddenly, the situation changed dramatically. (We all know that the 20th century was an unprecedented period of industrial and scientific progress. Mankind, formed by millions of years of complex, multi-layered processes, was used to slow, unnoticed changes. Suddenly the situation changes dramatically.)

A considerable part of humanity barely seemed to grasp the new technologies and ideas, when suddenly, in the matter of years or even months, those ideas and technologies too became outdated. (A considerable part of humanity does not seem to fully get used to new technologies and ideas, and suddenly it turns out that they are already old-fashioned.)

For over 100 years our race and competitiveness in fashion and style in various fields led us to its complete absence. (Mankind's race and competition after styles of "fashion" in various fields which lasted more than 100 years led to its complete absence.)

In this light, let's analyze one of the brightest examples of technological-industrial development - vehicle engineering, which has been at the center of my attention for two main reasons. (So, I take one of the brightest examples of technological-industrial development - "machine building", which has been in the center of my attention for two convincing reasons.)

First and foremost, the vehicle was the most important invention that made the commute and transportation time much shorter and more comfortable. This resulted in the closer communication of different societal classes and, inevitably, in the exchange of different cultures, which, in turn, led to an unprecedented development/phenomena - globalization. (First of all, the vehicle was the most revolutionary invention of road reduction, as a result of which the communication of different societies, of course, the cultural exchange, led to an unprecedented growth, in other words, "globalization".)

Secondly, of all the technological creations, the car became the closest to the structure of the human body. Its construct almost precisely represents human anatomy. So much so, that throughout the history of vehicle engineering the big companies of auto industry and their designers made it their mission to give the cars their own faces and even their own characters, representing the faces and characters of their creators, which was also reflecting the peculiarities of local cultures. (Second, the machine is the closest of all the latest technologies to the structure of the human body. It repeats its creator with almost the same accuracy. And the big corporations, the designers, were worried that the car would have its own face, even its own character, as a result of which each brand clearly represented the face of its corporation, containing the peculiarities of the local culture. Throughout the history of car production, large corporations and designers have been concerned that the car has its own face, even its own character, so that each brand clearly represents the face of its corporation, containing the peculiarities of local culture.)

In the recent decades, however, the car, not unlike its creator, has stood out with its technical sophistication, all the while losing its distinct facial features. Driven by the demands of the market the car, just like its fashionable and cosmetically-reconstructed owner, was gradually given more oval shapes, and its various color palettes were replaced by more "practical" shades like white, metallic, etc. (However, the car, like its creator, has stood out in terms of technical equipment in recent decades. And he lost his face unnoticed. The car, like its plastic-operated "fashionable" owner, got oval shapes, and various color solutions were replaced by "practical" colors, white, metallic, etc. (this is what the market demands).)

The model of the car has changed so much that it is distinguishable only by its logo. The machine and its creator seem to be heading towards a crisis of form and content hand in hand. (The model of the car is legible only in case of having a logo. The machine and its creator seems to be heading towards the form and content crisis hand in hand.)

And just like the well-equipped person loses their soul, the cosmetically-reconstructed car acquires one, as it looks like its owner to a frightening degree. Perhaps it wasn't so far-fetched that older generations would speak to their cars before starting the engine and would even give them names, such as Jeyran, Maral, etc. It seems like we intuitively grasped the closeness between the two of us so much that we needed to give them a soul, and even talk to them and they would listen. (A technically equipped person loses his soul. And the "plastic operated" car acquires a soul, because it looks like its owner to a frightening degree. Perhaps it is not accidental that the representatives of the old school, before starting the car engine, talked to it, giving them different nicknames: jeyran, maral, deer, etc. It seems intuitively understanding that a car's organism is so close to our organism that we need to give it a soul, to talk. And it will listen. And so they were outlining the globalization crisis, comfortably and vapidly.)

But what is globalization? Can we understand its content and structure more deeply? And most importantly, is it possible to at least roughly predict its further track and consequences, since it is not a homogeneous phenomenon but one that consists of a number of aspects? Some of the most important ones that I'd like to mention are the economic, cultural, and socio-psychological aspects, which, of course, is the result of the first two. Western scientists and intellectuals published analytical articles and books that predicted and outlined the world of the future and the problems it would have to face because of globalization as far back as the early 1980s. In particular, Konrad Lorenz, a great Austrian scientist and thinker, in his latest book "Civilized Man's Eight Deadly Sins" pays special attention to three important circumstances. (But what is globalization? Are we able to understand its content and structure more deeply? And most importantly, is it possible to at least roughly predict its further track and consequences, since it is not a homogeneous phenomenon, but consists of a number of aspects? The most important of them, which I would like to mention, are the economic, the cultural, the social-psychological, which, of course, is the result of the first two. As far back as the early 1980s, analytical articles and books were published by Western scientists and intellectuals, which even predicted and outlined the world of the future and the problems of globalization. In particular, the greatest Austrian scientist-thinker, Konrad Lorenz, in his latest book, Civilized man's eight deadly sins, pays special attention to three important circumstances.)

One of them is urbanization, such as the creation of uniform buildings and lack of human contact/communication in big cities that would in turn result in an increase of mental illnesses. (One of them is urbanization, the existence of uniform buildings, the restriction of human contact in big cities, which results in the increase of mental illnesses.)

The second is the aggression of the banking system, which in time would have to concentrate in its hands the means and resources of the society and even whole countries. And that it should be called the "World Bank". (The second is the aggression of the banking system, which in the course of time had to concentrate in its hands the means of the society, even of the whole countries. And it should have been called the "World Bank".)

And the third, of course, is the cultural uniformity or the eradication of diversity of cultures that were formed and developed throughout thousands of years. And they would disappear, or more specifically, would become homogeneous. (And the third, of course, is the cultural uniformity, which was the result of thousands of years of complex formation. And now it is almost disappearing, and more specifically, it has become homogeneous.)

The main reasoning of the advocates of globalism, that cultural uniformity would lead to elimination or at least to weakening of Nazism or fascism, is not convincing, because in a globalized world these do not disappear, they transform since they have a financial-economic nature. This does not mean, of course, that we would be chained and sold in a slave market, although in some countries slavery does still exist. (The globalism proponents' main reasoning that cultural uniformity will lead to the elimination or at least the weakening of Nazism or fascism is not convincing anymore, because in the world of globalization it does not disappear, it transforms. It has a financial-economic nature. Of course, we will not be chained and be sold in the slave market (although in some countries it is still actual).)

However, there will be a new, a different form of slavery that we will inflict on ourselves. How? Very simply put, we will be living in conditions where we are always creditors of the banking system, the same banking system that would not allow our livelihood to improve to the point of being capable of taking care of our own living without going into more debt. Furthermore, the most horrible thing is that we almost never question who the people that manage those banks are or where they get so much money from. Quoting Seneca: "There is no state of slavery more disgraceful than one which is self-imposed". (We will do it by ourselves. How? In a very simple way. We will always be the creditors of the banking system, because no one will allow our life to improve so much that we will be able to take care of our own living. And the most horrible thing is that we don't question who are the people who manage those banks for a long time, where do they get so much money from. Quoting Seneca: "There is no state of slavery more disgraceful than one which is self-imposed".)

One of the most powerful tools of turning us into perpetual creditors is advertising or, in other words, propaganda. They make us want to have fashionable technologies and things, the necessity of which we often do not have or usability we often do not know. As the Native Americans did during the Spanish colonization, we give gold in exchange for a "toy". This larger-scale process takes place in relatively poorer countries, donating state mining resources in exchange for legitimacy of government or other promises. Thus, whole societies are sold into de facto slavery, with people who are often unaware that they are the full owners of the state's wealth and its natural resources. (One of the most powerful tools to make us perpetual creditors is advertising and propaganda. To have fashionable technologies, the necessity of which we often do not have. And in some cases we do not even know how to use them. We give gold in exchange for a "toy", as the Latin American Indians did during the Spanish colonization. This larger-scale process takes place in relatively poorer countries, donating state mines in exchange for legitimacy of government or other promises. Thus, whole societies are sold into de facto slavery, with peoples who are often unaware that they are the full owners of state wealth, natural resources.)

But like all slavery systems, this one as well would be unable to hold on to power for a long time based on economic expansion alone, without establishing cultural domination as well. There are many such examples in history. One evident example was the Ottoman Empire, which conquered nations that were culturally more advanced and was constantly faced with riots. This eventually brought the empire to its collapse. (But like all slavery systems, it's unable to hold on to power for a long time due to economic expansion alone, as it would not have survived without cultural domination. There are many such examples in history. One evident example was the Ottoman Empire, which conquered more culturally advanced nations and was constantly faced with riots. Which brought the empire to its collapse.)

In the modern world, the Russian Federation seems to have taken over that role with its vision of restoring the Soviet Union and depriving neighboring states of sovereignty at all cost. It seems to want to repeat the example of Western globalization, but in a very provincial way, because the Soviet authorities were still able to maintain a certain cultural advantage; they had a clear offer to other nations and republics, otherwise the Soviet Union would not have lasted for so long. But the paradox was that the "proposing state" for many ongoing problems and reasons turned into a "limiting state" and faced the problems that are already a history. (In the modern world, the Russian Federation seems to have taken over that role with its vision of restoring the Soviet Union and depriving neighboring states of sovereignty at all costs. He seems to want to repeat the example of Western globalization, but in a very provincial way, because the Soviet authorities were still able to maintain a certain cultural advantage; they had a clear offer to other nations and republics, otherwise it would not have happened. But the paradox was that the proposing state or force for some reason turned into a limiter by facing the problems already known in history.)

Without delving into the labyrinth of historical excursion, I would like to single out the most important at the moment - the cultural one. What was the Soviet Union, if not a "crisis of form"? Did the standards of uniforms, architecture, and car production bring equality? I think not, quite the opposite. It led to a crisis, it was enough for the developed countries of the West to somehow show the diversity on the other side and the system was getting small but irreversible cracks. But what is happening today? Western capitalism, or as it is commonly called, the neoliberal market, has no other opponent. Then the need for product diversity begins to fade. The market develops easily produced and fast consumed products. It is not yet clearly visible, as it is just beginning its "sincere path". However, in the field of clothing and car production it is beginning to be accustomed. It feels like the West is repeating the path of the Soviet Union, from progress to uniformity. From now on, diversity is an almost monopolized term that refers only to sexual orientation. (Without delving into the labyrinth of historical excursions, I would like to single out the most important at the moment - the cultural one. What was the Soviet Union, if not a "form crisis"? Did the standards of uniforms, architecture, and car production bring equality? I think not, quite the opposite. It led to a crisis, it was enough for the developed countries of the West to somehow show the diversity on the other side and the system was getting small but irreversible cracks. But what is happening today? Western capitalism, or as it is commonly called, the neoliberal market, has no other opponent. Then the need for product diversity begins to fade. The market produces easily produced and fast consumed products. It is not yet clearly visible, as it is just beginning its "sincere path". However, in the field of clothing and car production it is beginning to be accustomed. It feels like the West is repeating the path of the Soviet Union, from progress to uniformity. From now on, diversity is an almost monopolized term that refers only to sexual orientation.)

All this reminds me of some observations I made from the second Artsakh war: first, there was apparent indifference of human rights organizations to what was happening; then, the silence of the feminist organizations, who, as it turns out, see no urgency in the problem of a single mother losing her son, because it is not a case of domestic violence; and the most remarkable fact was the letter of the French intellectuals in defense of the Artsakh victims, where the Turkish-Azerbaijani aggression and fascism were criticized. The interesting thing here was that the authors of the letter were representatives of the old school, whose careers were not formed in the "safe" period of globalization, and were full of various complications. Maybe this is the guarantee of valuing life. I have no idea what the author meant here to be able to edit the content. Maybe yes. (All this reminds me of some observations from the second Artsakh war: first, the apparent indifference of human rights organizations to what happened. Then the silence of the feminist organizations, who, as it turns out, see no urgency in the problem of son lost, especially in single women's case, as they were not beaten by their husband. And the most remarkable fact was the letter of the French intellectuals in defense of the Artsakh victims, where the Turkish-Azerbaijani aggression and fascism were criticized. The interesting thing here was that the authors of the letter were representatives of the old school, whose careers were not formed in the "safe" period of globalization, and were full of various complications. Maybe this is the guarantee of valuing life. Maybe yes.)

Nevertheless, the important thing here is not the issue of fairness, but the fact that the crisis of form is based on content. Therefore, it is a scientific criterion that needs deeper analysis, because we are dealing with a new socio-psychological model – a tolerant yet indifferent person. And the explanation that “wars do not reach the modern market because of its unprofitability and not because of moral values”, is dishonest, to put it mildly. And even if this were true, what would happen if market standards were to reshape and wars became profitable as a result, since the economy is always unpredictable? Should we treat it with the same calmness? Should we accept what is now fashionably called “the norm of real politics”? (The issue of fairness is not the most important thing here, but the fact that the crisis of form is content based. Therefore, a scientific criterion that needs deeper analysis, because we are dealing with a new social-psychological model, a tolerant and at the same time indifferent person. And the explanations that wars do not reach the modern market, because it is not the moral value that will stop the bloodshed, but its unfavorability, to put it mildly, are not honest. And even if it were true, what would happen if market standards were reshaped, since the economy is always unpredictable, and wars became profitable? Should we treat it with the same calmness? Should we accept what is now “fashionably” called the norm of "real politics"?)

Of course, we can't predict the future, and it would be an ungrateful job to try to. But we can follow and study the present. And maybe we can become aware of the future to some extent. The objects around us, the consumer market and its changes are the brightest token of our reality. What we see every day, everywhere. And this is where vehicle engineering talks to us with its uniform colors, shapes and meaningless technological saturation. And of course, like clothing, it became affordable at the expense of cheap labor, which is on the list of so-called achievements of the modern world. However, these "gifts" are very reminiscent of the relations between Native Americans and Spaniards. (Of course, predicting the future is not given to us, it is an ungrateful job. But we can follow and study the present. And maybe we can get aware of the future to some extent. The brightest proof of our reality are the objects around us, the consumer market and its changes. What we see every day, everywhere. This is where car production culture talks to us with its uniform colors, shapes and meaningless technological saturation. It, of course, becomes affordable, like clothing, at the expense of cheap labor, which is on the list of seeming achievements of the modern world. However, these "gifts" are very similar to relations between Native Americans and Spaniards.)