

Socio-Economic Dimensions of the Pandemic: a Philosophical Analysis

Andrii MOROZOV¹,
Nataliia SHUST²,
Mariya ROHOZHA³,
Yuri KULAGIN⁴

¹ Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine,
a.morozov@knute.edu.ua,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8051-7055>

² Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine,
n.shust@knute.edu.ua,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8491-160X>

³ Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine, mrogozha@ukr.net,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1469-861X>

⁴ Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine,
y.kulagin@knute.edu.ua,
<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3609-6713>

Abstract: *The current global crisis caused by the coronavirus pandemic has already become a challenge for individual national economies, as well as the global world system as a whole. The eminent English historian Toynbee (1987) wrote that the viability of a civilization depends on the extent to which its elite (“the creative minority”) can mobilize its intellectual, moral, and physical strength to respond adequately to the challenges. Therefore, challenges are necessary for humanity since without them one would deal with spiritual and intellectual stagnation. Indeed, that which does not kill us makes us stronger. This aphorism becomes especially relevant in present times when the world is concerned with what the “post-covid” world will be, what transformations the values and worldview of individuals will undergo. The coronavirus pandemic acts in this case as a catalyst and accelerator for change and forces one to pay attention to them. As Toffler (1971) once pointed out, “The inhabitants of the earth are divided not only by race, nation, religion or ideology, but also, in a sense, by their position in time”. The future is rapidly coming, although only a few per cent of the entire human population “live” in the future, that is, are psychologically ready for it. The vast majority of people (more than 70 per cent of the population) live with old ideas, stereotypes, and norms of past generations. This does not mean that one should break “the link of times” and recklessly erase the historical past. However, one cannot ignore the fact that a new era is being replaced by a new one.*

Keywords: *geopolitical environment, global world order, socio-economic transformation, pandemic, digitalization.*

How to cite: Morozov, A., Shust, N., Rohozha, M., & Kulagin, Y. (2022). Socio-Economic Dimensions of the Pandemic: a Philosophical Analysis. *Postmodern Openings*, 13(1), 450-467. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/13.1/407>

Introduction

Representatives from leading international banks conduct a thorough socio-economic analysis of the current situation and forecast future scenarios. Credit Suisse bank named the main global consequences of the pandemic. The latter has accelerated the trends in the global world that have already begun. As noted by an expert of Suisse Research Institute (2020), “throughout history, health crises have helped to drive scientific and social innovation, shaping the paths of future economic development. The current crisis will be no exception, but rather than radically changing the world as we know it, COVID-19 has mainly accelerated existing trends, triggering a structural change in fast motion in many sectors”. The institute experts have identified several long-term trends in the economy, politics and social sphere, which come out on top during the coronavirus pandemic (Suisse Research Institute, 2020). First of all, it is weak economic growth, social inequality and the revival of small towns. “Socially disadvantaged population groups are more likely to suffer job losses and lower income” (Suisse Research Institute, 2020, p. 1). Nevertheless, there should be a solution to the above-mentioned problem. Indeed, “lifelong learning will become a key part of everyone’s life to create an adaptable work force and develop skills that stress human advantage over machines” (Suisse Research Institute, 2020, p. 2). Given recent events, the role of the state has increased, primarily due to budget expansion and control over citizens. Despite the simultaneous and unprecedentedly deep failure of economic activity around the world due to the pandemic, its long-term economic consequences will be much weaker than past pandemics (plague, Spanish flu) (Suisse Research Institute, 2020). The COVID-19 pandemic would approximately kill only 0.0056% of the world’s population, while the Spanish flu destroyed 2.73%. Due to advances in science and medicine, mass vaccination has become possible, which will sooner or later “tame” the disease. Compared to pandemics of the past, however, one could observe a greater weakening of social and economic relations between countries, as well as a significant restriction of civil liberties.

A slightly different point of view is the forecast of Deutsche Bank (Baron, 2020). The era of globalization, which has lasted since 1980, is coming to an end. It is being replaced by an “era of chaos”. This new era of chaos will be characterized by the following changes. The first and foremost is the deterioration of US–China relations as Beijing’s economic weight grows. Reducing the gap between economics will increase the probability of the so-called “Thucydides trap”, that is the risk of military conflict between

two competing states when one catches up with the other in economic power. According to German analysts, military conflict is highly unlikely nowadays, while economic warfare is more likely. The confrontation between the United States and China, which will increase regardless of who rules in the White House, is reminiscent of the Cold War between the USSR and the United States. The economic conflict will be manifested in additional tariffs, sanctions, blocking of assets, bans on technology transfer. This will inevitably lead to the formation of country blocs – one led by China, the other led by the United States. Southeast Asian countries will enter China’s orbit, even though Japan, South Korea and Australia are likely to end up in the US camp. China, Russia, the European Union and Turkey will compete for influence in the Middle East and Africa.

According to Baron (2020), the following trends can be identified:

- The COVID-19 pandemic has given new impetus to integration processes. At the same time, Europe will likely remain in a state of economic stagnation with the prospect of political fragmentation.
- Further increase in debt and the spread of “helicopter money” from central banks as a monetary mainstream, which will likely increase inflation.
- Intensification of economic inequality in the first years of the post-war era, but in the future – the reversal of this trend: states will begin to collect more taxes from the rich.
- Increased intergenerational competition: Millennials and younger people will catch up in numbers with the older generations by 2030, which will allow them to determine the outcome of democratic elections.
- Growing global climate concerns (as early as the current decade, the world is likely to introduce a carbon tax). This, in turn, will bring about a new technological revolution.

Among the leading analysts of the pandemic situation and global inheritance for people, one can name Schwab (2020) and Piketty (2014). Besides, profound research by Zakaria (2020) “Ten lessons for a post-pandemic world” deserves special attention.

All in all, the world, which has changed as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, is new and scary. The crisis of protecting health has only accelerated many processes. In general, however, the development path followed by humanity creates big risks. For many reasons, including demographic ones, there are plenty of countries in which the economic growth is slowing down. The world will face uncertainty since the industrial and financial giants will become even more significant. Machine learning

develops so quickly that people can lose control over their creations for the first time in history. Lands and people are becoming more and more limited and self-contained, and their internal policy is isolated. The United States and China are moving towards a fierce and long-term confrontation. As noted by Zakaria (2020), “we should think seriously about a greater strategy of development. We can turn inward and put nationalism and internal personal interest on the first place, and we can look at common challenges like a stimulus to global collaboration and growth. We have before us a plenty of options for the future” (p. 14).

The Transformation of the World Economic System

It must be noted that the transformation of the world economic system began a long time ago, and, yet it remained unnoticed for most ordinary citizens of the planet. The pandemic strengthened the existing socio-economic problems in developed countries and unveiled what had previously been hidden. It raised the need for a comprehensive philosophical reflection on these processes. One can ask what problems the modern globalized world has been facing in recent decades. To answer this question, one needs to analyze the previous events.

Back in 2013, long before the current pandemic, a monograph by the French economist Piketty (2014) “Capital in the Twenty-First Century” was published. In it, the author argued that the welfare state, which was formed in several developed democracies countries, is a thing of the past. The Welfare state doctrine was based on the classical principle of liberalism namely, the idea of equality (primarily, it was about legal and political one, the equality of opportunity). At the same time, the pure capitalism of *laissez-faire* (where the state is “a night watchman” was softened) compensated by the elements of socialism. In such a society, individualism will be combined with a fair distribution of wealth and social responsibility for those who cannot achieve a minimum standard of living. According to this social model, progressive taxation was used to redistribute wealth, which provided citizens, regardless of their income level, with free education, medical services, and the socially unprotected (vulnerable, defenseless) received targeted social assistance programmes. However, in practice, even in the most democratic countries, such as the US, building a welfare state became problematic from the very beginning.

Piketty (2014) indicates “this complex and contradictory relation to inequality largely persists in the United States to this day: on the one hand, there is a country of egalitarian promise, a land of opportunity for millions

of immigrants of modest background, on the other it is a land of extremely brutal inequality, especially in relation to race, whose effects are still quite visible. Southern blacks were deprived of civil rights until the 1960s and subjected to a regime of legal segregation that shared some features in common with the system of apartheid that was maintained in South Africa until the 1980s. This no doubt accounts for many aspects of the development – or rather nondevelopment – of the US welfare state” (p. 117).

The Problem of Social Justice

Reflecting on a socially-oriented state that should protect citizens and create a society of equal opportunities, Piketty (2014) follows a long-standing philosophical tradition, including an understanding of the justice principle in the liberal tradition, in which one should balance majority and minority interests. Modern ethical discourse outlines the problems of wealth concentration and the decline of the idea of the welfare state and social justice. Rawls (1971) writes, “social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both: (a) to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged, consistent with the just savings principle, and (b) attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity” (p. 53).

Part (a) of the second principle is referred to as the difference principle while part (b) is referred to as the equal opportunity principle (Rawls, 1971, p. 53).

According to Rawls (1971), the difference principle presupposes that inequalities in social positions, social and economic benefits are acceptable only when they work to the greatest benefit of those in the least favourable position. To make inequality fair, it should appear from the improvement of the least advantageous position compared to what it would be without this inequality, i.e., under the condition of equal distribution. The point is that those who are in the best position cannot morally justify their advantageous position if it is established at the expense of others.

Principle 2 (a) acts as an opportunity condition for principle 2 (b). As noted by Rawls (1971), the distribution of limited resources should have a positive impact on the most disadvantaged (p. 72).

Principle 2 (b) requires an arrangement of public life in which everyone can develop their talents and abilities, honestly achieve various social positions, including those associated with greater wealth or power.

A just society, and more broadly a just discourse, can be built on fair equality of opportunity, set in particular by the education system, the health care system, the employment system. According to Costa (2020), it is important for Rawls (1971) that all social institutions can and should play an important role in balancing and compensating differences, to some extent reducing inequalities. “Every citizen is to have the same legal rights to access the desirable jobs, positions of authority, and the education and training necessary to complete for such jobs and positions” (Costa, 2020, p. 244).

However, the problem of injustice remains, both regionally and globally. Not only individuals with low socioeconomic status but also social and professional groups, even entire countries (for example, from the third world) with low ratings have fewer chances to gain access to the benefits of civilization, to be competitive in the world market of goods and services (Nerubasska, Palshkov, & Maksymchuk, 2020; Nerubasska & Maksymchuk, 2020).

It follows logically from principle 2 (a) that injustice is the lack of improvement in the living conditions of the most disadvantaged. The interpreter of Rawl’s doctrine (1971) Kymlicka (2002) figures out the following: “it is fair for individuals to have unequal shares of social goods if those inequalities are earned and deserved by the individual, that is if they are the product of the individual’s actions and choices. But it is unfair for individuals to be disadvantaged or privileged by arbitrary and undeserved differences in their social circumstances” (p. 58).

This statement of Kymlicka (2002) characterizes the situation in which Ukrainian society found itself during the COVID-19 pandemic. Instead of meritocracy (the power of those who deserved it by hard work, thorough knowledge, selfless service to their profession), one often sees an oligarchic system in which there is a huge social, economic and legal gap between those in power and the “rest” of the population. This disease treatment, as well as long-term rehabilitation after its dangerous post-covid syndromes, requires significant financial costs. Not to mention that Ukrainian businessmen, oligarchs, and powerful deputies can afford to be vaccinated not in their home country but abroad.

Lowry (2020) rightly points to the educational aspect of the problem, reflecting on the principle of fair equality of opportunity and the freedom of access to posts and social positions. Career growth begins with the period of study, so Lowry (2020) calls the opportunities provided by education “professional freedoms” or “occupational liberties”. “Fair equality of opportunity aims to make sure that the value of occupational liberties is not

affected by factors such as gender, race, parents' wealth" (Lowry, 2020, pp. 171–172).

Regarding the quarantine restrictions, these "occupational liberties" are threatened. When it comes to the Ukrainian population living in remote rural areas, or mountainous and forested areas, it is clear that not everyone has the same technical capacity to afford quality high-speed Internet and adequate computer and mobile equipment that would allow one to engage in online learning on zoom, google classroom. Over time, there will be another qualitative difference in knowledge: between the generations of those who studied traditionally (offline) and those who know only the online form of education, where impartial and transparent final control of knowledge is complicated or impossible (in particular, the objectivity of the exam) and not all students/schoolchildren/entrants have video communication.

Piketty (2014) expects the level of injustice in the world of the future to only increase. Thus, the practice of capitalist relations does not correspond to the theory of justice, on which a liberal-democratic society is thought to be based. After all, the Western world is gradually abandoning such a classic social-democratic concept of a political system, in which the state plays a key role in protecting and developing the economic and social well-being of its citizens. "Many commentators ... continue to believe that ever more fully guaranteed property rights, ever freer markets, and ever 'purer and more perfect' competition are enough to ensure a just, prosperous, and harmonious society. Unfortunately, the task is more complex" (Piketty, 2014, p. 28).

In times of globalization, a nation-state as a political institution (as well as the national economy) is dying out. They are replaced by intergovernmental and non-governmental political structures (blocs, associations) and transnational corporations. The end of the era of national sovereignty means that the concentration of wealth will necessarily grow and inequality will increase because this was the core and programme of capitalism with its idea of "free market" and minimization of the state. The world, according to Picketty (2014), is gradually returning to the idea of patrimonial capitalism, which leads to dangerous tendencies of the oligarchy, where no one cares about the moral component of enrichment. "The price system plays a key role in coordinating the activities of millions of individuals – indeed, today, billions of individuals in the new global economy. The problem is that the price system knows neither limits nor morality" (Piketty, 2014, p. 11).

Once the problem has been "diagnosed", one can think about recovery strategies. To ensure the principle of opportunity equality and

“save” democracy, it is necessary to introduce a wealth tax and return to the idea of state intervention (Piketty, 2014). When the borders were closed and the air travel between the countries was suspended due to quarantine restrictions, it was high time for the state to become stronger and for globalization to recede. At least, this is a reason for national economies to start relying on their strengths and reserves, without relying on any outside help.

In the context of globalization, Western countries are attempting, in various ways, to maintain a leading position in the world economy. Gabarta (2020) notes that “the United States increasingly resorted to protectionist methods during Donald Trump’s presidency to maintain its dominant position in the world and the promotion of its national interests”. The strategy of Western Europe is more cautious, and Western countries also strive to strengthen their state positions. Germany aims to consolidate its position as the leader of a united Europe, developing the financial programmes for economic assistance within the EU. The country views the rescue of European economies affected by the coronavirus pandemic as a matter of its economic security.

Lopez-Claros (2020) also advocates strengthening the role of states on the world stage. He claims that the pandemic has provoked the painful impact to the world economy. Such crisis has overcome financial calamities since the Great Depression at the first half of the 20th century. Governments try to unload health system using different methods. Social distancing measures play a central role in these efforts. The experience of different European countries, with different combinations of lockdown, testing and tracking contacts has probably managed to slow down the spread of infection. In his recent article, Lopez-Claros (2020) points out some key issues, namely, “lessons that can be learned from the experience of different countries”.

Improving Health Systems

COVID-19 has demonstrated the extreme unpreparedness of most countries and public health systems. The lack of hospital beds, respirators and other vital equipment has forced them to make the painful choice of health care rationing. This epidemic cannot be said to be a complete surprise to humanity, especially after the world was hit by Ebola and SARS. However, one can indicate a high degree of unpreparedness of public health systems. Thus, there appears to be the issue with budgetary priorities and whether governments sufficiently analyze the structure of public spending

and verify that it balances public health and economic needs. According to Lopez-Claros (2020), there is every reason to believe that the analysis of health system experience in different countries around the world enable them to avoid overloading efficiently. Not only the World Health Organization, given the global nature of the pandemic, will play a leading role in this field, but security and health of citizens will depend on the domestic policy of the state. In this context, the researcher suggests restoring the priorities of public spending (Lopez-Claros, 2020). There should be a broad and serious discussion on public spending priorities against other future requirements for public resources related to ageing, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and budget issues that are already under severe strain as the result of the pandemic.

Social Protection as a Priority of National Security

Covid-19 is another argument in favor of increasing health insurance and granting paid sick leave. In countries affected by the public health crisis, uninsured patients and those who do not have paid sick leave receive a stimulus to work as they cannot let themselves to live without working. In its turn, it provokes risks for others and, as a result, increases mortality and overall economic impact of this crisis.

Although closing borders cannot guarantee a complete solution to the risk of infection, it has proved to be a somewhat effective measure. It is no longer possible to completely "reverse" globalization by retreating behind national borders. However, there is a more realistic solution to return to the ideas of a socially protected state. It will expand access to health care and basic social protection for most of the world's population. This shows society's unity and demonstrates its concern for all undefended strata. After all, "vulnerable people must be protected" (Lopez-Claros, 2020).

In the context of this problem, the concept of national security must first be reconsidered. "COVID-19 has shown us that, in the midst of a pandemic, the most sophisticated and destructive weapons are totally useless: an atomic bomb is not effective in the fight against a virus. Perhaps national security will now have to be seen from the perspective of human well-being, from the ability of governments to have well-prepared health infrastructures, a clean environment, a social safety-net, and the resources to continue to educate children and young people in preparation for an increasingly complex world and economy, thus boosting our human capital endowments" (Lopez-Claros, 2020, p. 52).

Ultra-Globalist Approach

Thus, the positions of Piketty (2014) and Lopez-Claros (2020) on the restoration of the welfare state is quite clear. However, there is another, alternative point of view, represented by the proponents of ultra-globalism, in which the pandemic is an occasion not to strengthen the role of the state, but on the contrary □ for its final deconstructing. This view is represented by Schwab (2020), a famous economist, one of the founders of the World Economic Forum in Davos. Schwab (2020) is a consistent ideologist of globalism, a project that involves the destruction of nation-states, the unification of the world into a single space: culturally, politically and economically. In his works, he predicts a future in which state borders will be erased and differences between rich and poor countries will disappear. It would be a planetary state with a single world government. If democracy and globalization expand, the nation-state will have no place. At the same time, Schwab, Malleret, & Zahidi (2020) are the authors of another book, titled “Covid-19: The Great Reset”. They are also the creators of the Great reset concept, which has become the official agenda of the latest World Economic Forum. Reset is an attempt to cancel all previous history and start building a qualitatively new world.

Schwab's book (2020) is important primarily as an ideological document, as a program, action plan. The scholars are waiting “when things will return to normal”, but the German scholar gives short reply: never. “Nothing will ever return to the “broken” sense of normalcy that prevailed before the crisis because the coronavirus pandemic marks a fundamental inflection point in our global trajectory” (Schwab, 2020, p. 1). This is the epoch of watershed, the turning point in world history. According to Schwab, the world will never return to its state before the spring 2020 because the pandemic has symbolically divided it into two parts – BC (“*before coronavirus*”) and AC (“*after coronavirus*”) epochs (Schwab, 2020, p.1). We are overwhelmed and perplexed by the rapid and unexpected events. The changes taking place in the world have a cumulative effect and have unexpected and unpredictable consequences. Thus, a “new normality” (Schwab's term (2020)) is formed. In turn, economical onsequences involve the problem of psychological adaptation. “We will continue to be surprised by both the rapidity and unexpected nature of these changes as they conflate with each other, they will provoke second-, third-, fourth- and more-order consequences, cascading effects and unforeseen outcomes. In so doing, they will shape a ‘new normal’ radically different from the one we will be progressively leaving behind” (Schwab, 2020, p. 153). The German scholar does not exclude such a situation in

which society will be on the verge of revolution and social explosion. "Without delay, we need to set in motion the Great Reset. This is an absolute necessity. Failing to address and fix the deep-rooted ills of our societies and economies could heighten the risk that, as throughout history, ultimately a reset will be imposed by violent shocks like conflicts and even revolutions. It is incumbent upon us to take the bull by the horns" (Schwab, 2020, p. 157).

Many of the old beliefs, ideas about what the world should be like are crumbling. Young people will play an important role in this process of rejecting the old and establishing a new world order. According to Schwab (2020), youth is the catalyst for change. The main directions of these changes, aimed at creating a "new normality", will be climate change, the struggle for gender equality (the LGBT community and the dominance of sexual minorities will come to the fore), and the so-called "green energy". "The COVID-19 crisis has shown us that our old systems are not fit anymore for the 21st century. It has laid bare the fundamental lack of social cohesion, fairness, inclusion and equality. Now is the historical moment in time, not only to fight the real virus but to shape the system for the needs of the Post Corona era" (Schwab, Malleret, & Zahidi, 2020).

One can see here the commonplace about justice, equality, social solidarity and cohesion. In essence, this is new social contract, when the rich will be taxed (a parallel with Picketty (2014)), and additional rules for corporations will be introduced. Schwab (2020) believes that there must be close interaction between the state and big capital. Finally, however, it turns out that the essence of the reboot (reset) is somewhat different: corporations will begin to interfere in the affairs of the state and dictate to it what to do (the mass transition to remote work, distance education, digital passes and closed borders. It is quite interesting that Schwab (2020) calls on the authorities of all countries not to remove the strict quarantine restrictions and prolong lockdown. Schwab (2020) also notes that corporations can interfere in public policy not only through lobbying. This is, therefore, the question about a new legal system and the actual destruction of the nation-state. One must admit that the plans of the "Great Reset" initiators are indeed revolutionary and radical. As pointed by Schwab (2020), the economy of the new world will be governed by giant monopolies-corporations. Everything in the future will be decided by unaccountable groups of experts, which should be backed by global corporations with social responsibility (Schwab, 2020). These words of Schwab (2020) are highly questionable because at all times corporations were primarily concerned with profit and utility but not social responsibility. The fact that capitalism is attempting to destroy the state, privatize it, is in itself a symptom of radical change. However, the authors of

the article assume that it is better to have a bad state than its complete absence because here the individual has at least a theoretical opportunity to somehow influence the decision-making process authorities. Whereas in a corporation, the organization of labor and management are so rigid that the average employee has very little space for manoeuvre to exercise individual freedom. Thus, under conditions of the corporatocracy, capital and financial power become political power, which has a total character.

Yet, one can ask why ultra-globalists are revealing their plans right now. After all, the community of "new globalists", who sought to free business from the influence of the state and establish the sovereignty of the markets, emerged after World War II. Back in 1971, the European Management Forum appeared which was later renamed into the World Economic Forum in Davos. Since then, everything has been in line with globalization. However, it was when the world economy entered a state of crisis, external and internal problems began to accumulate. A few years ago, economists began to talk about the trend of returning to the Keynesian macroeconomic model, where the emphasis is on government regulation of aggregate economic demand. One can recall how the state helped banks and corporations to overcome the crisis of 2007-2008 in economically developed countries. Here there is a pandemic, which is "convenient" for the interests of corporations to take control over economic life. According to Schwab (2020), shortly, one will be able to observe how private property will die out, and its place will be taken by the "economy of use" or "economy of participation". The world will no longer be the same, capitalism will take another form, people will have completely new types of property other than the private and state. The largest multinational companies will take on more social responsibility, they will be more actively involved in public life and be responsible for the sake of the common good.

Cash will be eliminated, and digital currencies will be introduced instead. Green energy will displace hydrocarbon energy. Limits will be introduced on the consumption of water, electricity, some "environmentally hazardous" types of products (meat), industrial products (cars). At the same time, the most radical way to reduce the burden on the ecosphere will be to reduce demographic growth and even reduce the population. "The greater the demographic growth, the higher the risk of new pandemics" (Schwab, 2020). In essence, here Schwab (2020) works in line with the paradigm of neo-Malthusianism and repeats the main theses articulated in the Club of Rome's famous report "Limits to Growth" (Meadows, Meadows, Randers, & Behrens III, 1971). The main conceptual ideas are the same: limiting the consumption of the masses, population reduction, world supranational

governance, in which the main role is played by “independent experts”. However, it is a matter of dispute how independent they are if they defend the interests of trans-national corporations.

Schwab (2020) writes that robotics and automation in all spheres of economy and social life will be completed very soon. “In 2016, two academics from Oxford University concluded that up to 86% of jobs in restaurants, 75% of jobs in retail and 59% of jobs in entertainment could be automatized by 2035” (Schwab, 2020, p. 98). He also claims that “Up to 75% of independent restaurants might not survive the lockdowns and subsequent social-distancing measures” (Schwab, 2020, p. 122).

In the coming days, scientists plan to introduce an unconditional basic income for people who will be replaced by jobs but subject to confirmation that the person is vaccinated. The digitalization of all spheres of the economy and society will continue. An effective system for controlling the behaviour and movement of people will be established, including face identification technology. Schwab (2020) writes directly about this, “the containment of the coronavirus pandemic will necessitate a global surveillance network capable of identifying new outbreaks as soon as they arise” (pp. 16–17).

There is a reason for this because the protest mood will grow, which will have to be extinguished. “The problem of asynchronicity between two different groups (policy-makers and the public) whose time horizon differs so markedly will be acute and very difficult to manage in the context of the pandemic. The velocity of the shock and (the depth) of the pain it has inflicted will not and cannot be matched with equal velocity on the policy side” (Schwab, 2020, p. 14).

The new health care model will include regular testing, mandatory vaccinations, restrictions or penalties for those who evade disciplinary rules. Unvaccinated people will be deprived of their rights or receive the status of “socially stigmatized”. In light of transhumanism, humans will be perfected.

Summarizing Schwab's views (2020), one can name the main dangers that await humanity in connect with the epidemic shortly: overload of the health care system; political tension in international politics; strengthening control over the population; introduction of online technologies and digitalization; acceleration of robotics and automation and as a consequence the crisis in the labour market unemployment (robots do not need to be paid).

Regarding unemployment rates, it is better to provide official statistics. According to the World Bank, the current situation could lead extreme impoverishment of 40 to 60 million people on the planet, with Africa and South Asia suffering the most. “The International Labor Organization ex-

pects the equivalent of 195 million jobs lost. The World Good Programme estimates that 135 million people are starving and another 130 million are on the verge of starvation" (Department of Global Communications of the UN, 2020). No wonder that the UN suggests special program with such elements as protection of health care systems, social protection, protection of jobs, small and medium enterprises, the most vulnerable production entities. "The United Nations has raised \$ 697 million out of the \$2 billion needed to provide humanitarian assistance to countries because of the coronavirus pandemic" (Department of Global Communications of the UN, 2020). Thus, one can see that today the problem of justice is very urgent. Despite the measures planned by the UN, there is a lack of justice in society.

Injustice and Inequality as the Negative Consequences of the Pandemic

One of the consequences of globalization has been an increase in the income gap and, as a result, an increase in the stratification of society, which has become increasingly divided into two groups: beneficiaries and victims of globalization. In the context of post-Soviet countries, and especially Ukraine, one can say that such victims are budget workers, doctors, teachers, researchers, museum and theatre figures, retirees, people with special needs. With the introduction of quarantine measures, the income gap remains. This is especially evident in the example of business because some were allowed to work (for example, pharmacies, pet stores, supermarkets, public transport), those who were closed for lockdown (jewelry, furniture, toy stores, clothing, linen, souvenirs), those who were able to adapt to online telecommuting, and those who were unable to do so for a variety of reasons. Small, medium and large businesses have been put in unequal conditions.

Inequality is also manifested at the social level in such a phenomenon as social stigmatization, which was once carefully described in the 1960s by sociologist Goffman (1963). In 2020, the WHO released a rather interesting document entitled "Social Stigma Associated with COVID-19. A Guide to Preventing and Addressing Social Stigma" (World Health Organization, 2020). It deals with the problem of social stigma in health matters. It means ascription of negative connotations to a certain malady and branding a certain group of people who are sick with it. Social stigma is a set of prejudices and stereotypes that is represented in a form of discrimination and segregation towards a certain group of people. The bias produces negative effects for such people, their relatives, friends, and colleagues. Moreover, stigmatization and discrimination apply to those who are or were in recent contact

with carriers of coronavirus infection. The main factors of the COVID-19 stigma extent are: (1) a new disease with unpredictable aftereffects; (2) fear of unknown; (3) the theory of conspiracy able to explain easily strange regularities. “Confusion, anxiety, and fears of society are quite understandable. Unfortunately, these same factors provoke the spread of pernicious stereotypes” (World Health Organization, 2020).

Summarizing the negative consequences of stigmatization, it must be noted that it primarily undermines the social fabric of society and provokes limitation in movement and isolation of social groups. These factors provide more intensive dissemination of virus infection that can lead to severe consequences for the health of population and complex the struggle against the pandemic.

The Anti-Crisis Potential of Ukraine

The process of reformatting the world has already begun, and all countries, regardless of their desire, are involved in it, including Ukraine. In 2020, due to the pandemic, Ukraine’s socio-economic model was tested for survival, especially in such aspects as stability and security. For the past 30 years, Ukraine has been looking for a model of sustainable development that could provide it with stability and security in the broadest sense of the word. Despite all the difficulties, Ukraine has significant potential and competitive advantages that allow looking to the future with hope. One can assert the existence of the developed human potential in the country (Kresina, Shust, Hultai, Spivak, & Durnov, 2020). The Human Development Index (HDI) is a comprehensive indicator for life expectancy, literacy, education and living standards for countries around the world. This index is used to identify differences between developed and underdeveloped countries, as well as to assess the impact of economic policy on quality of life (United Nations Development Programme, 2020).

According to the UN classification, Ukraine falls into the category of countries with a high human development index (HDI) (Kresina, Shust, Hultai, Spivak, & Durnov, 2020). In 2020, Ukraine moved up 14 positions in the rating and now ranks 74th place in the world rankings (index 0.779). Ukraine has a new opportunity to take a more significant position in the post-covid world, strengthen its place in the world economy and international politics, given digitalization and transformation of the world order, when human resources and knowledge play an increasingly important role, as well as the ingenuity and intelligence of the Ukrainian people, their optimism and “cordocentrism” (cordiality, sincerity, humanity),

Conclusions

Many experts wonder whether the coronavirus will end the era of globalization. It is very difficult to answer this question unequivocally and, yet most analysts agree that globalization is likely to continue but in new forms. Old inefficient economic institutions and mechanisms will pass into oblivion, leaving room for new practices. In particular, the extinction of old sectors of the economy and the formation of new ones in their place, which arose due to the digitalization process, will accelerate. The incorporation of new technological advances and developments into the economy, as a rule, has a great impact on social relations, often negative. The reformatting of the services sector has begun to contribute to the liberalization of labour relations. If earlier this process provoked social protest (one can mention “yellow vests” in France in 2018-2019), this process will only accelerate in the new “postcovid” conditions. Therefore, special attention should be paid to the adaptation of society to new economic realities since the coronavirus pandemic accelerates this process.

Crises are opportunities for growth, development and new social arrangements. However, crises do not guarantee them. The civilization should make efforts to learn lessons. One should hope that current coronavirus pandemic is fruitful for the countries of the world and will lead to reforms. The authors of the article would like to end it with a quote from "Ten lessons for a post-pandemic world" by Zakaria (2020):

“We could settle into a world of slow growth, increasing natural dangers, and rising inequalities, and continue with business as usual. Or we could choose to act forcefully, using the vast capacity of government to make massive new investments to equip people with the skills and security they need in an age of bewildering change. We could build a twenty-first-century infrastructure putting to work many of those most threatened by new technologies. We could curb carbon emissions simply by placing a price on them that reflects their true cost. And we could recognize that along with dynamism and growth, we need resilience and security – or else the next crisis could be the last... The problem has not been to arrive at solutions – it has been to find the political will to implement them. We need reforms in many areas and were they enacted, these reforms would add up to a revolution of sorts. With even some of these ideas implemented, the world could look very different twenty years from now” (p. 20).

References

- Baron, O. (2020, September 10). Deutsche Bank erwartet “Zeitalter der Unordnung” [Deutsche Bank expects “Age of Disorder”]. *Godmode trader*. <https://www.godmode-trader.de/artikel/deutsche-bank-erwartet-zeitalter-der-unordnung,8693277>
- Costa, M.V. (2020). The indeterminacy of Rawls’s principles for gender justice. In J. Mandle, & S. Roberts-Cadyeds (Eds.), *John Rawls. Debating the Major Questions* (pp. 237–248). Oxford University Press. <https://oxford.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.1093/oso/9780190859213.001.0001/oso-9780190859213-chapter-21>
- Department of Global Communications. (2020). *Funding the fight against COVID-19 in the world’s poorest countries*. <https://www.un.org/en/un-coronavirus-communications-team/funding-fight-against-covid-19-world%E2%80%99s-poorest-countries>
- Gabarta, A. (2020). *Posledstviya pandemii koronavirusa: sotsialno-ekonomicheskii aspekt* [The effects of COVID pandemic: a socio-economic aspect]. https://ru.valdaiclub.com/a/highlights/posledstviya-pandemii-koronavirusa/?sphrase_id=473850
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: notes on the management of the spoiled identity*. Prentice Hall. <https://www.amazon.com/Stigma-Notes-Management-Spoiled-Identity/dp/0671622447>
- Kresina, I., Shust, N., Hultai, M., Spivak, M., & Durnov, Ye. (2020). Social responsibility in the context of global challenges: the case of Ukraine. *Revista Amazonia investiga*, 9(27), 578-587. <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2020.27.03.62>
- Kymlicka, W. (2002). *Contemporary political philosophy. An introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. <https://www.amazon.com/Contemporary-Political-Philosophy-Will-Kymlicka/dp/0198782748>
- Lopez-Claros, A. (2020). *COVID-19 shows we need to strengthen social protections*. http://augustolopezclaros.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/COVID-19-and-Social-Protections_Lopez-Claros_1-June-2020.pdf?x63557
- Lowry, C. (2020). Sen’s capability critique. In J. Mandle, & S. Roberts-Cadyeds (Eds.), *John Rawls. Debating the Major Questions* (pp. 170–182). Oxford University Press. <https://oxford.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.1093/oso/9780190859213.001.0001/oso-9780190859213-chapter-15>
- Meadows, D.H., Meadows, D.L., Randers, J., & Behrens III, W.W. (1971). *The limits of growth: a report from the Club of Rome’s Project’s on the Predicament of Mankind*. Universe Books. <http://www.donellameadows.org/wp-content/userfiles/Limits-to-Growth-digital-scan-version.pdf>
- Nerubasska, A., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). The Demarkation of Creativity, Talent and Genius in Humans: a Systemic Aspect. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(2), 240-255. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.2/172>

- Nerubasska, A., Palshkov, K., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). A Systemic Philosophical Analysis of the Contemporary Society and the Human: New Potential. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(4), 275-292. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.4/235>
- Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. <https://dowbor.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/14Thomas-Piketty.pdf>
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvjf9z6v>
- Schwab, K. (2020). *The aftermath of the Covid-19 pandemic*. <https://blackwells.co.uk/bookshop/product/The-Aftermath-of-the-COVID-19-Pandemic-by-Klaus-Schwab-author/9798566929415>
- Schwab, K., Malleret, T., & Zahidi, S. (2020). *Covid-19: The Great Reset*. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/07/covid-19-the-great-reset/>
- Suisse Research Institute. (2020). *What will last? The long-term implications of COVID-19*. <https://www.credit-suisse.com/media/assets/corporate/docs/about-us/research/publications/the-long-term-implications-of-covid-19.pdf>
- Toffler, A. (1971). *Future shock*. Bantam Books, Inc. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/sce.3730560328>
- Toynbee, A.J. (1987). *A study of history. Abridgement of Volumes I–VI*. Oxford University Press. <https://www.amazon.com/Study-History-Vol-Abridgement-Volumes/dp/0195050800>
- United Nations Development Programme. (2020). *Latest Human Development Index Ranking*. <http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/latest-human-development-index-ranking>
- World Health Organization. (2020). *Social stigma associated with COVID-19. A guide to preventing and addressing social stigma*. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/social-stigma-associated-with-covid-19>
- Zakaria, F. (2020). *Ten lessons for a post-pandemic world*. W. W. Norton & Company. <https://www.amazon.com/Lessons-Post-Pandemic-World-Fareed-Zakaria/dp/0393542130>