



Approach to the Activities of Closed and Open Societies in which Creativity Prevails

Vladimir Nikolayevich Sukhanov^{1,2,◇}

¹Kaliningrad State Technical University. 1 Sovietsky Prospect, 236022 Kaliningrad, Russia.

²c/o 366 Westgate Road, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE4 6NX, United Kingdom.

To cite this article:

Vladimir Nikolayevich Sukhanov. “Approach to the Activities of Closed and Open Societies in which Creativity Prevails”, *Parana Journal of Science and Education*. v.9, n.7, **2023**, pp. 35-52.

Received: October 18, 2023; **Accepted:** November 21, 2023; **Published:** December 1, 2023.

Abstract

A comparison of open and closed societies, their coexistence, complementarity, as well as the directions of their development are presented: a detained society and a reflexive society. The orientation of society towards openness is determined by the orientation of society's participants towards the development of external, still unknown, space: innovation, creativity in all its manifestations, new values, not yet formulated. The participants' perception of the openness and closedness of a society depends on the thinking preferences of these participants: focusing on local values and sources, for a closed society, and turning to external sources, for an open society. The participant's creative view (his perception) on the openness and closedness of society is presented.

Keywords: Society, Creative, Time, Law, State, Army, Family, Activity, Knowledge, Idea.

[◇]Email: inventcreat@yahoo.com; svn@physics.org



1. Introduction

“Should society have a predetermined form, or should its members be allowed to determine the form of the society in which they live?” The first type of society was called by Karl Popper as a closed society, the latter – as an open one. [1]

1.1. History

In mid–first millennium BC. Society appeared as open in Ancient Greece, in Athens, and as closed, in Sparta. [1]

In 1945. Karl Popper attempted to characterize these two types of society and give them scientifically based formulations: "A closed society is a magical, tribal or collectivist society... An open society is a society in which individuals are forced to make personal decisions." [1]

In 1935. The terms "open society" and "closed society" were first used by Henri Bergson in “The Two Sources of Morals and Religion”. [2]

In 1996. George Soros brought up the relevance and vital need of the idea of an open society. [3]

In 2003. The author presented both the differences between open and closed societies, as well as their natural relationship. [4]

In the period from 1993 to 2013, special attention was paid to the description of a closed society. [5] [6] [7]

Both types of society: open and closed, coexisted and continue to coexist simultaneously to this day. [1]

1.2. Comparison of open and closed societies

Comparative studies [8] are the first step towards revealing the nature of societies: open and closed.

An open society is synonymous with freedom and individualism, while the main characteristics of a closed society are orientation and collectivism. Open and closed types of societies differ in how they manage their internal and external affairs, based on different philosophical tenets. [1]

The formulations of open and closed societies have different basis and are different in nature. They are united only by the fact that both are a community of people united by the characteristics of their organization and activities: [4]

1.0. An open society is a community of people interested in each other, in achieving personal goals (or goals accepted as personal), on the basis of equality (lack of privileges), while mutual interest ensures the unity of society, and the structure of society itself is associative.

1.C. A closed society is a society of people united to achieve a common goal (or goals) on the basis of legitimate or tacit privileges, while the goal of the society ensures its unity, and the privileges ensure a hierarchical management structure.

2.0. In an open society, there is a stabilizing element in the relationships between participants: They consciously strive to settle their affairs, and solve problems that arise themselves and in a timely manner.

2.C. In a closed society, the stabilizing principle is laid in its social structure and the presence of laws designed to provide for all life processes and phenomena in society. In a closed society, the cult of law (custom or etiquette) can be traced. Due to the presence of an abundance of all kinds of laws known to people, their constant updating and the discovery of new natural laws, as well as sometimes unlimited state “law-making,” closed societies are distinguished by exceptional diversity and historical uniqueness. The most exotic, ambitious and bizarre societies are closed.

3.0. An open society is monotonous and inexpressive, like a modest Cinderella.

3.C. A closed society, in its best examples, is compared to a living organism.

4.0. In an open society, each participant is responsible for his own life and goes bankrupt personally, while the society respects the right to private property and personal dignity.

4.C. In a closed society, our “sacred duty” is to go bankrupt all together, and private property is a questionable (reprehensible) or even criminal matter, and what dignity can criminals have?

5.0. An open society tends to creativity.

5.C. A closed society tends to specialize.

Pioneering innovations in a closed society are not only not produced, they are not even considered if they arise by chance. To identify pioneering innovations, real activity of innovative participants is required, as in an open society, and not individual state (or public) structures or organizations, as in a closed society.



Government officials can consider traditional innovations within the framework of established dogmas, for example, in accordance with the current state of knowledge. Naturally, officials cannot consider something that is fundamentally unknown to them. Therefore, it is incorrect to offer pioneering innovations in a closed society. No one will understand anything anyway.

6.0. The culture of behavior in an open society is personal.

6.C. In a closed society, public discipline and state legality of the behavior of participants are established.

7.0. A condition for the life of an open society is a culture of communication between participants.

7.C. In a closed society, no attention is paid to such culture at all, except as required by etiquette. The role of this culture in a closed society is played by regulations or customs. [4]

8.0. Economic relations can provide positive conditions for relationships in an open society, with great attention paid to the morality and culture of relationships between the participants. [3]

Indeed, one cannot exist without the other. An open society, with economic relations and without a culture of communication, will turn into an association of swindlers. It is the personal culture of the participants, in conjunction with the culture of society that has a significant influence on the choice of goals of the participants. In turn, a set of goals and methods for achieving them determine the “face” of any society.

9.0. In an open society, each individual is an individual, and he is recognizable and has his own name and face. The condition of recognition and responsibility of each individual is the basis for the formation of relationships in an open society, but the individual himself is outside the boundaries of society, since the personal name of the individual cannot be transferred, exchanged or sold. Personality is one of the independent values of an open society.

9.C. In a closed society there is a tendency to depersonalize individuals. The face and name of a closed society is the goal facing this society. Everything else is subordinate and is transformed (or renamed) to achieve the goal. This gives the society a holistic, monolithic and complete character, but if the goal has already been

achieved or it has not justified itself even before it is achieved, then the closed society becomes ineffective.

10.0. In an open society, not only each individual must be recognized, but the entire society must be recognized in the world around us (in the Universe). The nature around us and the entire Universe must recognize society and, if possible, each individual. Otherwise, various types of self-alienation may appear, and we will not have an open society, but only one of the forms of a closed society.

10.C. A closed society excludes anyone or anything outside itself. If a “stranger” is nevertheless discovered by a closed society, he will most likely be classified as an enemy.

11.0. An open society can itself maintain its existence without time limits.

11.C. A closed society is always a temporary phenomenon.

12.0. An open society provides stable good results for a long time and can be the basic form of organization of people.

12.C. A closed society can achieve brilliant results, but only once (after which it is advisable to abandon it).

13.0. An open society is a self-governing society.

13.C. Closed society is hierarchical management. [4]

14.0. An open society gives participants the right to rely on their own strengths and capabilities.

14.C. A closed society tends to control everything and manage everything.

14.C.0. It is fair to say: “A closed society and its participants,” and vice versa: “Participants and their open society.”

14.0.C. “In an open society, many of its members strive to climb the social ladder and take the place of other members... In a closed society, such properties are practically not inherent. Its institutions, including castes, receive a sacred sanction – taboo” [1].

15.C. A closed society is a system with tribal relations, when kinship and acquaintance (the presence of connections) ensures success in society. In a thieving and wild environment, where a “stranger” is outlawed, this is perhaps the only form of ensuring the personal safety of



individual members of society. Mutual guarantee ensures security within closed society.

Anyone who has not learned or accepted such rules of a closed society is forced to vegetate at the bottom of society, even without the right to be a slave. A slave in a closed society is also a position, and such a position must be formalized through appropriate tribal relations and connections. They, in turn, must be periodically (or even constantly) maintained by observing ritual etiquette. Otherwise, the member of society will be thrown out of the relationship.

16.0. Open societies have the highest productivity and efficiency. In addition, as a rule, in an open society, it is customary to reward the results of work, especially creative work.

16.C. In closed societies, position in society is rewarded, not labor, since in such societies it is generally accepted that position corresponds to the labor expended. In fact, this issue is specific, and for each closed society can only be considered separately. [4]

Naturally, the question arises: which one should be preferred?

“Misconceptions suggests that perfection is unattainable and we must be content with the best we have: an imperfect society, always open to perfection.” “... The form of society cannot be 'scientifically' determined, participants must be given the opportunity to determine the form of their organization. Since no one participant has a monopoly on the truth, the system must allow for a process of criticism, in which conflicting views can be freely discussed and eventually be tested by reality.” [3]

This excludes the possibility of the manifestation of a prophet – the bearer of the ultimate truth (at that point in time).

“If no one has the ultimate truth, then we need a form of social organization that would give people the right to choose”. [3]

Contrasting open and closed societies, emphasizes the sanity of the open and the illusory nature of the closed.

To distinguish societies from the standpoint of fallibility, is proposes distinctive features: “...

based on the discrepancy between thinking and reality... An open society acknowledges the existence of this discrepancy, a closed society denies it. These are abstract models, and real conditions may approach him, but will never be able to achieve them, otherwise there would be no difference between thinking and reality.” [3]

From the position of analyzing the way of thinking, is the significant differences between societies based on the dominant way of thinking, which is associated with the type of organization (system) of society, namely the traditional way of thinking – with an organic (or traditional) society, and the critical way of thinking – with open society. [3]

In other words: the static nature of thinking determines the formation of a closed society, and the dynamic nature of an open one.

Considering the stability of societies, there is another difference between them: “An open society corresponds to a state close to equilibrium, and a closed society corresponds to a state far from equilibrium” [3]. Outwardly, this looks like the positive stability of an open society and its dynamic development, and the stagnant uncertainty of a closed society and its periodic jerks to catch up.

1.3. Society values

One of the problems of any society is the lack of values. This is a question for the entire civilization. It is possible that it is values that determine the type of society. The list of true values remains open to this day. Here are some of them: [3]

- Quality of life – “The best criterion of this quality would be the degree of independence that people enjoy, since life should not be reduced to simple survival.”
- The identity and name of the participant as a condition of liability.
- Condition for the independence and capacity of the population.
- Orientation towards an open society is a condition for ensuring the well-being of the most capable and honest part of the population.



- State of satisfaction and happiness.
- Safety and comfort...

The list of these values is open not only to addition but also to deletion of already listed values. It is possible that a universal list will never be compiled.

It is necessary to indicate the values inherent in strictly one type of society: open or closed. For a closed society, the vector of values is directed towards the center: holy place, ideology, land of the fathers, idea, dogma, love of neighbor, patriotism, idolatry, leader... For an open society, the vector of values is directed outwards: open space, new knowledge and technologies, new thinking, universal love, cosmopolitanism... These two types of society have diametrically opposed orientations of value systems.

1.4. Equality of participants

The thesis about the equality of participants may seem fair, but in real life this has never happened and will never happen, since all people are different (individual). Levelling among people is inappropriate. Both types of society: open and closed, suffer from various forms of equalization. This doesn't do them any good.

Besides,

"Open and closed societies are not the only regimes that can be observed in history. Moreover, in reality they cannot exist at all, since they are theoretical constructs." [3]

Of interest is the change of regimes. "Open and closed societies represent ideals to which people can strive." A closed society is always "inspired and fertilized" by an idea. "The absence of an idea in an open society is a manifestation of the condition for personal freedom, for the achievement of each person's personal goal. An open society does not limit a person to any goal. For people from a closed society, deprived of the right to have their own goal or opinion, all this looks like emptiness". [3]

To be free means to have the freedom to be "overboard." Not everyone is able to exchange the illusion of guarantee for freedom of choice. Given the transience of human life, a temporary illusion may seem permanent or even eternal. There are enough people who would prefer not to know all this and be happy in a closed society.

"Those who are unable to find purpose in themselves can turn to dogma, which offers a person a ready-made set of values and a safe place in the universe. The only way to get rid of the lack of purpose is abandon of the open society. If freedom becomes an intolerable burden, then salvation can seem like a closed society." [3]

1.5. Society and State

"An open society presupposes a certain relationship between the state and society... the state and society are not identical; the state must serve society, but not rule it." In fact: "By its nature, the state is better suited to rule than to provide services..." [3]

Probably, society and the state have their own areas for activity. They must complement each other. Although there may be other opinions: "In an open society, the state is under the control of society" [3], and in a "closed society" there may be no society at all, since there is only one state. At the same time, the state itself imitates society.

There may be cases when in a closed society there is no state, and the closed society itself is engaged in its imitation. This is already an example of a family or mafia structures.

In real life, any state is closed, and any search, improvement and creativity (inherent in any society) is always open. For the state, closedness is a condition for self-preservation and ensuring its integrity, and for creative search, openness is the environment and food for activity. At the same time, a state that has abandoned creativity will inevitably transform into a "slave-eunuch" for the world community.

It is worth mentioning the fundamental closed structures without which the state cannot exist. This includes the army, the navy, the family, the babies, the police... State security requires the presence of these closed components for the existence of a closed society, and for an open one as well.

2. Open Society

There is something that has eluded us until now. This is socially useful and recognized creativity as a way of life. The environment for such creativity is an open society. It is beyond verbal categories, despite this, the article makes an attempt to reveal its meaning. [4]



2.1. Foundations of an open society

"An open society is based on the principle that there is an inherent imperfection in our understanding. This seems to be a negative quality, but it can become a positive quality: what is recognized as imperfect can be corrected. Understanding uncertainty allows us to recognize fallibility, which opens up room for unlimited improvement." [3]

"An open society is an ideally changing society in which none of the existing connections (in personal relationships, in opinions and ideas, in production processes and materials, in socio-economic organization...) is final (stable) and the attitude of people's towards country, family and friends are completely dependent on their own decisions. This means the destruction of the forced constancy of social relationships, and the organic structure of society is in complete disintegration." [3]

"Integration can be achieved on the basis of mutually beneficial contracts and agreements, but any agreements can be terminated according to the conditions stipulated in them. In conditions of free competition, there is no room for hopelessness, violence and exploitation... Mechanisms for regulating relationships in such a society already exist. One of them is market relations (with all their varieties). In other words, economic behavior is formed." [3]

The regulatory mechanism can also be based not only on economic principles, but also on other, for example, moral or aesthetic ones. For universal recognition, these principles must represent a more complete, convenient and meaningful generalization of the categories of vital values, compared to economic ones.

Now the most perfect and universal criterion for such an assessment is money. In a market economy, it is convenient to use economic analysis when making decisions, but the economic age, as it began, will end in due time.

This can happen when the universal criterion for assessing life support becomes not money, but something else, for example: energy, love, sighs or smiles... There will be a need to evaluate, measure and count them. As new categories of values emerge, there will be a need for new principles of decision-making. Then market relations and economic analysis will lose their meaning.

Over time, we will all reach a state in which no calculations or opinions are needed. There is already such an example: This is when a mother holds her new-born baby in her arms. This is a simple example of a closed society with ideal values and attitudes.

To focus on market (economic) relations means to acquire a dogma and part with the principle of an open society. It is already clear that the market economy needs either a decisive rethinking or a complete replacement with a new system of relationships.

Another formulation:

"An open society (to a certain extent aims at) correcting errors and excesses, but it also recognizes the absence of an objective criterion by which to judge them." [3]

An open society only helps prevent crises, but does not itself intervene in their elimination.

An open society requires a realistic outlook on life, but what to do with societies in which their members live according to superstitions and prejudices. "Education can develop the worldview of participants and raise social relations to the level of an open society." [3]

Education can overcome superstitions, but education is a tool for spreading scientific superstitions also. Therefore, for the most part, expectations of educational success and the opening of the path to an open society have not yet come true.

"...An open society can only move forward if it does not want to be detained and returned back to captivity, to the animal cage." [1]

The idea of an open society is to "seek to go beyond its problem to something universal..." [3]

2.2. Benefits of an open society



In an open society, "personal relationships of a new kind can arise only where they can be entered into freely, where they are not determined by the accidents of birth. The result is a new individualism. Likewise, with the weakening of biological or physical ties, spiritual and etc. communications." [1]

"Once the impossible demand for perfection is abandoned, the path to progress is open. If you look at the facts, you will see that open societies are usually associated with progress and prosperity." [3]

An open society with critical (better to say dynamic) thinking is open to creativity, search and scientific discoveries. Thanks to this, humanity discovered nature, themselves, the Highest Meaning and the horizons of the unknown.

The presence of an open society is one of the main conditions for the development of civilization and the resolution of the most incredible problems that may arise. As long as corners of an open society remain on Earth, we will have hope for the future.

It should be borne in mind that the enemies of an open society are within the open society itself. One could say that an open society is its own enemy. [1]

2.3. Disadvantages of an open society

"The concept of an open society can highlight a problem, but does not really solve it. In an open society, there are no final solutions." [3]

But this disadvantage in difficult conditions is an advantage for active and creative individuals.

Ideas about an open society are far from perfect. They can even be called not entirely intelligible. This is rather a call to life, creativity and a rejection of vegetation and inertia, but a call to whom and where is not clear. [4]

The vector of development of an open society is a perfect society, which, in turn, can become a happy closed society. This is possible for a period of stable existence of society in unchanged conditions. In such a society and at such a historical moment, all vital forces can be concentrated and directed in one direction without

doubt or search. The achievements of such a society will be amazing, but as soon as the external conditions of the society's existence change, as soon as the internal stability of such an existence is disrupted: an unchanged and perfect closed society will turn into a murderous monster, or, at best, into a tyrant.

Undoubtedly, an open society is able to provide an unprecedented level of individual freedom, but does everyone need this freedom, is it useful for everyone? People, having been "poisoned" by their freedom or using this freedom without meaning and restrictions, can lock themselves into an extreme form of a closed society. [4]

The descent from an open society to a closed one is a natural process. A closed society is more holistic and stationary compared to an open one. An open society is more redundant in its structure and activities than a closed one. By its nature, a closed society meets the principle of sustainability - a minimum of energy and resources. The minimum of energy and resources (basic needs) approach was introduced by the International Labour Organization's World Employment Conference in 1976. [9]

In natural science it is believed that this principle corresponds to the conditions of equilibrium to which nature strives. Apparently, this is the reason that the transition from an open society to a closed one can occur involuntarily. But getting out of a closed society into an open one is incredibly difficult.

2.4. Attempts to initiate an open society from a closed one

Funds aimed at developing a closed society into an open one were used to carry out a huge number of scams in the interests of a closed society, since they were spent mainly by the institutions of a closed society to satisfy their needs.

One of the reasons for the persistent state of a closed society in relation to innovations of transformation into an open society is that these innovations are open to development and incomplete in content, and for most scientists this is not correct knowledge, since all this is not reproduced through formalized operations.

The innovations of an open society do not free participants from the need to think creatively, and creativity is a matter of luck, not a limit. The



creative process cannot be distributed, transmitted, or controlled. This means that the philosophy of an open society is not available to a closed society.

Usually in a closed society it is impossible to think fruitfully, because according to national (local) traditions and ambitions, these local representatives believe that they are talented pioneers and have succeeded in writing their history.

In fact, by introducing innovations, a closed society itself is deceived by historical falsifications and is blocked from the path of possible change in the current situation. [4]

2.5. The spread of the open society

The area of expansion of an open society is possible, but not through expansion towards a closed society, but towards the Open Sea and Antarctica. On the high seas, the principles of an open society have been developing for several centuries, and these principles have been established at sea for thousands of years. It was navigation and the success of mankind on the high seas that gave the open society an overwhelming superiority over the closed society. [1]

"An open society allows people to think for themselves, decide what they want, and turn their dreams into reality. People can explore the limits of their abilities and achieve intellectual, artistic, or practical results that they might not otherwise have imagined possible Creativity is the positive aspect of imperfect knowledge." [3]

Creativity naturally accompanies an open society. But this is provided that people have positive thinking. Otherwise, they will create such forms of "creative" crime that an open society will be associated only with the ugliest and most harmful phenomenon for humanity. [4]

3. Closed society

We, living on planet Earth in stability and isolation from the rest of the Metagalaxy, are a closed society (in the extreme form of this concept).

Our planetary closed community is far from perfect, and any change that comes to us "from

outside" can destroy us, if we do not have life experience of an open society.

Living in a closed planetary community, we also need to know the nature of a closed society and be able to use it.

A closed society is a dream society, but a dream can transform into an illusion, and it, in turn, into deception. This is how a closed society turns into a society of lies.

Participants in any society, isolated from each other, eventually form closed societies. [4]

3.1. Characteristics of a closed society

"One of the essential features of the magical consciousness of an ancient-tribal or closed society is the prevailing belief in such a society that it exists in a vicious circle of unchanging taboos, laws and customs, which were considered as inevitable as the rising of the sun, the change of seasons and the like completely obvious laws of nature" [1].

A closed society must be considered by its participants as something sacred, legal and the only possible one.

"A closed society is similar to a herd or tribe in that it is a semi-organic unity, the members of which are united by semi-biological ties, kinship, a common life, participation in common affairs, the same dangers, common pleasures and troubles..." [1]. Now in a closed society, the main thing in ensuring unity is nationality, state affiliation or cult.

Social stability, obedience, protection from failure, harmony in relationships and confidence in orientation are some of the main advantages of closed societies. They also have their drawbacks, such as dogmatism of ideology, rigidity of the social system and the position of its members, and, as a result, dissatisfaction. [1]

Definition of a closed society based on the perception of reality:

"Existing ideas are perceived as reality itself, or, more precisely, the differences between ideas and reality are simply not given," or "only bitter experience teaches people to



distinguish between their own thoughts and reality.” [3]

An extreme form of a closed society is a nursing mother with an infant. Mother and child truly live together as a single organism. Attempts to interfere in their society do not promise anything good and will be perceived by normal people as blasphemy. Violation of the integrity of such a closed society will negatively affect the health of the mother and the development of the child.

The family should also be mentioned as an example of a closed society. Husband and wife, and there cannot be anyone else in this structure (except children). In a family, its members cannot change places. Loving families are not looking for a different structure and are not going to change anything. Attempts to change anything in family relationships, for example, to make them open, can lead to the destruction of the family, as well as a decline in the spirituality of its members, and further – poor health. The basis of a family's well-being is closeness of family members. The family as a closed society is predetermined by nature itself, and one should not experiment or joke with it.

Another form of a closed society is the army, with its dictatorial unity of command, dogmatic charter, depersonalizing uniform, clear goal, strategy and tactics, combat mission, rigid structure of organization and management, extreme form of suppression of initiative, clear hierarchy, service privileges, lack of personal goals for participants and much more that points to the army as an ideal model of a closed society.

If wars lose their historical significance, then the closed society in the form of an army will retain its original function – patrolling the territory of the state. This function is one of the natural foundations of the state, which ensures unity (brotherhood): first of the army personnel (during service), then unity (citizenship) of the entire population. In densely populated areas, this function is performed by the police and the people's squad. [10]

In a closed society: society, the state and their participants merge into a single “whole”. Nowadays this “whole” is more often called not society, but the state.

The predetermined structure and regulated functioning of a closed society contributes to the alienation of its participants from real life. To

support this, a general (state) budget and a system for the distribution and redistribution of vital goods are provided. Such a system can be very complex and cumbersome with a constant tendency to grow, since it will strive to provide for everything, and this is impossible to do.

A closed society is necessary in a social way of thinking where there is reason not to trust individual participants. In case of failure of public thinking, the usurpation of thinking by an individual advanced leader may happen. This process is usually alternating.

Such a closed society is advisable if the participants are thieving, and also if the dominant goals of the participants are questionable (especially if they are criminal). [4]

In order to rehabilitate a closed society before supporters of an open one, it is necessary to classify closed societies according to:

- Delivered goals
- Habitat (situation),
- The condition and position of the participants,
- The relationship between the given characteristics...

In this article, all types of closed societies and stages of their development (degradation) were considered simultaneously. In a closed society, the same processes and phenomena can be both progressive (useful) and regressive (harmful).

A closed society is the embodiment of a dream: to escape from reality and from ourselves. It is a closed society that can create (and creates) masterpieces of artistic and literary invention. Without fiction, a closed society cannot exist.

Usually we criticize not a closed society, but its imitation. A natural closed society is an exceptionally stable and balanced form of social structure. To be at its best, a closed society must be carefully protected and preserved from external influences that could upset the balance and efficiency of such a society.

A closed society can be compared to a good house in a harsh climate. No one will doubt the need for a warm and durable home, for example, in Russia.

Criticism of a closed society in the last stages of its existence can be useful, but it can take on the appearance of "desecration of a corpse." A decrepit closed society (like the human body) is



worthy of respect for old age, and not a demand for its premature liquidation. A dying closed society is not an evil, but an age-related phenomenon or, in some cases, a state of total mobilization, as in a short-term and decisive war.

3.2. Advantages of a Closed Society

Our imperfect knowledge, our fallibility, first of all, in choosing the path of improvement, as well as the vagueness, superficiality and vagueness of our ideas about the situation in which we find ourselves, force us to record the achieved results as acquired experience and standardize them. Based on what has been achieved, establish dogmas and, moving to a closed system (society), begin to implement existing knowledge in real life.

It is impossible to build, for example, a machine in which the standards of parts are constantly changing and improving. During the development and construction of a machine, it is enough to change only one standard (and there are hundreds of them) and the whole work is doomed to failure, since the principles of compatibility and interchangeability of parts will be violated. Assembling the machine will become impossible. At the same time, naturally, changing or failure to comply the standard (stereotype...) in the process of work is classified as a crime. [11]

Thus, a closed society (system) is a constructive and production necessity in the creative process.

In a closed society, as in a living organism, any openness is a disease: perforation, ulcer, injury...

3.3. Disadvantages of a closed society

The predominance of standard over creativity is a principle of nature, which is strictly observed in a closed society. This principle was formulated back in Greek mythology, namely, the emergence of Prometheus beyond the boundaries of society into a higher sphere to accomplish innovation and ensure the evolution of humanity. It all ended badly for the pioneer Prometheus. [12]

It should be noted that this natural phenomenon still does not have a clear formulation.

On the failure of a closed society, discovered back in the days of the ancient Greeks: "Perhaps the most important reason for the collapse of a closed society was the development of maritime communication and trade." [1]

With the development of navigation, the area of human activity expanded significantly. People went out into the "outside" world. At the same time, they encountered previously unknown difficulties. A free and creative approach to solving them ensured the success of an open society. The closed society was left with unsolvable problems and itself "exploded" from the inside from internal tension and dissatisfaction. So in some countries the closed society ceased to exist. It should be expected that, with the emergence and development of interplanetary space communication, a closed society on Earth will cease to exist everywhere, as unviable. At the same time, new forms of societies will arise.

A closed society is one with the state. At the same time, participants in the state (society) are its property (an integral part). This is a modern form of slavery, which promises participants irresponsibility for the results of their activities. In turn, in an open society, each participant is not only free to choose a goal and responsible for his activities and its results, he is not anyone's property.

The appearance of Messiah (or a prophet) in a closed society is a state crime, which is the most serious for a closed society. At the same time, there is an aggravating circumstance – a prophet cannot be state property. In a closed society, the place of a prophet is only among criminals.

The activity of the prophet is an epochal doctrine. On its basis, another closed society or even several societies (sects), sometimes hostile to each other, can be formed. No closed society can tolerate this.

A closed society is an attempt to preserve a decaying society by cementing (fixing) all functions and relationships. Moreover, everything that is not cemented is considered illegal, unrealistic, disdainful or even absent.

Any corpse society (so that it does not decompose) must be preserved (embalmed). Otherwise, it will begin to decompose so much that everyone will immediately agree on the need for its conservation. In this case, a closed society is "not a cure, but a funerary accessory (or necessity)."

The difficulty is that there are no absolutely corpse societies. Therefore, attempts to "cremate" a closed society, for example, through military action, are questionable and even severely punishable.



In the face of mortal danger, a closed society can create agony and internal consolidation of its members, incredible for an open society. Then the flawed closed society will surprise everyone with mass heroism: the desire to die valiantly, making its enemies bitterly regret what they have started. At the same time, anyone from a closed society who does not die valiantly will be shamefully tortured by the closed society itself.

Probably the best that can be offered in this case is a tolerant attitude towards a closed society, giving it the right to “dry up” naturally over time. [4]

3.4. Coexistence of closed and open societies

A healthy (reasonable) ratio of openness and closedness – probably this is precisely the vector for improving modern society, our thinking and all the systems with which we deal. The question immediately arises, what are the criteria for this ratio? Probably, in each specific case this ratio should be determined separately.

If this relationship (openness and closedness) is uncertain, preference should be given to openness. The error of such an orientation will lead to inevitable costs and losses, but we should not forget that we live in a world unknown to us. It is unrealistic to create a cozy world isolated from external influences and sit in it. “Thunder will strike” from where we do not expect it. You can say “from outside”. We must be prepared to meet this “from outside” and not behave “like an ostrich hiding its head in the sand.”

The question of the relationship between openness and closedness of the system is a question of the well-being and even viability of the system. Exclusively closed systems are doomed to “self-digestion”. Closed system are usually short-lived.

One of the purposes of this article is to give an idea of closed and open societies and to dispel hostility between them.

Nowadays it would never occur to anyone to differentiate, for example, mechanics into statics, kinematics and dynamics as hostile or mutually exclusive methods. They complement each other. This is not yet possible in society. The imaginary hostility or opposition between open and closed societies is an example of this. [4]

There is an analogy and parallelism between mechanics, way of thinking and type of society.

So in mechanics, the division into statics, kinematics and dynamics corresponds to thinking, in the way of thinking: static (organic), kinematic (dogmatic) and dynamic (critical), which, in turn, correspond to societies: organic, closed and open.

The use of the phenomenon of reflectivity [4] and its development will make it possible to create a fundamentally new society with a new form of thinking, and will also ensure the formation of new sections and directions in all natural sciences. We will be able to take a fresh look even at mechanics.

An open society does not look impressive against the backdrop of a closed one. There are no mind-blowing throws, no overturning of entire states or even regions. An open society has problems, but they must be resolved in advance.

“Resolving crises that have not yet erupted does not bring laurels, and solving problems is more difficult than identifying them.” [3]

Therefore, people from a closed society observing the way of life in an open society consider it undeservedly good. The fact is that people in a closed society spend incomparably more effort, energy and capability to achieve the same result than in an open society.

What is the secret of this discrepancy? Probably in the way of thinking that dominates society and is generally accepted. It should be noted that not thinking is also a way of thinking. It is inherent in a closed society.

In reality, people from a closed society have no place in an open one, and vice versa, people from an open society are doomed in a closed one. Therefore, people are forced to emigrate in order to move from a society alien to them to their own environment.

People from a closed society, watching people from an open society, get food for gossip, and people from an open society, watching a closed society, can experience a feeling of disgust. In this case, the principle of good neighborliness and mutual respect between people from different systems is important.

The relationship between closed and open societies can, in turn, have a closed or open character.



All useful new thoughts and discoveries are a product of open (critical) thinking and, inherent in it, an open society. [3]

Dogmatic thinking (closed society) successfully works on their implementation, since it most fully meets the conditions of realization and self-preservation at a given (specific) point in time.

In a specific case, it may be necessary to abandon improvement as an abstract process and move on to specific actions in accordance with the chosen dogma (course or direction). In some cases, closed thinking that does not accept any criticism (captious criticism) is progressive and the only possible one. This is when we are in a hostile environment: wild, unsuitable nature for life, or among crazy people (obsessed with a delusional idea or without any ideas at all), as well as in the absence of habitat or society as such... The list of such situations is not limited to this.

In the cases listed above, and in many others, one should not rush to abandon the principles of a closed society, since, at best, this ends in tears, and at worst, in death. We are not immune from such cases.

In turn, wild nature and crazy people must close themselves off from everyone else. Otherwise, a situation will arise: who will defeat (or destroy) whom, and in such a situation, a closed society has an overwhelming advantage over an open one. [4]

One should not assume that wild nature, maniacs, and emptiness or chaos do not have the right to exist. They must be in closed systems (societies). This is important for us right now. Humanity is coming out of the age when nature can exist without taking into account our desires. Although, we have a way in which we can abandon nature as a means of production and a raw material appendage for us...

There are forms and cases in which critical thinking is only possible in a closed society. This, first of all, concerns situations that are dangerous for humanity, but which must be overcome.

In addition, critical thinking, as the basis of an open society, operates with knowledge formalized to the level of laws and abstractions. Without this formalization, it is impossible to transfer knowledge and use it. Any formulation or even a word carries within it the limitations of dogma, and dogmatic thinking is appropriate only in a closed society.

If there are no problems or people have agreed not to pay attention to the problems, then an open society is not needed. Individuals and entire states can refuse to solve current problems and live by increasing external debt or by selling off everything they have that anyone will buy.

In some cases, this is the only possible state, but it cannot last long. The denouement is necessary and inevitable. In such cases, a closed society should not waste its life time and resources ineptly, it must correctly choose the direction of exiting the state of a closed society. Otherwise, all this could end in tragedy. Such cases can be called "hearths of open society."

One of the tasks of an open society may be to search for "hearths of an open society" at all levels: from individual families to entire states, as well as to arrange their conflict-free transition from a closed to an open society. This can be called the "midwifery function" of an open society.

All states that have become outcasts for some reason are forced to live according to the principles of a closed society.

Are the principles of an open society appropriate in a totalitarian state? For example, in a state where the "rule of law" prevails. Is unrestricted propaganda of the ideas of an open society acceptable in such states? Isn't such propaganda blasphemy? Shouldn't an open society, as a more responsible one, take care of the integrity and well-being of closed societies?

Any significant innovation leads to a re-evaluation of core values. For an open society this is everyday life, but for a closed society it is a shock that threatens to overturn the existing balance. Out of careful attitude and respect for a closed society, one should not expose its participants to the risk of self-destruction; one should not reveal all the discoveries of civilization to a closed society.

Closed and open societies should be mutually distant from each other (reasonably isolated), but real societies have characteristics of both of these societies. In real coexistence between societies there is confusion about who is who and in what cases. A closed society cannot function without an open one, and it needs cooperation and comprehensive trade.

If this principle is violated, then, due to vital necessity, a closed society is forced to steal from an open one. They steal, first of all: ideas,



scientific discoveries and pioneering inventions. This is not because all this does not exist in a closed society. It's just that in a closed society there are no institutions to distinguish scientific discoveries from unfounded imagination or delusional ideas. So a closed society often has to steal its own from others.

At the state level, this leads to the growth of special services, intelligence services, diplomatic missions and other thieves' organizations. Honest people, due to circumstances, conscientiously fulfilling their official duties, become thieves and swindlers. So the issue of the relationship between closed and open societies must be resolved. With this we will take another step from savagery to civilization.

An open society is a vector in our lives from birth to death. Each of us is moving towards an open society, but this does not mean that we will all be there. From birth to open society and beyond... all space and time is filled with people. Moreover, without the birth of... – a closed society... – an open society could not exist. An open society would have nothing to build on or from.

It seems that proponents of an open society exaggerate its importance. Probably, such an exaggeration is useful, since an open society on Earth is not yet sufficiently developed. This deficiency limits the universal human creative potential, which has never been superfluous.

And yet, an open society is not yet self-sufficient. It needs elements of the closed. This must be taken into account.

The key to the well-being of a society is not in its openness or closedness, but in the priorities of its members, in what motivates people, in their dominant interests. This is what is commonly called spiritual orientation.

We should not forget that it is not societies that live, but the people in them, and it is people with their mentality who determine what society should be like: open or closed. Will the members of society be free people or slaves (performers)? Will they be able to make their own decisions or will they have a leader (the love of the people or a dictator) who will pretend that he is leading society into a "bright future".

If you ask every person: "What does he live for?" It will become clear that this is precisely the secret of the relationship between openness and closedness of society, since many people will not

be able to answer this question, and some will give such an answer that it is better not to know it.

It would be right if every person lives as he sees fit, but if a person does not know why he lives and how he should do it, he does not know and does not want to know. To expose such a person to an open society of "effective competition" is more than cruel. To assume that all people are inclined to independence, responsibility and creativity is doubtful.

Open and closed societies can be neither regressive nor progressive. Each of them can have a state of prosperity and decline. There is a special reason for this. There is an opinion that this reason is the morality of the participants, but a logical-mathematical relationship between morality and the long-term success of the participants has not been deduced. Therefore, now we will not be able to closely examine the nature of society: open or closed. We still have not learned to measure and evaluate morality, and without it, society is a mystery to us.

There is one more difference between open and closed societies, but it is mentioned only here and not at the beginning of the article. This is the attitude towards discoverers, inventors and trailblazers. It seems that everyone needs them, however, attitudes towards them in open and closed societies differ significantly.

In an open society, whatever happens to the discoverer, they are full members of society.

In a closed society, pioneers are needed only to ensure social ambitions, which honest and intelligent people do not take seriously. Moreover, there is no place for discoverers and inventors in a closed society. A place in a closed society is a position (rank, grade, estate, clan, caste, degree...). In a closed society, no position – no place in life.

In a closed society, inventors and discoverers are unofficial concepts. This is natural, since creativity cannot be a job responsibility. Creativity can only manifest itself through openness to the unknown, and this is already outside the boundaries of a closed society. As a result, creative people in a closed society must live both within it, for example, as citizens, and outside it, as homeless people – at the same time.

There is another option for the fate of an inventor or discoverer in a closed society. If he is a representative of a privileged caste and is involved in scientific developments or discoveries,



then he can work normally and create serious competition for his colleagues from an open society. In closed societies, “mythical” or “imaginary” discoverers may arise, but this is a separate conversation.

The life path of innovators: inventors, artists, writers and poets in a closed society is terrible. Any successful activity leads to changes in relationships in society. An innovator needs to work to get his result. Such work is not provided for by existing regulations, since it has no analogues and is not similar to anything. A closed society cannot allow this. An innovator is thrown out of society, as a rule, as a slacker or a person unable to observe basic standards of decency in relationships with people. The innovator is deprived of his family, all family and friendly relations, and he has two choices:

- Die prematurely (that is, safely for him), or
- To suffer and work to death, being at the bottom of society in humiliation and contempt.

Any pioneering activity in a closed society is perceived as a clever crime, since laws to suppress this kind of “crime” are not immediately found.

It is impossible for one person to overcome the opinion of society and “constantly maintain a circular defense hold”.

In a closed society, love, which is capable of establishing its own social unit in a closed society, is of exceptional importance.

If a talented artist (or inventor) emerged in a closed society, this means that someone was close to him. And this someone, together with the artist, put his whole life on the altar of life.

If in a closed society it was possible to destroy love among its participants, or at least completely compensate for it with something, then such a closed society could become eternal. In a closed society, only one love is permissible – this is the closed society itself. [4]

I can say: “Don’t destroy the society in which you live”, but I cannot say: “Don’t love”. This is my forced verdict on a closed society, with all my careful and respectful attitude towards it.

The division of societies by type: open and closed is incomplete and insufficient. In this division of societies: mother and child find themselves next

to an army of mercenaries. Clarification of the types of societies and their gradation will ensure the identification of progressive (vital) and regressive (immoral) societies.

It is possible that immoral patterns may exist among open societies, but this question has not yet been considered.

3.5. Prospects for the coexistence of open and closed societies

In a closed society, participants are submissive people. In an open society, participants are fallible people.

In the first case (closed society), the person who heads the society is doomed to exposure and condemnation. Sooner or later, people will see the light and be disappointed in the state dogma (or other religious–ideological surrogate) offered to them, as well as in their idol. In a closed society, the ruler must be an idol for all participants, and if not, then the entire society may prematurely go scat, but the ruler must have the purpose and meaning of the entire society.

In the second case (open society), people will play with their destiny blindly. They must always win, but one day they will all lose. This will be the collapse of the open society.

Nobody writes about total bankruptcy in an open society. Probably no one even thinks about this, but a global loss for all participants in an open society is likely.

If you can lose regularly and in small ways, then this is the path of progress for an open society. After each such loss, participants will gain experience and knowledge, and will also take measures to improve society and correct their mistakes. But one of the major (global) losses will leave people neither the strength nor the time to correct and improve.

If you take measures to prevent a global mistake, this may result in a closed society.

Participants in an open society should look beyond the boundaries of their society, the global community, and humanity and look for answers in the area of correctness, infallibility and truth. So open society can turn into a closed society.

An open society must always imagine the boundaries and the depth of its spread. It is a mistake to imagine that an open society is



borderless and absolute. An open society is limited just like a closed society.

If we do not pay attention to the closed societies among all known to us, then we will discover that all our open societies are closed.

Good results can be achieved by a closed society if its members renounce their fallibility (they have already done this) and turn to absolute, inhuman, error-free management (absolute doctrine). Naturally, this doctrine cannot be found among erring people, but this does not mean that it does not exist at all.

The question of a borderless open society and the question of a closed society with an absolute inhuman doctrine of infallibility should be considered together, since they will most likely be the same type of society.

Such boundless and absolute doctrines are unknown to science, but paradoxically, people have used this super knowledge throughout their history. We use it and don't think about how we do it. If science has not discovered this knowledge, this does not mean that it does not exist. Just because they don't teach it in universities doesn't mean people don't use it. Assuming that we understand how and at whose expense we live is also a mistake.

We should not despair at our lack of understanding of our lives. There will be another discoverer who will find and describe the next horizon of our life.

With all the achievements of science, we should not imagine that we understand how and why we live. We should also not think that our ignorance can stop our life.

We must learn to consciously use all the knowledge about our lives, including knowledge that is still unknown to us.

The use of knowledge unknown to us occurs everywhere and is obvious. If our life depended only on our knowledge, we would die. Considering our knowledge about our lives, one can only be surprised at their insignificance and our inflated self-esteem.

Conditions and knowledge about our lives are not limited to information and skills. This is not enough for sustainable participation in life. We still need faith, hope, love and much more, but these concepts do not have any sufficient

scientific explanation, moreover, they do not have the correct scientific content.

To participate in life, we need "this" (I don't know what), the existence of which we do not even suspect. We don't know what "it" is and we don't even know what "it" is called. But if we use "this" in our lives, then we need to do "this" consciously and moderately.

It is possible that much of "it" is inaccessible to us and we will not be able to reveal the nature of "it", but since we use "it", we need to do "this" in a human way.

So that this article does not seem to you like a discussion about "nothing", I will try to give an example from our life. This example is simple, but it should be clear.

We still don't know everything about our digestion. There was a time when we knew nothing about him at all. But we use digestion throughout our lives. This has always been the case with people.

Our life is not limited only to:

- Digestion, about which we don't know everything, and in our bodies there remains a lot that we don't even suspect the existence of, but our life is not limited only to the existence of our bodies,
- There are many unknowns and those responsible for our lives that are outside of us...

A number of these enumerations tend to infinity, unknown to us. In such conditions, we need to refrain from making categorical conclusions about everything, including types of society.

The question of open and closed types of society remains open. It is possible that such a division of societies is erroneous and has no solution. This can be thought about by studying the intricacy of the relationship between the two types of societies in our real life.

Apparently, the distinction between understanding (thinking) and a pattern (behavior algorithm) will give us the necessary distinction and definition of openness and closedness in society.

3.6. Detained Society



As a rule, all closed societies, to varying degrees, are detained societies. [1]

The detained society, due to its historical insanity (at best, irresponsibility and lack of maturity) is a hotbed of crime and perverted atrocities. Precisely perverted (tricks) atrocities that are difficult to immediately understand and it's even hard to believe it. [13]

Any attacks on the detained society for its destruction are doubtful. It is necessary to help the detained society to free itself from the “poisonous hormone” that causes its delay. Representatives of any society are people – peoples who have a natural ability and need for reproduction. There is no use in killing them. Any genocide is dubious in nature and practically ineffective.

Evil has a good natural quality – to be annihilate with other evil. At the same time, life and the success of the mind triumph.

4. Reflective society

Reflective thinking can bring to life a fundamentally new type of society, in which crimes and punishments of participants may be absent. These procedures will be replaced by relocations, but these will not be forced deportations or exiles. It will rather be the needs of the participants themselves. Society will not interfere with this, but most likely, it will facilitate this, that is, it will streamline the relationships of the participants among themselves.

In a reflexive society, with a sufficiently high responsibility of the participants, there will be no state laws, army, family institutions and even social protection, and each participant who is unable to live independently will be saved from life in the “cage” of a closed society or in the temperate regions of an open society.

In a reflective society, participants purposefully influence their future. The decline of such a society may result in the formation of a closed – magical society, in which participants will lose their ability to influence the future, but will continue to expect results from their former abilities. It is possible that the famous closed magical societies are the ruins of former reflexive societies.

Magical society is not the only thing that could result from the decline of a reflective society. The most interesting topic is not about the decline, but

about the flourishing of such a society. This requires independent and responsible activity of the participants. Probably, already now it is necessary to provide for a way out from an open society into a reflective one.

Quite often, brilliant inventions and scientific discoveries were initially used by the criminal world. Probably, a reflexive society is no exception to this sad series.

One should not seek or strive for a “pure” form of reflective society. As in the cases of open and closed societies, there are no “pure” forms.

It should be taken into account that, reflexivity leads to “swings” in public opinion, especially in a closed society, since an open society strives not to have its own socialized opinion. These “throws” cause cyclical repetitions: ups and downs in relationships among societies. These “throws” are especially noticeable (to the point of tragedy) for participants in a closed society. [4] [14] [15] [16]

5. Conclusion

A participant in society – a pioneer (or creative person), directing his attention to the space around society, and contemplating the infinity of knowledge, opportunities, energy, means, nutrition... will be able to describe the society in which he is located only as an open society.

It is an open society that should become a universal human value of the pioneers, but, in fact, before it, with all its necessity and usefulness, has time to strengthen and establish itself everywhere, it will become morally obsolete, since this is the phenomenon of the pioneers. An even more progressive concept of society with an original, hitherto unprecedented type of thinking will be proposed. Now the question is how quickly and effectively we will arm ourselves with this still wonderful idea of an open society (we are talking about pioneers).

A participant, for example, a new-born, not yet opening his eyes, begins to look for his mother's breast. By focusing on what he knows for sure, the participant is in a closed society.

Only a closed society can temporarily create conditions for the existence of people in real, unpredictable conditions, in which humanity has more than once found itself, and those conditions were a wild habitat for people, which not suitable



for life. A closed society in such cases is a citadel of security and a condition for evolution.

In the cases of the revived and renewed, everything is the same. The adult participant who continues to strive for the essence of society is also in a similar state (in a closed society).

In the first and second cases, the type of society is determined by the participants themselves, or more precisely, by their condition. At the same time, the extreme form of a closed society on planet Earth is the opinion of any person from our planet about the unsuitability and uselessness of the space around us for our lives.

In this example, an open society is only possible for the crew of a space station with unlimited autonomy. However, as soon as this station leaves the boundaries of our planet, conditions of a closed society may arise on it. This applies not only to life support (the simplest example of the necessary conditions for the existence of society). This also applies to knowledge, morality, spirituality...

According to the Gospel, love for God and love for one's neighbor are an inalienable human need. [17]

It should be remembered that love for one's neighbor is the basis of a closed society, and love for God is a condition for achieving the state of an open society.

The differences between an open and a closed society are simply the opinion of the participant: his view of the environment and the perception of his activities.

References

- [1] Popper, Karl Raimund. The Open Society and Its Enemies. *Routledge. London.* (1945), (1965). ISBN 978-0-691-15813-6, ISBN 5-85042-063-0, ISBN 5-85042-064-9, ISBN 5-85042-065-7. URL: <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.59272/mode/2up> (1945). URL: https://platona.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/politologija/karl_popper_otkrytoe_obshchestvo_i_ego_vragi_v_dvukh_tomakh_tom_1/21-1-0-229 (1992) URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346997061_Popper_Karl_Raimund_The_Open_Society_and_Its_Enemies (2020). URL: [https://libking.ru/books/sci/sci-](https://libking.ru/books/sci/sci-philosophy/146896-karl-popper-otkrytoe-obshchestvo-i-ego-vragi.html)

[philosophy/146896-karl-popper-otkrytoe-obshchestvo-i-ego-vragi.html](https://libking.ru/books/sci/sci-philosophy/146896-karl-popper-otkrytoe-obshchestvo-i-ego-vragi.html) (2009). (Russian)

- [2] Bergson, A. Two Sources of Morality and Religion. *Engl. ed.,* (1935). *Doubleday Anchor Books,* (1954). URL: <https://www.bard.edu/library/arendt/pdfs/Bergson-TwoSources.pdf> URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355020452_The_Two_Sources_of_Morality_and_Religion (2020).

- [3] Soros, G. Wien, B. Koenen, K. Soros on Soros: Staying Ahead of the Curve. *J. Wiley, New York,* (1995). URL: <https://www.worldcat.org/title/soros-on-soros-staying-ahead-of-the-curve/oclc/654808677> and "Soros on Soros: Ahead of change". *Infra-M, Moskva.* (1996). (Russian) URL: <https://www.worldcat.org/title/42062721> URL: <https://freelibrary.ru/bookread/220834-dzhordzh-soros-soros-o-sorose-operezhaya-peremeny>

- [4] Sukhanov, V. N. Open (closed) society. From the book: *Inventive Creativity. Foliant. Kazan.* (2003). ISBN 5-94990-002-2, pp. 178–210. (Russian).

URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/365644734_Izobretatelskoe_Tvorcestvo pp. 180–206. and URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363753389_Otkrytoe_zakrytoe_obsestvo

- [5] Soros G. Nationalist Dictatorships versus Open Society. *Soros Foundations. N.Y.,* (1993). URL: <https://www.amazon.com/Nationalist-Dictatorships-Versus-Open-Society/dp/B0006P2G0Q>

- [6] Akhiezer, A. S. How to "open" a closed society. *Institute "Open Society". – M.: Master,* (1997). 40 p. ISBN 5-89317-029-6. URL: <http://opac.hse.ru/absopac/app/webroot/index.php?url=/notices/index/IdNotice:2057/Source:default> (Russian)

- [7] Izgarskaya, A. A. «CLOSED SOCIETY»: OUTSIDE THE LIMITS OF K. POPPER'S CONCEPT. Novosibirsk. (2013). URL: <https://www.sibran.ru/upload/iblock/596/59625d14f3fb89c716bf8cd0e66ea931.pdf> (Russian)

- [8] Patrick Manning, Navigating World History: Historians Create a Global Past. *New York: Palgrave Macmillan.* ISBN 978-1-4039-6117-4.



(2003), p. 279–280. URL: <https://www.h-net.org/reviews/showpdf.php?id=8878>

[9] Shaw, D. J. ILO World Employment Conference, (1976). In book: World Food Security. A History since 1945. *Palgrave Macmillan London*. pp 222–229. (2007). URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230589780_18

[10] Federal Law of April 2, N 44-FZ: “On the participation of citizens in the protection of public order.” Article 12. Creation and organization of activities of people's squads. (2014) URL: https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_161195/e1e889b658c74a193afab05194a2132b1132163b/ (Russian)

[11] CODE OF THE RSFSR ON OFFENSES. Article 170: Violation of rules on standardization and quality of products, release into circulation and maintenance of measuring instruments and their use. (1984) URL: <https://base.garant.ru/3973819/ba148af9f757e5eb3441b24b102cb9ee/> (Russian).

[12] Prometheus. (18th century BC). Smith, "Prometheus". Archived 2021-02-25. *Wayback Machine*. URL: <https://web.archive.org/web/20210225132658/http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0104%3AAalphabetic+letter%3DP%3Aentry+group%3D47%3Aentry%3DPrometheus-bio-1>

[13] Seindal, R. Mafia: Money and Politics in Sicily, 1950-1997. *Museum Tusculanum Press*. (1998). URL: <https://books.google.mn/books?id=kJf-oKqos1YC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>

[14] Thomas, W. I. The Child in America: Behavior Problems and Programs. *Knopf*. p. 572. ISBN 978-5-87290-065-8. (1938), [1928]. URL: https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=yNALAwAAQBAJ&pg=PP572&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false

[15] Popper, Karl. Unended Quest: An Intellectual Autobiography. *Routledge*. DOI:10.4324/9780203994252. ISBN 0-415-28589-5. (2002). URL: <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203994252/unended-quest-karl-popper>

[16] Sukhanov, Vladimir Nikolayevich. Reflexivity of humanitarian processes. Chapter in book: Inventive Creativity. *Foliant, Kazan*. ISBN 5-94990-002-2, pp. 159-177. (2003). URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363709673_Refleksivnost_gumanitarnyh_processov (Russian)

[17] Mt 22:37-40. (41 to 98 AD e). URL: <http://www.patriarchia.ru/bible/mf/22/> (Russian)

[18] Sukhanov, Vladimir Nikolayevich. Open (closed) society. *ResearchGate*. (2023) URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.16868.55683>