Modernity, Globalization, and Human Civilization

Yogie Pranowo[1*]

[1] Multimedia Nusantara University, Indonesia; yogie.pranowo7@gmail.com

* Corresponding Author

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

The study of modernity reveals significant transformations in both space and time, accompanied by a shift from traditional to digital modes of thinking. Anthony Giddens, a prominent scholar in the discourse of modernity, emphasizes the interconnectedness of capitalism, industrialism, surveillance, and military power, highlighting their inseparability. Capitalism operates as a system of commodity production, centered on the relationship between private capital rights and labor devoid of ownership rights. Industrialism involves the efficient utilization of material resources for production purposes. Surveillance encompasses the collection, control, and supervision of information and individual activities, particularly in political domains. Meanwhile, military power characterizes a modern state's ability to monopolize the use of mobilizing forces. The main issue to be researched is how the interconnectedness of capitalism, industrialism, surveillance, and military power in the context of modernity influences the social dynamics of society. This research is significant in understanding the complex network of modern society and addressing the challenges faced, particularly regarding rapid social changes and the complexity of relationships between economic, political, and military forces.

ABSTRAK

Kajian mengenai perihal modernitas senantiasa mengungkapkan transformasi yang signifikan dalam ruang dan waktu. Hal itu seringkali ditandai dengan pergeseran cara berpikir dari tradisional ke modern/digital. Anthony Giddens menekankan keterkaitan kapitalisme, industrialisme, pengawasan, dan kekuatan militer, yang tak bisa dipisahkan satu dari yang lainnya. Kapitalisme beroperasi sebagai sistem produksi komoditas, berpusat pada hubungan antara hak kepemilikan modal pribadi dan tenaga kerja tanpa hak kepemilikan. Industrialisme melibatkan penggunaan efisien sumber daya material untuk tujuan produksi. Pengawasan mencakup pengumpulan, pengendalian, dan pengawasan informasi dan aktivitas individu, terutama di ranah politik. Sementara itu, kekuatan militer mencirikan kemampuan negara modern untuk memonopoli penggunaan kekuatan mobilisasi. Masalah utama yang ingin diteliti adalah bagaimana keterkaitan antara kapitalisme, industrialisme, pengawasan, dan kekuatan militer dalam konteks modernitas mempengaruhi dinamika sosial masyarakat. Penelitian ini memiliki signifikansi dalam memahami jaringan kompleks masyarakat modern dan cara mengatasi tantangan-tantangan yang dihadapi, terutama terkait perubahan sosial yang cepat dan kompleksitas hubungan antara kekuatan ekonomi, politik, dan militer.

1. INTRODUCTION

Giddens begins an analysis of the nature of modernity by proposing a discontinuous interpretation of modern social development. Modernity is discontinuous. In Giddens' view, modernity has removed any form of traditional social order from our lives (Giddens, 1990). The change in order occurred extensively and intensively and was much more profound than in previous times. It is called extensive because it concerns an almost infinite geographical area. And it is called intensive because such changes occur in the most intimate regions of everyday life. This discontinuity is demonstrated by three things. First, is the stage of very rapid change. Technological developments show this rapid change and developments in the technological region mean developments in all other dimensions. Second is the scope of the change. As the world's regions connect, change is happening globally. Third, is the intrinsic nature of modern institutions. Modern social institutions such as the political system of the nation-state, the dependence of production on material resources, and the system of world markets that allowed trade in goods and services could not be found in the traditional period of human civilization (Giddens, 1990).

The peculiarities of modernity turned out to be unintelligible to classical social theory. Giddens points to three important notions that have long been developed in classical social theory and instead shows its failures (Storper, 1985). The first is an institutional analysis of modernity, the second is the concept of society, and the third is the link between sociological knowledge and the character of modernity itself. According to Giddens (Tomlison, 1994), institutional analysis in interpreting modernity always falls on one tradition, namely looking for one main dynamism that determines the changes in human civilization. Marx said that the main transforming force in the modern world is capitalism (Magnis Suseno, 2003; Rockmore, 2000). Durkheim, in Giddens' perspective, rejected Marx's thesis and put forward his thesis that it was industrialism that played a transformative role in this civilization. As Giddens saw, Webber was closer to Durkheim's ideas than Marx's by constructing his ideas of rationalization in the form of bureaucracy and technology as a transforming force. Against all three. Giddens put forward his thesis that modernity is inherently multidimensional (Flew, 2020). For Giddens, modernity includes four things: capitalism, industrialism, surveillance, and military power (Giddens, 1990). Capitalism is a system of commodity production centered on the relationship between personal rights to capital and unprivileged hired work (Sklair, 2002a; Townshend, 2007). Capitalist society has certain characteristics. First, the company is highly competitive and expansive, supported by technological advances. Second is the independence of economic institutions, and third is the separation of politics from economics due to the expanding private ownership of the means of production. And fourth, the autonomy of the State is determined by the control it exercises over the accumulation of capital which is increasingly controlled by the State. While industrialism is the use of material resources for production. Surveillance also means the collection and control of information and supervision of individual activities either directly or indirectly in various areas of their lives, especially political areas. Meanwhile, military power itself is a characteristic of the modern State that can maintain a monopoly on the use of means of power (Giddens, 1990).

On the concept of society, Giddens has two criticisms of Marxist and Durkheimian understanding (McPhee, 2004; Townshend, 2007). In the first, he affirmed the importance of an analysis of the concept of the nation-state as one of the modern forms of society. The second is about the theoretical interpretation of the concept of society as constructed by Parson. According to Giddens, the main goal of Parsonian sociology is to look for factors that govern society. And thus Giddens wanted to evaluate Parson with a more essential understatement of seeing society as a social system binding space and time. Giddens saw that social systems influenced each other in socio-political and cultural areas even though each had an internal unity.

The third concept is the relationship between sociology and modern reality itself. Giddens assumes that there are at least two connections between sociology and modern reality. First, it treats sociology as a provider of information about social life that can be used to control that social life, and secondly, the information provided by sociology cannot simply be applied to concrete social life but rather must first be filtered by the social actor. Against those two understandings, Giddens proposed an alternative that he called double hermeneutics. There are two frameworks of meaning that interact and influence each other. On the one hand, there is a concrete world of social life experienced by the layman. On the other hand, there is a framework of meaning built by the social sciences with their multilingualism that demands certain skills.

This research aims to delve deeper into Giddens' multidimensional approach to modernity, exploring how the distinct elements of modernity—capitalism, industrialism, surveillance, and military power—interact and reshape traditional social orders. The central research problem focuses on understanding the mechanisms and impacts of these interactions on contemporary social structures and individual lives. This issue is significant because a thorough comprehension of these dynamics can provide insights into the broader processes of social transformation. Specifically, it can help identify the benefits and drawbacks of these changes, contributing to the development of effective strategies for adapting to modernity's challenges.

The research seeks to address several key questions: how technological advancements contribute to the acceleration of social change in the era of modernity, the extent to which globalization alters traditional social orders in various countries, the main characteristics of modern social institutions and how they differ from traditional social institutions, and how the elements of modernity—capitalism, industrialism, surveillance, and military power—interact to shape modern social structures and individual experiences.

This study is crucial for several reasons. First, it aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the forces driving modern social changes, which is essential for sociologists, policymakers, and educators. Second, it seeks to highlight the implications of these changes on both global and local scales, thereby contributing to more informed decision-making processes. Finally, by examining Giddens' theories in detail, the research hopes to offer valuable perspectives on the multidimensional nature of modernity, enriching the broader field of sociology and enhancing our understanding of contemporary social dynamics.

2.   RESEARCH METHOD

This research employs a qualitative approach based on a literature review. For the research design, the researcher follows the steps outlined by Kaczynski (2014), Neuman (2014), and Creswell (2018). These steps include:

- Conceptual Framework Development: In this stage, the researcher formulates problem identification, research design, and research procedures. This is done by examining phenomena related to globalization as recorded in literature reviews and attempting to hypothesize based on existing theories.
- Instrument Development: In this part, the researcher outlines several theories presented in the detailed discussion of this article. The theoretical instruments used employ a qualitative approach.
- Data Analysis: At this stage, the researcher conducts a descriptive analysis derived from qualitative data. This elaboration of data helps the researcher identify connections between the variables studied in this research.
- Conclusion: In this section, the researcher provides a summary of the study's findings, which are presented in the conclusion section.

3.   RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In premodern societies, time and space are related to the location of a person (McPhee, 2004). The rhythm of time in everyday life is determined by the change of seasons and the daily atmosphere of the locals. Space is limited to what can be captured directly and measured by the location where a person is located. In the 18th century, the invention and spread of clocks gave rise to the universalization of time. Time is released from the bonds of place and allows for the reorganization of time and the global system according to specific zones. Likewise, space, as it is outlined on the map, becomes universal, no longer tied to individual locations. The separation or distanciation of time and space is a process of modernization. Giddens calls it disembedding (Giddens, 1990). The liberation of time and space allows the organization or regulation of human activities across the distances of time and space. Time is released from locally experienced events and becomes a mathematical time unit scheme.

The disembedding mechanism also formulates the process of symbolization even further. The first symbolizes money as the medium of the exchange system. Money can shift value from one context to another and thus allow social relationships across time and space. In addition, the process of abstraction also occurs in what Giddens calls the expert system, which is a system of expertise or expertise that can be transferred into the context system. This disembedding mechanism presupposes the existence of the trust, namely that the community has confidence in the value of money and the accuracy of expertise. So modernity includes high trust and high risk (Storper, 1985).

Although modern man allows himself and his life to be influenced by the mechanism of money and expertise, it is always accompanied by a monitoring mechanism. Because they are aware of risks, modern humans are also called risk societies, and modernization currently is called reflexsive modernization. Modern society is reflexive in the sense that social activity is always accompanied by the flow of information and analysis of information, it will always undergo reproduction and revision (Kiratli, 2022). People no longer lean on habits, for example in the case of the education of the child, but always look for information about how to carry out the task from TV, books, expert consultations, and others.

Global Culture

The symptoms of globalization are not new, they have preceded modernity and the development of capitalism. The main currents of thought and thinking frameworks of the idea of globalization today are about issues that seem to have entered a contemporary realm that cannot be adequately understood only in the context of the nation-state level (Sklair, 2002b). The problem in question is not only in the context of national society but also has encompassed a global problem, which (to be sure) has exceeded the level of a nation-state. Traditional as well as contemporary sociology places its studies on state-national societies or national societies. Globalization is shaping the world as 'one place'. Thus, the refocusing of the sociology project—moving away from the 'society' and the 'nation-state' towards the 'world society'—is seen as a logical prerequisite for giving meaning to the contemporary human condition. The worldwide theory of global systems has its characteristics, namely "thinking globally, acting locally" (Caselli, 2013).

The global system, by the end of the twentieth century, was not synonymous with global capitalism but the dominant force of global capitalism had become the dominant force in the global system. In simpler words, individuals, groups, institutions, and even all local, national, and transnational communities, can thrive because they always carry out capitalization activities in a global system that is global (Sklair, 2008).

Capitalism has always sought to persuade people to consume products created by their corporate enterprises to perpetuate the accumulation of capital for optimal profit (Sayers, 2015).

The culture-ideology of consumerism states that the meaning of life can be found in what we have. Therefore, in the culture of consumerism, the fullness of one's life is embodied in the activity of consumer goods or services continuously. The notion of men and women as economic or political beings discarded by global capitalism is quite logical because the system of global capitalism does not pretend to satisfy everyone in the life of the nation and state. In the system of global capitalism, individuals are spoiled by capitalist products that seem to demand to always be fulfilled (Sklair, 2002a). Human beings are becoming more and more forgetting about their humanity and only thinking about technical things, multidimensional humans are now transformed into one-dimensional humans (Adian, 2006).

Since the early 1960s, increasing empirical pressure has forced sociology to abandon the assumption that national societies can only be understood without seeing what exists beyond their existential existence. The nation-state remains an important part of the analysis of the global system. Nation-states should also be analyzed as a form of operation of a more global system. Global cultural flows, technology, people, goods, and capital determine the level at which and how society changes at the national level (Caselli, 2013).

The approach commonly used by many prominent sociologists differs from that of the study of international relations. The International Relations approach emphasizes and sees the global system as a structured part, especially in interactions between nations in which the state is a unitary actor. The global system is also thought to be neatly structured due to the distribution of national power between developed nations. Sociologists are also fundamentally very interested in how a global system that is structured and closely related to the flow of resources, people, ideas, and attitudes across geographical boundaries is interrelated and closely related to the progress of the modern world (Ritzer, 2008).

In sociology, ''globalization'' has changed in both the economic, political, and "development" spheres of sustainable states, with central themes in their respective subfields and disciplines. The topic of globalization is also often raised by sociologists to the point of interdisciplinary debates with political scientists, anthropology, geography, and even sometimes economics. At the most abstract level, globalization concerns the removal of time from space. Giddens named the symptom time-space distanciation, while Harvey called it time-space compression (Giddens, 1990; Ritzer, 2008). Back before the internet and communication technology were as advanced as they are now, a person who wanted to meet his old best friend was very difficult. Even having to use correspondence services that take a long time, now, everything can be done easily. Especially with the support of increasingly sophisticated technology. Even in reality, we are often unable to tell which is reality as reality, and which is virtual reality. As technology develops as part of the development of globalization, we are increasingly spoiled and bombarded by cyberspace (Wilcox et al., 2003).

Etymologically, the word Maya is rooted in the word virtus or virtue which means excellence, potential, success, and maturity. Virtue, as explained by Rob Shields points to the conformity of life attitudes and moral principles (Shields, 2003). Quoted in etimonline.com mentioned since the middle of the 17th century, Maya is already understood as something that exists as an essence or fact, although it is not called so. In addition, the word Maya is often used as a noun "the virtual", which describes a place, space, and all the graphic objects of the world as well as animated personas that inhabit fictional, ritual, and digital domains as representations of actual objects and humans (Shields, 2003). Michael Heim explains that Maya is something that has an effect even though it is not officially recognized, while the reality is an event or sitting matter (state of affairs). From the combination of the two words, virtual reality is an event or entity whose effects are real but not real as fact (Heim, 1993). Let's just say that when watching a movie in a cinema with the help of 3D glasses. It's as if there are real objects that are very close to us. It's not something that happened, it's just that we believe it to be something real.

A simple understanding explains that virtual reality consists of two words, namely reality, and Maya. Reality is what we experience whereas Maya can be interpreted as approaching. So, virtual reality means approaching reality. As a technical term in computer technology, virtual reality is used to describe a three-dimensional environment resulting from computer simulations that a person can explore and interact with (Ludlow, 2015). The person becomes part of the virtual world or is immersed in that environment. If he is in virtual reality, he can manipulate objects or perform a series of actions. Rob Shields also gave an example of the meaning of Maya by taking examples of things commonly referred to as virtual teams. This group is intended as a working group that not only communicates via e-mail and so on, but as a whole unit assembled to address certain types of problems. An example is computer data that can be re-displayed on a video screen. They are called Maya simply because people do not face each other face to face and are far apart from each other but their nature is latent. The infrastructure that supports them is a communication network (link) so that they leave only a small trace of reality, such as email records and archives of video-conference recordings (Shields, 2003).

Marxism and the Theory of Modernization

Since the 19th century, the issue of the impact of work as a human activity that influences culture has been sharply alluded to by philosophers. Let's just say Hegel's ideas were very influential in Germany, especially towards Ludwig Feuerbach: Feuerbach argued that religion was a projection of human nature (Sullivan, 1970). Man has alienated himself by projecting his essence on something outside of himself. Thus, man becomes poor. Marx criticized Feuerbach's view by saying that Feuerbach did not answer the question: why does man alienate himself? This is what Marx will answer.

Marx took over the dialectical method from Hegel and applied it to see the development of society.

"My dialectic method is not only different from Hegel's but exactly the opposite. For Hegel, the life process of the human brain, that is, the thought process, which under the banner of "Idea" is even transformed into one independent subject, is the essence of the real world, and the real world is merely an external and phenomenal form of "Idea". For me, on the contrary, ideas are nothing, but the real world reflected in the human mind, and translated in the forms of the mind." (Sullivan, 1970)

The dialectic here is not the same as Engels' "dialectical materialism" which sees the whole of nature as having a dialectically developed "matter" substance, or metaphysical teaching of matter as the ultimate reality. What Marx taught was a "materialist conception of history" or "historical materialism." (Tarrit, 2006). Marx's historical materialism would like to state that historical development is influenced by real living conditions, that is, through production or economic systems. It is not the mind, but rather social work that is the basic human activity (Budi Hardiman, 2004). There is a development of the mode of production from simple to capitalism. Changes in terms of the way of production will generate changes in social relations, political power, and various other forms of consciousness.

The social power, i.e. the multiplied productive force, which arises through the cooperation of different individuals as it is determined within the division of labor, appears to these individuals, since their cooperation is not voluntary but natural, not as their united power, but as an alien force existing outside them, of the origin and end of which they are ignorant, which they thus cannot control, which on the contrary passes through a peculiar series of phases and stages independent of the will and action of man, nay even being the prime governor of these. (Sullivan, 1970)

Marx saw human history as the realization of the human self. If in Hegel history is the realization of the human self, that is, the moments of development of the Spirit or Idea, for Marx

the realization of the human self-in history occurs through work. Similarly, in the book German Ideology, Marx and Engels say in the whole conception of history up to the present, the real basic of history has been neglected or else considered as a minor matter, quite irrelevant to the course of history (Rockmore, 2000).

Man creates history through labor and by labor man manifests himself and humanizes nature. With human labor, man realizes his social and meets his needs by cultivating nature. Furthermore, human needs are evolving beyond physical needs alone. By labor man also embodies his freedom. Man realizes himself by transforming the world through work (Jones, 2011).

According to Marx, work is a typical human activity. For him what distinguishes man from animals is work. Four things make work a human activity (Imam, 1993):

1. Work is the fulfillment of human needs. Man cannot directly meet his needs from nature like an animal. His body demands an adjustment or an effort upon nature. This means demanding work. Here it appears that man is a natural being at once more than natural. He is distanced from nature and his ratio distinguishes him from other beings which makes him move not according to his mere instincts as happens with animals. Thus, he becomes a free being because he does not live in a confined environment that binds himself to his instincts. As a result of this, man cultivates nature, where he works.

2. Work is the realization of human potential. In work, man objectifies himself to nature through his work. Nature gains the face of man, and the image of the self-created in nature because of his work justifies his existence and elevates his consciousness and self-recognition to a dialectically higher level.

3. Work shows aspects of human sociality. It is easy to understand that it is impossible for man to single-handedly meet all his needs. It needs someone else for that. In addition, man needs the recognition of others for the results of his work. Self-recognition and acceptance confirm his existence in the world.

4. Through labor man produces something and leaves traces. Work produces culture and builds human history. It is through that work that humanity is carried out and developed.

In the years after World War II, Marxism and the theory of modernization were debated about the problems and consequences of the development of the capitalistic world. However, although their ideologies are slightly contradictory, they nevertheless share some basic assumptions about the character of this development of the modern world. They share the assumption that global systems are dominated by diffusion processes. In the words of the Communist Manifesto, the expansive character of capitalist production expresses its opinion from a Marxist perspective that it is only by the expansion of the core economic relations of the state, especially in the form of importing more foreign capital, that poor countries may be able to reduce the gap that separates them from rich countries (Magnis Suseno, 2003).

Sklair argues that the world system organized through the nation-state is being replaced by a 'global' system and has been dominated by economic, political structures, and inter-state social activities (Sklair, 2002b). He pointed to the emergence of a transnational capitalist class that governs the world economy for its own sake, in contrast to the worldview in which the global system constantly competes with the capitalist class (Sklair, 2008). Robinson argues that sociology should move beyond the nation-state with an analytically-based approach to creating transnational social structures as well as appropriate objects of study, since individuals are largely determined by their position in structures such as economics, politics, and transnational culture are somewhat other than with national or local transnational-characteristic structures that are very, very strongly dominated by capital (Jones, 2011; Ritzer, 2008). Another Marxist-oriented theory emphasizes the irrationality of capitalist competition on a global scale since competition between national capitalists creates a crisis of profitability for capital due to global

overcapacity, which in turn causes declining conditions for labor. Nonetheless, the emphasis remains a dilemma of the diffusion of capitalism and is a fact of diffusion predicted by many observers, especially sociologists (Magnis Suseno, 2003).

Investigating the complex prevalence of ideas and attitudes associated with modernity provided an important impetus for modernization theorists to look globally at the diffusion of culture and social structure. Giddens argues for an inherently globalized modernity. Both are connected by the process of disembedding social relationships from the context of local interactions. There are two main mechanisms of disembedding: symbolic tokens (universal media such as money) and expert systems (bodies of technical knowledge that can be applied in a variety of different contexts) (Giddens, 1990).

World System Theory

The contribution of the dependency approach to our understanding of the international system, however, has been limited by the fact that it does not focus directly on the structure of the global system itself. The world of systems approach, launched by Immanuel Wallerstein and others in the early 1970s, takes the overall structure of the system as a starting point (Jones, 2011). Wallerstein contributed not only to direct the attention of the analysis of the global system itself but also to establishing the contemporary capitalist world system in the context of the previous system that was rife in society (Sklair, 2002b).

Wallerstein's in-world system, the hierarchical structure is postulated as something essential for its survival. The early geographical expansion of the economic and political influence of northwestern Europe in the late fourteenth century in Wallerstein's view was important for carrying out a productive organizational transformation of the region. Furthermore, the exchange between regions with different modes of extraction has become central to maintaining the accumulation process in the system (Aziz et al., n.d.).

Another interesting trend in the current sociological work on the global system is the increased attention of sociologists to the politics of international relations among countries. World systems theory does not analyze how those countries are affected by the development of world-systems—unlike in previous perspectives. However, this analysis is concentrated on the struggle between nations to take over hegemonic power in the world system (Sklair, 2008).

Network Community Transformation

Globalization that began in the economic sphere inevitably affects the types of jobs, work patterns, and lifestyles of its workforce. The new labor force called Castells the flex-timers can no longer live up to the customs and traditions of pre-industrial societies to industrialized societies (Castells, 2004). Traditional values also inevitably shifted. For example, one of Castells' studies across America and Europe shows a dwindling number of traditional families surviving to death as a unit. Traditional patriarchal families are diminishing with the women's movement, the acceptance of homosexuality, and the phenomenon of single parenthood (Castells, 2022).

However, man's need for a continuous meaning is unchanged. The increasingly blurred hereditary traditions amid world interconnectedness pose new problems in identity formation. Highlighting this, Castells, like several other social scientists who discussed the emergence of fundamentalism viewed the social movement as one of the reactions to this identity crisis (Castells, 2004).

In politics and statehood, Castells did not issue bombastic statements like Fukuyama. Castells only describes the crisis facing the nation-state like the figure of the king of the universe living alone on a planet in the fairy tale Little Prince Saint Exupery. He also described the ongoing crisis of democracy and then reconstructed democracy (Castells, 2004).

In the transformation of society into a network society, various new social problems have also emerged. The interconnectedness of the world, in addition to producing socio-political movements that seek to liberate the marginalized inhabitants of the world from oppression, also produces global crimes that are strongly supported by information technology (Castells, 2004). Fundamentalism in its form heralded by America and OECD member states, as well as the covert terror of developed countries against the world's poor majority, are also the result of interconnectedness or sociability. So what is a network society?

Network societies were a new phenomenon in the late 20th century, as was the term informational society that many called Castells. Both terms are often used to designate the same society, but some differences make Castells choose the title The Rise of the Network Society and not The Informational Society. What is a network society? In his conclusion, Castells defines a network society as a society in the information century in which dominant functions and processes are increasingly organized around the network. Networks determine the new social morphology of society, and the spread of network logic substantially modifies operations and outcomes in production, experience, power, and culture. The special character of the network society is that it is superior to morphology over social action, with the prevailing thinking paradigm being the information technology paradigm (Castells, 2022).

In reading Castells, it is necessary to distinguish the network society, the information society, and the informational society. The term information society emphasizes the role of information in society. While informational signifies attributes of a particular form of social organization where the process of generating, processing, and broadcasting information is a fundamental source of productivity and power. Informational society is heavily influenced by the technological conditions that emerged in this period of history. One of the key characteristics of an informational society is the network logic in its basic structure. Nevertheless, the term network society is not the same as informational society. Because other components in the informational society such as the State or social movements show characteristics that are different from the logic of the network. And according to Castells, today's network society is nothing but a capitalist society

4. Conclusion

The problems faced by modern humans today are complex and multifaceted. In the context of globalization as a worldwide system, we observe how it allows us to expand our local thinking into broader and more universal perspectives. The culture-ideology of consumerism suggests that the meaning of life can be found in material possessions. Consequently, in a consumerist culture, the fullness of one's life is manifested through the continuous consumption of goods or services. If a modern individual does not engage in continuous consumption, their existence may be questioned by prevailing public assumptions.

As inhabitants of the modern era, we are challenged to critically address contemporary issues. Economic background is a crucial component in analyzing human life problems since the economy drives human existence. Without economic activities, humans would struggle to function in society. However, we must remain vigilant of the growing influence of capitalism and consumerism in social life. Global capitalism has spread through large corporate corporations that bombard us with persuasive advertisements. These advertisements create a perceived need for their products, suggesting that our value and meaningfulness as humans depend on consumption.

It is essential to emphasize the need for strict control over advertisements in society. Advertisements have the power to either civilize or degrade societal culture. Effective social control over advertising can foster a conducive environment for a modern human civilization that

is critical, dignified, and well-intentioned. Such a civilization would not solely base its existence on profit-driven activities. Instead, it would encourage a balanced approach to life that values both material and non-material aspects, ensuring a holistic development of individuals and society. This approach will help mitigate the negative impacts of consumerism and foster a more equitable and meaningful human existence in the modern world.

REFERENCES

Adian, D. G. (2006). Percik Pemikiran Kontemporer. Jalasutra.

Aziz, A., Government, I. P., Brantley, J., Taylor, S., Ashley, M., Abdul, D., & Ibrahim, A. (n.d.). Globalization and International Business Communication: The understanding of the matter of globalization and the global market Globalization and International Business Communication: The understanding of the matter of globalization and the global market 1. In International Journal of Science, Engineering, and Technology (Vol. 2022, Issue 2). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359329691

Budi Hardiman, F. (2004). Filsafat Modern dari Machiavelli sampai Nietzsche. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Caselli, M. (2013). Nation states, Cities, and people: Alternative ways to measure globalization. SAGE Open, 3(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244013508417

Castells, M. (2004). The Network Society. Edward Elgard Publishing, Inc.

Castells, M. (2022). The Network Society Revisited. American Behavioral Scientist. https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642221092803

Flew, T. (2020). Globalization, neo-globalization, and post-globalization: The challenge of populism and the return of the national. Global Media and Communication, 16(1), 19–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/1742766519900329

Giddens, A. (1990). The Consequences of Modernity. Polity Press.

Heim, M. (1993). The Metaphysics of Virtual Reality. Oxford University Press.

Imam, R. H. (1993). Louis Dupre Alienasi Kultural dalam Pemikiran Karl Marx. In Tim Redaksi Driyarkara (Ed.), Diskursus Kemasyarakatan dan Kemanusiaan (Seri Driyarkara). Gramedia.

Jones, P. (2011). Introducing Social Theory (2nd edition). Polity Press.

Kiratli, O. S. (2022). Loving globalization: High-growth enterprises and public opinion on globalization in Europe. European Union Politics, 146511652211380. https://doi.org/10.1177/14651165221138026

Ludlow, B. L. (2015). Virtual Reality: Emerging Applications and Future Directions. In Rural Special Education Quarterly (Vol. 34, Issue 3). http://www.simschool.org.

Magnis Suseno, F. (2003). Pemikiran Karl Marx dari Sosialisme Utopis ke Perselisihan Revisionisme. Gramedia.

McPhee, R. D. (2004). Clegg and Giddens on power and (post) modernity. Management Communication Quarterly, 18(1), 129–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318904265134

Ritzer, G. (2008). Modern Sociological Theory (2nd Edition). McGraw-Hill International Edition.

Rockmore, T. (2000). On recovering Marx after Marxism. Philosophy & Social Criticism, 26(4), 95–106.

Sayers, S. (2015). Marxism and the doctrine of internal relations. Capital and Class, 39(1), 25–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309816814564129

Shields, R. (2003). The Virtual. Routledge.

Sklair, L. (2002a). Democracy and the Transnational Capitalist Class. In ANNALS, AAPSS (Vol. 581, pp. 144–157). Sage Publications, Inc.

Sklair, L. (2002b). The Transnational Capitalist Class and Global Politics: Deconstructing the Corporate-State Connection. International Political Science Review, 23(2), 159–174.

Sklair, L. (2008). Sociology of The Global System. In F. J. Lechner & J. Boli (Eds.), The Globalization Reader (5th edition). Wiley-Blackwell.

Storper, M. (1985). The spatial and temporal constitution of social action: a critical reading of Giddens. Environment and Planning, 3, 407–424.

Sullivan, J. E. (1970). Prophets of The West. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.

Tarrit, F. (2006). A brief history, scope, and peculiarities of "Analytical Marxism." Review of Radical Political Economics, 38(4), 595–618. https://doi.org/10.1177/0486613406293223

Tomlison, J. (1994). The Phenomenology of Globalization? Giddens on Global Modernity. European Journal of Communication, 9, 149–172.

Townshend, J. (2007). Living with Capitalism: From Hobson to Giddens. British Journal of Politics and International Relations, 9(4), 599–617. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856X.2006.00276.x

Wilcox, L. M., Allison, R. S., Elfassy, S., & Grelik, C. (2003). Personal Space in Virtual Reality. Human Factors and Ergonomics Society, 2097–2101. www.vision.caltech.edu/bouguetj/calib-doc/index.html