

SOME CURRENT TRENDS IN THE INTERACTION OF RELIGION AND POLITICS

Katrin-Leyla Yazid Sawalha¹

Received: 14.08.2020 Accepted: 30.09.2020

Abstract

The article discusses the problems of the interaction between religion and politics in the present and in the conditions of the pandemic with the coronavirus COVID 19. According to the author, its social consequences are comparable to the results of global crises that erupted centuries and decades ago on the spread of pathogenic microorganisms. Historically, the commonalities and differences between religion and politics as two forms of social unification are traced. There are many examples from modern times, the critical analysis of which gives the reader the opportunity to assess the extent to which the interaction between Religion and Politics today has to do with his own behavior and future destiny - closer and more distant.

Keywords: religion, politics, institution, radical social change, social interaction, behavior, ideology, norms and expectations, secularization, "online" reality, etc.

JEL Codes: Z12.H12.Z18.N3.I10

INTRODUCTION

The coronavirus appearance and spread in societies undoubtedly have caused a great "jolt" in the lives of modern people who have, more or less, already got accustomed to its current and so-called "global dimensions".

All around the world, COVID-19 has strongly affected the medicine and healthcare of the individual countries, their material production, agriculture, education, culture, especially communications and, above all, domestic and international transport links, tourism and the accompanying business activities, and trade in general. It also put to the test the normal functioning of national institutions for social survival, the welfare and policies, related to the dismissal of a huge number of people from work and last but not

¹ PhD student, Faculty of International Economics and Politics, University of National and World Economy (UNWE), Sofia

least – around the world the social environment management itself was unpleasantly surprised!

That same effect and the social consequences of it more or less seem comparable to the results of the world crises which erupted several times centuries and decades ago in a similar way , i.e. based on the spread of pathogenic microorganisms globally.

The numerous questions arising in connection to the mentioned can be united in one common question - Doesn't modern world face a large-scale challenge similar to the one the Bulgarian society (and not only it!) faced thirty and even more years ago?

Are we all, modern people, today at the threshold of another and totally new radical social change?

There is indeed a reason to raise this question, and others related to it as well. Thus, besides the significant changes that have occurred as a result of the pandemic in the socio-economic structure (sphere) of the countries around the world, we are witnessing profound changes in modern people's daily existence or way of living. We can already distinguish visible and significant transformations in the relations between individuals (individual members of social groups) at the different levels of social interaction - micro, meso and macro.

Do not also escape from the observer's view the vicissitudes, transformations or metamorphoses in the seemingly conservative spheres of public life, and more precisely in the institutions of both Religion and Politics. All of them are underlying the author's current interest in the issues under consideration. Her purpose is to present in the following lines opinions expressed on individual issues, as well as to try to systematise them and to offer her own position on some of them.

This paper should be viewed in the context of the interdisciplinary approach, a logical and meaningful consequence of the nature of the problems presented to the reader.

PREREQUISITES FOR ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

Let us point out what content we give to the complex concept of "radical social change."

It is clarified in the literature that the main component of the concept of radical social change - its content - correlates with that of the concept of social change in sociology. In most general sense, therefore, its meaning and use encompass the relatively rapid (in historical sense) alteration or change of the social - «in particular the political and technoeconomic system and organisation of society - of its institutions and values, and of actions of individuals and social groups ... changes in the interrelated statuses and roles of

individual members of Bulgarian society, which constitute a relatively stable system of social relations and interactions, norms and expectations, rights and obligations of individual citizens and groups" (Bratanov, P. 2018; 2015).¹

The religious institution in its essence and according to the traditional understanding in Bulgarian sociological science of the content of the term "institution" (Mihailov, St., S. Koleva, 1996)¹, is considered in a functional-substantive and normative sense 'a spiritual-practical attitude of man to the world, which is related to supernatural personifications and ideas, and relevant practices and organisational forms' (Bogomilova, N. 1996).

In particular, and again in the sense of the sociological interpretation, the church, which we herein consider a synonym of the religious institution, is defined as "an organisational manifestation of religion, within which the religious activity is carried out. It forms a system of authorities, values, beliefs, social norms and rituals, and a hierarchical structure, specifies the rights, obligations and manner of recruiting its members" (Bogomilova, N., cit. above).

Giddens emphasises the fact that until the beginning of the new millennium, at least sociological approaches to the study of religion were strongly influenced by the works of the three classical theorists - Marx, Durkheim and Weber (Giddens, A., 2003). Thus, the activity of a religious institution, for instance, according to Mendras (Mendras, A., 2002) should be analysed within and according to the rules of functional analysis. Then one of the main functions of religion, according to the French author, is to "unite society, to strengthen its internal unity" (Mendras, cit. above). At the same time, however - this author argues - we are also witnessing a dysfunctional role which religion can play as regards social integration (and cohesion). To clarify this fact, Mendras illustrates this with examples from Ireland and Lebanon.

In our opinion, quite naturally and logically with regard to these examples and in the same context we should include a number of contemporary events that immediately preceded the pandemic situation, which however takes place at the moment of its "subsiding" (or when it, the pandemic, gains strength for a re-appearance or for the so-

1 In the cited work "the institution (social)" is considered as an activity "... for the creation of material and spiritual goods for the servicing of people in meeting their needs, for the education and upbringing of adolescents, for the management of society, etc. It includes a certain number of people, which can vary widely, social things of one kind or another and a set of social prescriptions, norms and rules (written or non-written), which regulate the performance of the functions of the Institution its behaviour, the work of the people in it. These prescriptions, norms and rules unite the people working or participating in the Institution ... professional-labour, political, religious, sports or other community. "(Mihailov, St., S. Koleva, Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sociology, Institute of Sociology, Sofia, 1996).

called "second wave" -?) and therefore, almost every day do not cease to attract the attention of the world community - the events in Syria, Morocco, Libya and others.

The functional approach to the analysis of the religious institution's specifics and activity in Durkheim's work focuses on religious life in small traditional societies, whereas this researcher "does not associate religion mainly with social inequalities, but with the general nature of institutions in society" (Giddens, cit. above).

This fact, obviously, distinguishes it from the analyses of M. Weber, which emphasise the connection of religion with social change. This idea is clearly developed in his famous book "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism" (Weber, M. 1993), where the author traces how Protestantism and its extreme manifestation – Puritanism - are the basis of capitalist entrepreneurship and its rise, which modernises a number of countries in Western Europe and brings them to visible welfare and prosperity compared to countries of other, non-Christian religion.

From the perspective of our interest in the peculiarities of the interaction between religion and politics, and in the context of the present analysis, we do not wish to disregard another view expressed by Abercrombie, Hill and Turner (N. Abercrombie, S. Hill and B.S. Turner, 94).

These authors refer to the potential opportunity which the functional approach offers in cases when it is applied to the consideration of religious views, beliefs and rituals as a specific social connection uniting the members of different social groups into a community. Their work indicates the probability of artificial or illegal expansion of the integrative features on the basis of which the given religious community is formed. The authors give as an example the fans of a football team, as well as the real representatives of nationalist groups in modern society. (1980)¹.

In fact, in our opinion, this case concerns a – let us call it "dark" - side of the religious tradition in general. J. Frazer was the first to focus the attention specifically on it in his famous book *The Golden Bough* (J.G. Frazer, 1923), where he describes numerous cases of extreme cruelty, torture and killings of unfortunate innocent human victims of various superstitions, taboos, magical and religious prohibitions (Frazer, J. 1980)²; Tokarev, S.A., 1980).

The ideology of nationalism in its extreme manifestations, similar, for example, to those in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the 1990s, has led to almost half a million human casualties (!), i.e, when it, that same ideology, is not only deliberately distorted, but also dressed in religious garments, obviously, this precedent at the end of the last century, in

¹ See also Tokarev, S.A. Preface to the Russian language version of the book by J.G. Frazer, 1923, *The Golden Bough*. Moscow, 1980, Afterword in the Russian edition, pp. 794-804.

our opinion, is a frightening indication of what is always possible to happen. That is exactly why this tragedy should be perceived as an extremely serious warning to all of us, to the whole humanity at a time when, because of the pandemic, that same humanity is overwhelmed by discomposure, dismay, fear and anxiety, about both for the present and the future - closer or farther!

Our attention in the current analysis is drawn also by the understanding of J. Theodorson and A. Theodorson on the very essence of the religious institution. These researchers define it as “a system of social norms and roles organised to meet the need to clarify issues that affect the ultimate goal or purpose of life, as well as the meaning of its end, death, suffering, and accidental events. A religious institution includes those customs, rituals, prohibitions, standards of conduct, organisational forms, and roles that primarily encompass or justify the supernatural and the sacred, whether or not it affects formal religious organizations ”(Theodorson, G.A. Theodorson, A. G., 1979).

There are many other authors – including those in the bosom of the religious institution itself, as well as even more thinkers, bookmen, and profound social scholars who, in their manuscripts, treatises, writings, works, and books, trace the essence of religion and its history and development over the centuries to the present day. The authors cited here, however, and according to the purpose of the present work, seem to offer us in sufficient detail the main that interests us at the moment and which we should take into account when considering the interaction between religion and politics nowadays.

So, since Religion is a system of authorities, values, beliefs, social norms and rituals and a hierarchical structure that specifies the rights and obligations of citizens, it really plays (a) certain role (s) in society based on the realisation of its own functions.

They aim at developing certain views, opinions and worldviews, as well as training, awareness, accumulation of knowledge, and the development of certain habits and standards of behavior. All this, undoubtedly, has its vital meaning, and ultimate goal - to create and maintain stability, solidity and sustainability of the respective social community, social environment and surroundings.

In other words, the religious institution seeks to integrate (unite), to relate and communicate, to regulate, to cultivate strictness, obedience and compliance, and also to direct its members in their perception of the relevant normative models («standards ») of behavior in socium, which, at that it enriches with knowledge and erudition, as well as with life experiences.

We, therefore, should always remember that, when it comes to Religion, to a religious institution, respectively, at the centre of its focus and attention constantly, even eternally, stands the individual, as well as the whole religious community !

Undoubtedly, in the context of the further analysis and apart from the above-mentioned example of the former FR Yugoslavia, it will be interesting to see what of all that has been said so far about Religion is of particular relevance to Politics.

From the history we study nowadays, it is known that Politics, "as such", emerged relatively later in time after Religion. Until its appearance, i.e. in the prehistoric period, it was the religious cult and faith, considered in their various primary forms, that "governed", regulated and controlled the behaviour of the people of that time. It is the cult and the faith – in their capacity of unchanging guide, that are the reliable and safe reference points in the environment where the individuals are born, brought up, work - hunt, engage in agriculture, gathering, fishing ... It is that same environment which those "first people" seek to transform into their "second" specific reality - the artifacts from that time that have come down to us testify to the creation of own spiritual world by the tribal and communal people - a world where they, with their families, raise their children, exist and grow old and finally ... - leave, are gone ... Magical rituals and the following religious ideas and beliefs, according to the modern historical science, are the main adviser in the prehistoric era, which guides people, mentors them, but also helps them when needed. However, they demand trust, compliance and unconditional obedience from our "prehistoric" ancestors. The latter is aimed at observing traditions and customs, rituals and rites, norms and expectations related to the maintenance of superstition or - in other words - everything that has to do with the preservation of the dogma (faith), praise and divine predestination in the world of men, i.e. in the public (social) environment built by them.

Through the comparative-ethnographic method and on the basis of the evolutionary conception of the history of mankind and culture, Frazer developed also his famous theory of "magic and religion." We, however, and in connection with our aims in the present paper, we should distinguish in the work of this author another idea among his, which too is theoretically developed and known as "Frazer's theory of the origin of royal power."

In this theory, the prominent scientist assumes that in the human population "the first bearers of power - chiefs, leaders, kings – were the sorcerers, priests, magicians, and the basis of that power was the trust in their magical power." (Tokarev, SA ., cit. above).

The modern interpretation of power and Politics uses the legacy of Marxism and neo-Marxism and especially the ideas of M. Weber, but also what is laid down in the structural-functional theory of T. Parsons, in the so-called Theory of Elites and in organizational-managerial theories of power. The author, who specifically mentions this, further states the following: it (the power) is based on "... social relations of inequality, in which the ruler (an individual or a group of people) can impose their will on other participants in the social interaction, even despite their resistance, can change the behavior of the subordinate through specific means - authority (imposing of values and norms), law

(imposing of sanctions), violence (coercion). Power relations are essentially a form of social integration in which the will of one social subject is realised through the actions of others ... '. And further: "... power expresses a degree of social dependence. The monopoly of the ruler for influence over the right to choose the behavior of the subordinate rationalises the definition of power as "relations of domination and subordination" (Kolarova, R. cit. above).

For Weber specifically, power is at the heart of Politics, which is striving for it, or at least striving to participate in it. Weber's politics is inextricably linked with the so-called "Concept of democracy and leadership" or rather with the ideal of "leadership democracy" (Führerdemokratie) or "charismatic domination" (Autaritat). According to him, the political charisma of the "gifted leader" ("**positively value**-laden charisma") introduces "dynamics into political life" (Weber, M., 1992). In this regard, for example, Dahrendorf specifically emphasises that the individual-aristocratic type of liberalism in Weber's "leadership democracy" is "a manifestation of some of the qualities of a political leader - passion - a sense of responsibility - a faithful view" (Dahrendorf, R., 1998, p. 7 - quoted in Bratanov, P. 2004, p. 127).

Indeed, Weber writes the following: "... the possessor of charisma has" forces and qualities inaccessible to everyone else" whereas "it does not matter how "objectively" correctly the relevant quality of the political leader is assessed. All that matters is only how it is practically evaluated by the objects of the charisma, by the adherents ... The bearer of charisma undertakes a task suitable for them and requires obedience and following by virtue of their mission ... Not every modern and not every democratic form of "creation" of a ruler is alien to charisma. In any case, the democratic system of so-called plebiscite domination ... has in its idea essential charismatic features, and all the arguments of its defenders emphasise precisely this peculiarity of it. The plebiscite is not a choice, but a one-off or ... renewed recognition of a candidate as a personally qualified charismatic ruler "(Weber, M., cit. above).

Weber's quoted text is not accidental at all. Based on his briefly presented idea, we could, in our opinion, make assumptions, opinions and possibly hypotheses about the real meaning and the actual historical role of the individual and the ruling person - the "charismatic person" - in the life of society in a given place and in certain time.

Modern Politics deals with the structure and governance of the state and the public environment by administering and controlling relations within it, as well as the dissemination and perception by individuals and social groups of various ideas, intentions and specific social actions that target the intergroup, incl. the class conflicts and which are related to the occupation of positions of power for the imposing of the private interest of the ruling class (or social stratum) as common to the whole society. Politics is also

inextricably linked "with the economic interests of the main owners of the production means grouped in certain classes" (Nikolov, S., R. Kolarova, 1996).

The conclusion that follows from what has been written is that both Religion and Politics "as such" have the same origins or nature – the socium or society in general. At that, both have potential that can be realised in its capacity of a characteristic means, way or tool for uniting, organising or uniting individuals and social groups in an indivisible whole or community. This is the reason to determine that both Religion and Politics should also be defined as two specific forms of social uniting, merging or cohesion ("integration"), sufficiently close in formal characteristics, but also different in content.

Apart from this fact, however, it is known that in the life of society these two forms of social grouping (uniting), however different in content and similar in form they may be - and possibly precisely because of that (!) - they sometimes act together. and synchronously in time in their capacity of accomplices and even very close aids. Thus, those same two forms of this specific social action – the connecting ("the integration") - have become the outer shell of religious conflicts and even of prolonged bloody wars over the centuries and to this day. For example, the Crusades and religious wars in Europe before the Enlightenment, and nowadays - the creation of ISIS, the clashes in Central and East Africa, in the western part of Middle East, in Afghanistan, as well as in the countries mentioned above.

The scientific explanation for such a "combination" is not an easy task - as evidenced by the classic work of M. Weber, to which we have paid special attention above. In all cases, when approaching it, as does the cited author, it is necessary to apply the specific-historical approach and analysis, which requires detailed clarification: first, the specific historical circumstances that characterise the connections and interrelations between Religion and Politics in the given moment and place, including internal and external interstate relations, influences and interactions; second, the place and the role of Religion and Politics in the given social environment, i.e. an analysis of the relationship between secular and spiritual authorities at the moment of interest to us is necessary; third, the role of the dominant groups and of the individuals in the realisation of Religion and of Politics; fourth, the level of development or civilising of the individual participants, social groups and communities; fifth, the relationship of Religion and Politics with the role of morality, law and the prevailing doctrines at the particular time and place; sixth, the adherence to the existing traditions, rituals and customs in the life of the social groups and communities of interest to us; seventh, the peculiarities of everyday life, the daily routines, habits, norms and expectations of the individual participants, etc.

Another feature of the modern interaction between Religion and Politics is consequential from the fact that both set as their own desired goal and intentions the

implementation in the social environment of a certain behavioral model ("standard" of behaviour), which we have characterised above as "obedience and obedience" especially with regard to religion. In fact, this is a feature not only of Religion - any political leader, coalition or any other political governing group presupposes and imposes as a special requirement the unconditional obedience to their own decisions and will of the members of social groups and the community they instruct, guide and manage. In other words, this is another common characteristic of Religion and Politics, which finds its explanation and individual manifestations in the present precisely as a prerequisite and basis for the exercising of power.

The examples in this regard are innumerable and therefore we could limit our argument down to a single illustration in this sense - the strict legislatively-binding requirements, for example, of NOH (National Operational Headquarters) due to the declared "pandemic" state of emergency in our country on the eve of the greatest Christian holiday Easter, as well as in the days preceding the not less important Muslim holiday Ramadan Bayram. Let us add that Bulgarian citizens - regardless of their religion - demonstrated the appropriate discipline and listened not only to the instructions and threats constantly broadcast or disseminated through various communication channels, but most of all - "heard the voice of their own reason" and did what was required of them and what was imposed by the ruling coalition in the country, i.e. those same ones - the voters, the Bulgarian citizens or the electorate - have implemented the model of compliance and obedience required by all the governing persons to their own behaviour, habits and traditions (the "standard" of behaviour), i.e. they did not allow worshippers to congregate in churches and mosques and outside them during the performance of traditional religious rituals.

Yet, let us add that at about the same time, the world as a whole witnessed other specific patterns of individual and group religious behaviour, approved, recommended, and unwaveringly followed by other religious institutions and denominations as well. Thus, believers in many countries around the world celebrated religious holidays with their prayerful presence in only a limited number of temples and with observance of both the recommended distance and the ban for any physical contact, with mandatory decontamination, with the cancelling of customary rituals, with the strict regulation of social contacts in general, etc.

For instance, similar recommendations and actions, initially agreed with the Mayor of Moscow, were implemented by the church institution of the Russian Federation. In particular, Patriarch Kiril's address to the Russian Orthodox people not to go to church at Easter due to the risk of spreading the infection was accepted, understood and adequately implemented by the Russian Christians believers.

The Greek Orthodox Church, during the biggest Christian holiday, Easter, in turn closed church for visits of the laity and thus effectively supported the efforts of the Greek Conservative government to successfully deal with the further spread of the coronavirus.

Pope Francis also prevented a dangerous gathering of people in Rome, inside and outside the Catholic Cathedral of St. Peter, in turn, as an effective counterpoint to the growth of the coronavirus epidemic in Italy and in compliance with the requirements of the health authorities - he implemented an adequate rational model of religious behaviour on the occasion of Easter.

Society develops over time, and along does the relationship between Religion and Politics changes.

It is known from history that the process of the so-called secularisation dates back to the Enlightenment, when prominent thinkers, writers and the public political power and religion Since then until today and separately from the single events in regional and global plan, which we have already described, including the beginning and development of the coronavirus pandemic - we see that Religion is essentially moving away from Politics. The same process in a large number of modern countries is even resolved by law – i.e. the state is separated from Religion and is left to make its own institutional, organisational and managerial decisions. At least in our country, the Republic of Bulgaria, this is the case and in this way the religious institutions are legally separated from the political processes.

In reality, in practice, however, the mutual influence between Politics and Religion is still manifested in the various countries where there is legislation on the issue, similar to that in our country. For example, in the United States, the President places his hand on the bible when he takes the words of the obligatory oath upon taking office. In England, at the coronation of the new king (queen), the Archbishop of Canterbury says sacred words that affirm the monarch's relationship with God. Even in our country, the President, when celebrating, for example, the day of the Bulgarian army - St. George's Day – it is obligatory done in the presence of the highest officials of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church - and the Bulgarian Patriarch himself consecrates the military flags of the Bulgarian army. In fact, this is the continuation of a tradition that dates back to the distant Bulgarian Middle Ages.

During the April Uprising and the Liberation War, and later - during the numerous periods of social upheavals, troubles and misfortunes that befell our country, religion more or less did not remain a silent, indifferent and apathetic witness to what was happening. This fact was confirmed in the years after the radical social change in November 1989, when a sufficiently serious and prolonged attempt was made to introduce a schism in the Bulgarian Orthodox Church. It was an experience which - as is well known – the church did not allow to take place! Five or six years ago, however, and after the beginning of the

events in Kiev - similarly and under the active (political) dictate of Ukrainian nationalists, aimed at changing the consciousness, views and overall worldview of Orthodox Christianity in the country, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church proclaimed its sacred independence from the Russian Orthodox Church. These facts prove, in our opinion, that nothing guarantees against the possibility of modern interactions and contacts between Religion and Politics to be used at any time for one purpose or another (political) and intentions, possibly coloured even with self-interested, private interest(s) and leading to the overt and deliberate "politicisation" of Religion.

Thus, Religion is able to "justify" in the conditions of social change, especially in the eyes of believers, the actions of certain "politicians" by giving them a juridical, legal legitimacy (a seeming one!). Apparently, it makes their connection with the historical past (the Middle Ages), when the government of individual (European) countries was closely linked to the church institution, which embodies everything that is of interest to the power-desiring social social group (stratum) - law, political ideas and intentions, values (including ethical), norms (including moral) and expectations, cultural life and education, but also the system of control over their observance or violation, which is strictly sanctioned and respectively severely punished in individual cases, which are not small in number at all!

The question that still remains unanswered, in our opinion, is - in a global context – Should that same politics, the modern Politics, in turn follow more or less its own path of diverging from religious dogma?

The grounds for skepticism with regards to a positive answer are first, the facts in the present, some of which we have already noted - the policy of jihad and the emergence of the so-called Islamic State in the Middle East region, also the events in the Balkans a little more than two decades ago, and second, the presence nowadays in the political space of a number of European and sufficiently developed in all respects countries of religious, ie. so-called "clerical" parties - in Belgium, Italy, Germany ... Of course, the fact that they are religious does not mean that the ideas and programmes they offer are the same or identical. Politologists today define them as conservative or extremely conservative, as well as as social-reformist political parties. In any case, they function and will continue to develop in extremely complex and contradictory conditions and circumstances, both in individual countries and around the world.

Finally, let us focus attention to those same conditions or circumstances, which in the present and in the near future, will, most likely, remain an integral part of our own daily life and further existence.

CONCLUSIONS

First, an important circumstance for all of us, modern people, is the psychological crisis that the individual and members of social groups around the world have experienced (and continue to experience!) in the context of the pandemic. It inflicted a deep psychological trauma, accompanied by a sense of helplessness and hopelessness, of the inevitability of the impending disaster, as well as the inability to respond adequately to the impending danger and risk. All this - accompanied by a general concern for the future - closer or farther - and most of all with a fear of infection and possibly approaching – as if secretly - death ...

The effect of all this remains and at best, in our opinion, forces us to more or less ask ourselves questions such as, What is the meaning of our existence as people and individuals in general?; What is death?; Why does it exist at all?; What is most important in our own lives and in the lives of our close relatives?; What are the most significant values in it?, etc. And these are those vital questions, existential questions to which Religion gives its answer ...;

Second, the economic problems of the present - the drastic reduction of income, unresolved issues with work, family support, children, the constant rise of food prices, general insecurity, personal development of family members, medical problems and fear of the poor state of the health-care system, etc.

Third, the “online” reality after COVID-19 will continue to determine our individual behavior, our habits and way of life at different levels of social interaction - our personal and interpersonal contacts, interaction in and between groups, as well as between social communities and formations.

The final conclusion, which logically and meaningfully follows from all that has been said so far, is that modern society, considered individually as a group or as a global whole, faces a dilemma - whether to continue to exist, function and develop in the usual for our daily lives and in a way known to all of us way, or to change something, both in its surrounding material environment and within itself - including changes with regard to Religion and Politics.

In our opinion, digital reality and the so-called AI - artificial intelligence, which is already a reality, will continue to occupy an increasingly important place in our existence as individuals and as a biological population.

Together, they will unconditionally continue to exert an unavoidable impact on religious and political institutions, ie. and on Religion and Politics.

In turn, the same impact, will highly likely affect the specifics of their further functioning and development, their relations and mutual interrelations with the individual,

on the one hand, and with those of other major institutions of society, including those of the family, medicine, health care, material and spiritual production, education, culture and management of the social environment, on the other.

The answer to the other part of the final conclusion above seems to be more complicated - Will there be "any" change in each of us as individual members of society, also in our capacity of an integral part of it under the new conditions? And if so, what will be this change "in itself"?

We believe that there will definitely be a change and it depends on each one of us what it will be - whether it will lead us in the right, adequate direction to finally reach the dreamed promised land or vice versa.

REFERENCES

- Abercrombie, N., S. Hill, and B. Turner. Dictionary of Sociology, Penguin Books, London, 1994;
- Bogomilova, N. Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sociology, Institute of Sociology, Sofia, 1996;
- Bratanov, P. Functionality of social communication, UNWE Publishing House, Sofia, 2004;
- Bratanov, P. The Thirty-Year Transition, Innovations and Crises in Bulgarian Media Space, Academy of Innovations and Development, International Discussion Forum, Education, Science, Innovations on topic "Innovations for Higher Education Development", Proceedings, Printing Complex Nuance Design, Sofia, February 24, 2018, pp. 99 - 114;
- Bratanov, P. Transitive Media Theory (Media „Transition” Theory) – Main Principles, In: ACEU (Alliance of Central-Eastern European Universities), Proceedings of the IV th International Scientific Conference Climate Change, Economic Development, Environment and People (CCEDEP), Regional Development of Central and Eastern European Countries, Academic Publishing House "Talent", University of Agribusiness and Rural Development- Bulgaria 2015, Volume 1, pp. 403 – 426; ISBN 978-619-203-015-5, EN;
- Dahrendorf, R.S. Modern Social Conflict. Essay on Politics and Freedom, Sofia, 1998;
- Giddens, A. Sociology, PH Prozorets EOOD, 2003;
- Kolarova, R. Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sociology, 1996;
- Mendras, A. Elements of Sociology, Kama Publishing House, 2002;
- Mihailov, St. S. Koleva, Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sociology, 1966;
- Tokarev, S.A. Foreword to the Russian language version of the book by J.G. Frazer, 1923, The Golden Bough. Moscow, 1980, Afterword in the Russian edition, pp. 794-804.
- Weber, M. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Sofia, 1993;

Theodorson, G.A. Theodorson, A.G., A Modern Dictionary of Sociology, Barnw & Noble Books,
New York, 1979.