

The Ecological Wars: The Notion, Concept And Dynamics

Oleg N. Yanitsky

Ph.D., Professor, Chief Researcher,
Federal Center of Theoretical and Applied Sociology
Russian Academy of Sciences

ABSTRACT

Drawing on a scientific literature on the Biosphere and the global SBT-structure and development, on Russian, foreign and my own investigations of global ecological issues and environmental movements, I came to the following conclusions. *First*, these issues are both important practically and theoretically. *Second*, under the ecological war I mean all kinds of harm which is caused by man to the natural, human and complex invasion into the natural and social ecosystems. *Third*, the researchers are still follow the principle 'Firstly, we should to cope with the after-effects of a certain disaster and then to evaluate their immediate and far-reaching outcomes'. *Four*, our urgent task is to foresee the coming disaster and to have a time to take the preventive measures in advance. *Five*, I distinguish three main archetypes of the ecological wars that I conditionally names as the natural, social and the feedback's wars conducted by the global SBT-system against natural, social and mixed ecosystems. *Six*, the time regime of the global SBT-system functioning and of the ecological wars is very important but still ill-investigated issues. *Seven*, the main resource of any ecological war is the speed of its spreading in time and space and transformation of natural ecosystems. *Eight*, the current pandemic showed that the systemic approach, interdisciplinary and prognostic researches are the main instruments for coping with the ecological wars. It follows that the sociologists have to learn and widely-use these three theoretical instruments.

Keywords: Biosphere, ecological war, feedbacks, forecasting, globalization, pandemic, SBT-structures, sociology, time regime.

WHY THE ISSUE IN QUESTION IS SO IMPORTANT?

This issue is both important practically and theoretically. Practically because as the current pandemics as well as a set of global ecological disasters like Chernobyl, Bhopal, Three-Mile Island, the catastrophe with the Exxon Valdes tanker and now the overflow of diesel fuel in the Norilsk city in Russia have confirmed that the ecological wars are do existed.

I think that is now necessary to introduce the notion of the ecological wars into a scientific circulation for the following reasons. First, there are too many notions which meaning, content and use are uncertain (the accidents, disasters, catastrophes, calamities, etc.) that signifies the same kind of events. Second, the above events are usually considered beyond a particular natural, social

or complex context. Third, many researchers follow the principle 'We should first to coping with the after-effects of a certain disaster and then to evaluate its immediate and far-reaching outcomes, while our urgent task is to foresee the coming disaster and to take the preventive measures in advance. Four, it means that recently when all is interconnected with the all the any scientist and scholar should distinguish between the crises which periodically coming and gone and the critical situations which have a long-term and all-embracing character. The critical situation (hereafter the CS) is usually leads to the substantial transformations of a global organism as a whole. Five, finally the main resource of any ecological war are the speed and tempo-rhythms of its spreading in time and space. Six,

Under permanent global geopolitical struggle the ecological wars are becoming a very serious arm in it because they are unseen, quiet and very quickly spreading across the world. In sum the ecological wars are the complex arm combining scientific and technology achievements with political pressure and propaganda. Seven, the means of the struggle against the ecological wars should be symmetrical to its reasons, content and structure i.e. these means should have complex character as well. Eight, as current global pandemics clearly showed, ecological wars have produced a global turmoil irrespectively of their origin.

THE NOTION OF AN ECOLOGICAL WAR

Under the ecological war I mean all kinds of harm which is caused by natural, human and complex disasters to the natural and social ecosystems including the global SBT-system. The ecological war is now resulted in the abrupt transformation of all forms of natural and social life and violates a fragile mane-nature balance.

Under such balance I mean a coexistence of the social and natural ecosystems. The regeneration by man the earlier destroyed such ecosystems by climate changes, wars or by overexploitation of natural resources I consider as the antithesis to the notion of ecological war. I fully realize the conditional character of the term 'coexistence.' Nevertheless, this notion has resembled a current global reality which is full of attempts made by the scientists and politicians to protect already existing fragile balance within man-nature relationships.

To begin a more detailed analysis, we first of all should to define the conceptual frames of it within which the notion of the ecological war has to be defined. First, a widely used notion of the biosphere isn't a biological organism only. The biosphere is the very complex notion which has embraced the interrelationships of the cosmic, biological, social and technological structures and processes both an inert and movable, relatively static and dynamic, linear and chaotic, etc. Then, in any case a global social community is much smaller than the outer i.e. cosmic space. Theoretically speaking, this community is capable to make a suicide but not the outer space.

Therefore, theoretically speaking the tandem like 'man and the biosphere' isn't universal but it fits to a certain period of human history only. The same is right in relation to widely used word collocation the 'man and his environment.' If we imply the relationships between humanity and its environment it's one thing, but if we mean the relationships between the individual and his living milieu, it's quite another matter and so on and so forth.

After then, looking at the issue in question historically one could see that in the word collocation the 'man and his environment' the man is usually considered as an active force (actor or agent) while the 'his environment' is as usually more or less stable.

Maybe, in the moment, i.e. here and now such conceptualization is correct but if we speak about the ecological wars as a modern i.e. the global phenomenon we are needed in a quite another theoretical apparatus which fits to an ecological war which development has usually accompanied with unintended consequences and bifurcations. The current pandemics with its unintended fluctuations have confirmed the above statement.

Recently, the globalization represents a permanently developing and very complex process of interactions between its natural, social and technological structures with the abovementioned periodical unintended consequences and bifurcations. Accordingly, humanity is now living in a very mobile and uncertain world. And therefore we still didn't now the laws of its short-term and long-term dynamics. Prof. D. Meadows with his colleagues has introduced the notion of the 'limits to growth' (Meadows at al., 1973, 1989). But the growth of what: of a global population, its productive forces, of consuming resources or of the arms races? Or it's going on the threat of the resource or nuclear wars? More than that, the first book of Meadows and his colleagues has the title 'The Global Equilibrium.' But such equilibrium is impossible due to a domination of market economy and tough struggle for deficit resources and geopolitical domination. Above all, during last 35 years our world has become qualitatively different.

To my mind, the 'limits to growth' principle is too wide and uncertain in order to be a starting point of reasons of the modern ecological wars analysis. The above principle has excluded the all class of natural disasters. We already know that the earth is a living organism but we still don't know the fundamental laws of its functioning and development.

Therefore, I offer to take the existence of the global (or more correct a cosmic) socio-bio-technical system as the starting point of the ecological wars analysis. In turn it means that potentially there are an endless number of its forms and therefore we are not able to analyze all of them. The question arises: which of them has to be analyzed first of all? This question has no definite answer because, as the current practice shows, there may be at least three main archetypes of the ecological wars.

MAIN ARCHETYPES OF ECOLOGICAL WARS

The first and the most understandable to all people I've called as the natural one. It's going on about the foreseeable and unintended natural disasters. The earthquakes, tornados, floods, drought as well as the century-long climatic changes are the best-known examples.

The second one I've called as the social one. This archetype has usually mixt, i.e. complex structure. If we consider a usual procedure of the move from the decision-making to a certain technical construction which usually means an invasion in natural or built environment, we'll see that humans first of all mean their immediate needs and only then think about an environmental consequence of far-going consequences of such invasion. A capitalist system and its global market are the main drivers of such one-sided processes. Of course, there are a lot of regulative instruments for a minimization of natural losses (laws, decrees, instructions, expertize, public hearings and other

forms of communication with the state and civil society organizations) but their efficiency is usually very low.

The matter is that socially-initiated ecological wars have never definite character and time-duration. On the contrary, they are usually producing the immediate and long-term or postponed after-effects. In other words, any socially-initiated environmental disasters have long-term and therefore unpredictable outcomes. More than that, the socially-initiated ecological wars may have the cascade effects generating negative transformations in various types of social life and environmental structures.

The third archetype has produced by the feedbacks of the fluctuations of the global SBT-system which exerts influence on the people and their living milieu. The social and natural sciences have still studied these feedbacks very rare. It's a true difficult issue if one take into account that such feedbacks usually contains an impact of sun rays, the fluctuations of the magnetic field and other cosmic forces on our planet.

In all abovementioned cases one should keep in mind that the above three archetypes may interfere with one another. And this very fact is the most difficult obstacle in the studies of the ecological wars.

The preliminary conclusion is as follows. Actually, there are many variants of the process which we call as the ecological war. But humanity is an inseparable part of the global SBT-system. So we should simultaneously study this SBT-system and the ecological wars which it periodically produced.

THE SOCIAL DEFINITION OF THE CORONA PANDEMIC: DOES IT SUFFICIENT?

This subtitle doesn't mean that I fully reject all said above. But let's analyze the Corona Virus Pandemic more closely, and from the viewpoint of an interdisciplinary approach.

A typical definition of a current situation is as follows: 'the way societies perceive and understand the viral spread is not reducible to the ontological reality of the virus, but instead follows a social logic. The moment when the viral pandemic becomes the social reality is the moment of its social definition, and the moment when it becomes a disaster is when it disrupts taken-for-granted reality (Pfister, 2020).

Two questions are immediately arising. The first is 'taken-for-granted' by whom? The rich has one world-view while the poor has quite another world-view; the worldviews of the sociologists, the scientists and the environmentalists are different as well, and the same may be said about any social strata or group across the world. And the second is who said that the social reality is existed separately from its very complicated socio-bio-technical environment? On the contrary, recently all they are tightly interdependent.

The Dr. Pfister continued, 'the social definition of the pandemic becomes obvious through the fact that...the pandemics appears through the daily checking of the epidemiological maps, the prevalence of the virus (the infected part of a given community), incidences (new case for a given period of time) and the rising of the death tolls. Unlike most other disasters the pandemic lacks

direct evidence. Therefore it is built on the assemblage of information, and hence is situated in the sphere of knowledge' (Pfister, 2020).

It's very indicative that some sociologists who don't want to recognize a necessity of the interdisciplinary approach and the creation of the interdisciplinary knowledge used such very uncertain terms as the 'the assemblage of information.' For the practical aims of struggle against the pandemic such 'liquid terms' means nearly nothing, and usually they are replaced by the forceful administrative measures (isolation, self-isolation, closed enterprises and services, so-called 'masked and distance regime', etc.). Such regime may be called as an open pressure on people under conditions of total unpreparedness of the business-power system to the threats produces by themselves.

I realize that to overcome the institutional separation of the particular disciplines created by the Enlighteners even in XVII century isn't the easy task, especially because the further the more a scientific bureaucracy have justified its existence and gained the surplus constructing every day the new rules of games (Burawoy, 2008). Nevertheless, the interdisciplinary knowledge is urgently needed because all spheres and structures of the global SBT-system have now inherently interdisciplinary character. Such spheres as a geopolitics, bio-politics, eco-sociology as well as an environment and it poisoning – all of them and many others spheres of social activity have already become interdisciplinary.

HAVE WE BEEN PREPARED TO THE ECOLOGICAL WARS?

Some years ago I've issued the article entitled 'Are the Sociologists Well Prepared to the Modern War?' (Yanitsky, 2015). To my sorrow, it has no active response in the global sociological community. The situation with the ecological war has confirmed that global community of the scientists, sociologists and politicians doesn't want to study the wars as the phenomenon inherent to any form of a society existence and development. The roots of such 'alienation' have many reasons.

Firstly, an access to such information is strictly limited by a very close circle of the scientists and politicians responsible for national and international security. The access to the secret information and operation is usually limited by many years and even the decades. More than that, it often happened that the knowledge related to secret inventions and operations had obtained in the course of archeological investigations, and, as often happened, a social or political interpretation of such knowledge subjected by the critics from the side of the widely accepted worldview.

Secondly, the secret services across the world have preferred to supply the society with partial and sometimes with false information. It's a usual tactics and strategy of all divisions of such services in our competitive world. And it's quite natural because the secrecy is a mighty weapon in all spheres of global economic and political life. That is why the any new information gained by the insiders in any sphere of life of the potential adversary is so highly valued.

Thirdly, therefore it seems quite natural that the struggle around the initial sources of the corona pandemics is still continuing in all spheres of global community (in various scientific institutions, mass-media, interpersonal communications and even in the science fiction). Such uncertainty isn't quite natural but simultaneously it's a very efficient instrument to disorient a potential adversary.

Fourthly, after the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombarding the global community has been and still is infected by the fear of nuclear warship for many decades. Recently before the corona-virus pandemics the public's attention has been attracted to the trade wars between the US and China. And these wars are still exerts a negative impact on global economy and world's geopolitics. This one-sided state of the global consciousness maintained by the mass-media and uninterrupted political struggle between the global stakeholders and leading political figures have disoriented not only the mass consciousness but the politics of particular countries and their alliances.

Fifthly, the process of global environment degradation is on the global political agendas for years but without well-seen practical results. And it's quite natural because the any practical attempts to create an ecologically-compatible way of life means a total reorganization of global economy-political tandem. Such total 'green revolution' is impossible under conditions of a capitalist market economy.

Sixthly, as W. Churchill rightly noted the generals are always have prepared to the past war. It's quite natural at least for two reasons. The former is that these generals have unconsciously relied upon their past experience. And the latter is that the all military machine that contains very complicated structural-functional organization is developing much slower than the scientific researchers in their labs.

Seventhly, a situation of uncertainty generates by the everyday routine, global, national, local and even individual ones. Under conditions of a peaceful chaos it's rather difficult to distinguish what is do important and what is the only an instant fluctuation or as the journalists call it 'the events happened in this very moment'. There have been many attempts to present a current reality as the uninterrupted flow of events, but this concept hasn't been well substantiated and developed.

Eighthly, if the state of uncertainty of a scientific and public consciousness is permanently exists it generates a temptation to govern it by means of mass-media by a permanent use of endless block-basters and thrillers that are full of horrors. But together with the permanent contradictions between numerous actors of all kinds of global market these factors produces a situation of permanent uncertainty.

Ninthly, it's a bit surprising but we have no conceptual definition of the very term of environment. As many centuries ago, it existed in our scientific and mass consciousness in two forms, namely as a natural environment with its own and still not very clear to us dynamics, and as a built i.e. man-made environment which is governed by humans. The term of anthrpocene is too wide and uncertain as an instrument that allows us to understand and describe an essence of modern environment. To my mind, we should speak about and analyze an entirely new kind of global complexity which I've called as the SBT-system, i.e. the socio-bio-technical system which has to be investigated by an interdisciplinary analysis (Yanitsky, 2016).

Tenth, summing up I'd say that the ecological war is a kind of permanent war which man conducts against social and natural environment. As any other living organism, humanity interacts with its natural milieu in a double manner. On the one hand, he is trying to adapt to it while on the other hand it is gradually transformed it into a very complex SBT-system which laws and regularities are

still unknown to us. It means that humanity is permanently and simultaneously conducts numerous ecological wars against natural ecosystems including humanity as such.

THE ECOLOGICAL WAR DEVELOPMENT: MAIN PHASES

In this section I'll consider only the most typical and dangerous types of such wars only because there are many types and forms. Principally speaking if the evolution of a natural, social and built environments has accompanied with the struggle of their agents a certain losses are inevitable. Since our world is embraced by the pandemic and this is the most acute issue of humanity the following arguments will be related to the main phases of the pandemic development only.

The first phase: the starting point

Firstly, I'd to reiterate that the all processes listed below have an uncertain character. It signifies that the development of the pandemic in question may have different ways of development. For example, the process of the pandemic spread over the world may have many other ways and forms. Secondly, the principled points of a very slow response (actually the delay) is rooted in the uncertainty of an extremely complex structure of everyday routine when every element of it may play a role of the trigger of the ecological war against natural, social and complex ecosystems.

Thirdly, if we turn to the emergence of the pandemic in the biological lab in the city of Wuhan, the capital of the Hubei Province in China one should to remember that the Wuhan city has a population about 12 million inhabitants. The Wuhan is a large city with various industries, universities and with well-developed transport infrastructure (with the airport, railways, metro), cultural and sport facilities etc. In the Wuhan there were concentrated a couple of the British, French, German and Japanese concessions. So the Wuhan may be called as an international center of industry, culture and science.

Fourthly, it follows that there were a lot of opportunities for a leakage of any infection from the Wuhan labs toward many cities and countries across the world. Under such developed system of intensive world communication the corona pandemic from the Wuhan may appears everywhere. Fifthly, the Covid-19 in the Wuhan has been identified in December 2019. Keeping in mind the existed transportation system, we may suggest that this virus may be found in any point of the globe during 5-8 hours and then to infect thousands people. But remembering that the incubation period duration is 14 days, it means that potentially a large part of the world population will be already infected.

Sixthly, but as we already know now, this pandemic may taking its course without any symptoms or going in a mild (light) form. It means the sick man or woman fill himself/herself healthy but actually he/she plays the role of the pandemic carrier and distributor. It turns that there are objective reasons for the divergence between those whom the statistics counts as the healthy and the amount of those who are actually sick.

Summing up, one can see that the first phase of the corona pandemic hasn't been recognized in due time and therefore actually missed. It's important conclusion because it has happened practically in all counties of the world. More than that, the World Health Organization which should be the first who obliged to warn the global community and its leaders about the coming global threat lags

behind this process. It is one more confirmation of the thesis of U. Beck that we are still living in a society of the after-effects (Beck, 1992, 1999).

Then, it's one more confirmation that the capitalist system and its main mechanism (the global market) are incapable to make complex i.e. systemic analysis of ongoing processes and transformations. They are able to foresee one step forward only. After then, being technocracy-oriented the global stakeholders have become short-seeing and pay no attention neither to the threats generated by the feedback of the global SBT-environment nor to the potential threats of new types of the biological arms developed in their own labs. Finally, being the adherents of new technological inventions these stakeholders forget that every technological novelty has its dark side.

The second phase: the urgent measures

Firstly, I'd like to underscore again the difference between the crisis and critical situation. The crises, economic, political or social are emerging and ending whereas the critical situation may cause the substantial changes in a structural-functional organization of a society.

Secondly, since the all world is subjected to the functioning of global market the commencement of the war against the pandemic has been more or less unified. From the very beginning the political leaders, scientists, scholars and, the most surprising, the leaders of the green parties and environmental movements haven't even noticed the coming of such global critical situation. I call it as the 'effect of the habituation' and therefore fall into the trap of a primitive and not of the scientific reflection.

Thirdly, it has been very typical case of thinking in the terms of already passed events and disasters. Such mode of thinking is very typical to various administrative bodies including the scientific ones which are accustomed to follow the already existed model of thinking and doing created by them. In other words, it's one more example of the case when the generals are preparing to the past war. Fourthly, the case under consideration is a typical example of the gap between the advanced thinking of a scientific community and the backward mode of perception and doing of the administrative bodies. This gap is very difficult to overcome because the scientific community is usually dependent on financial and other resources given by the fund which belongs to the mighty financial corporations and governmental bodies.

Fifthly, in turn the business as such is interested in a permanently gaining profit only, and thus the business organizations have usually commissioned to take necessary measures against to the social institute of medical services. As it now appears, from the epidemics of Spanish flu in post-WWI Europe had come 100 years, and the modern institute of medical services is absolutely unprepared to such all-embracing threat of global pandemics.

Sixthly, it's still not clear what type of the relationships between the pandemic and global economy crisis is now developing? Is it the case of accidental coincidence, two parallel but interdependent crises or we are now dealing with the economic consequences of the pandemic? I'm not the economist but to my mind, we are now facing with the interdependence of all the above threats and forces.

Seventhly, this unpreparedness of global community to such hybrid treats has inevitably led to the effect of all-embracing mobilization and hurry. Such mobilization has been peculiar to the large cities and transportation facilities. As it appears, the social institutions and global industry have been unprepared to such mobilizing efforts made by the state and its administrative bodies. As the result, a suddenly-introduced regime of the isolation and self-isolation has delivered a serious blow to all social institutions and communicative structures of a global whole. It follows that the adherence of the life in a society of after-effects is much more expensive than to try to foresee the coming disasters and to take preventive measures in advance.

Eighthly, one more negative after-effect of the above transformations is a lack or deactivation of civil defense forces. Being the teenager in the times of the WWII I could to observe how efficient had been their rescue activity including the building of the bomb shelters. It seems to me that in the case of current pandemic civil society organizations have been excluded from rescue operations.

Ninthly, as many centuries ago, in-between of any critical event and the necessary measures to cope with it or to mitigate its negative effects there are the interpreters, be it the independent experts, politically-engaged experts, party leaders, public figures, journalists, rumors and many others. And it is they who define a degree of possible risks and losses and the list of urgent preventive measures.

The third phase: a new uncertainty?

Firstly, I've called this phase as a new uncertainty because it will be the competition between three models: a slow restoration of the past, a combination of restoration and the partial transformations and some unknown novelties. It seems to me that such combination is the most possible because all three models have their backers (lobby). But it's again the reflection of an existed balance between the interests of the participants of the global and local markets.

Secondly, but every critical situation has its teaching effect. Under it I mean the extinguishing of some actors and the gaining the power by the others on national and global arenas. To my mind, the distant (online) work has offered many new opportunities both to the business and service organizations and to their workers.

Thirdly, as the theorist I'm forced to consider the most dangerous scenario when one critical situation will generate the next one, and so on and so forth. That's I mean two types of the after-effects: the cascade and the cumulative ones. The former is presented by such disasters as the Bhopal, Chernobyl, Fukushima-1, the oil leakage in the Mexican bay. A common distinguishing feature of all of them is their uncertain space-time development and its negative consequences. The latter, thank God, is still existed as a model only like, for example, as so-called Nuclear Winter.

Fourthly, to my mind, the inertia of global community to live at the expense of the exploitation of natural resources is so strong that to overcome it is extremely difficult. Therefore, I think that a state to teeter on the brink will continue with all its negative consequences.

Fifthly, that is why the theorists, politicians and practitioners usually avoid to use the term of 'ecological war' preferring to operate with well-known notions as the crisis, difficulties, and, of course, the market that as appears is able to resolve any problem.

THE GRADUAL EXIT FROM THE PANDEMIC: THE LOSSES AND CHANGES

The world is still in the process of struggle against the pandemic and its social and natural consequences. As the current attempts of such struggle clearly showed, the economic, social and political losses are inevitable. As concerned to the ecological losses, they are (as usual) are usually not at the global and national agendas. All political and business forces are now concentrated around the economic restoration and its further development.

As the new number of the 'European Sociologist' (2020, No 45) clearly showed, all social scientists and their associates are involved in the estimations and comprehension of already happened events, social, economic and other losses and not in the development of the after-shock prognostic developments and prognoses.

Meanwhile, the necessity of some substantial transformations is already well-seen. To my mind, they are as follows. The majority of the politicians and developers suggest that the pre-pandemic state of global affairs should be restored as soon as possible, while the process of a replacement of the workers by the online activity of various kinds of the 'smart machines' is rapidly going on.

Then, the domination of a man over natural ecosystems is continued. The theorists of current phase of globalization are still avoid to use such terms as the ecological wars, nature repression, limits to growth, etc. Some articles in the above issue of the 'European Sociologist' are mainly concentrated on the health and psychological problems of the population after the cancellation of the regime of an isolation and self-isolation as well as on the importance of the global monitoring (surveillance) (Kravchenko, 2020). It's really important issues but they are still based on the principle of the 'after-effects. After then, there are still no studies on the global SBT-system development and its impact on social and natural ecosystems. Finally, it seems to me that the current pandemics signified that the world is entering into a new transition period with much more degree of uncertainty than earlier (Yanitsky, 2019).

THE TIME REGIME OF THE ECOLOGICAL WAR

The time regime of the global SBT-system and of the ecological wars is very important but still ill-investigated issues. I've no my own investigations of this issue, thus I'm forced to restrict this section with some general statements.

First, the process of evolution of life on the earth has continued for many centuries with various time-rhythms. Second, humanity as a part of global ecosystem has emerged much later. Third, its existence at the expense of nature and its resources is continued up to now. As F. Engels rightly stated, the mankind is a child of nature and he is living and developing due to nature and its resources.

Four, for a long time the man has been a part of global natural ecosystem. Nevertheless, by and large the man has constructed the areas (islands) of social life. From time to time, the man has left one areas and move ahead to master the other natural ecosystems, partly protecting their tempo-rhythms of functioning or partly replacing them by the social ones.

Five, the industrial revolution has marked a decisive turn of the Biosphere evolution: the further the more the tempo-rhythms of industrial functioning (fabrics, cities, communications, etc.) began to outstrip the natural ones.

Six, it means that the industrialization has started up an irreversible process of speeded up destruction of the Biosphere system and its transformation into the global SBT-system with still unknown feedbacks of global social community. As we can see now, the one-sided process of human's wars against nature is now transforming into mutual warship.

CONCLUSION

A man was and still is a part of global ecosystem i.e. of the Biosphere. In the course of its evolution the man's role in its shaping and transformation has gradually grown. Accordingly, the man's role in the tandem of the 'Man and the Biosphere' has grown more and more quickly. It means that the man has considered a natural environment as a source of unlimited resources.

But during XX and XXI centuries a total influence of man's activity on the Biosphere began initially and then more and more rapidly to transform it into the sociobiotechnosphere. I estimate this period of time as the beginning of humanity wars against its motherland, i.e. the Nature. In other words, the aggressive and one-sided process of the humanity war against nature has begun.

The main features of this war are as follows: a violation of the turnover of a matter and energy in the Biosphere; a reduction of the diversity of natural species and their ecosystems; a violation and total destruction of natural ecosystems (desertification, violation of global water turnover); the shaping a man-made ecosystems (large cities) which are permanently needed in supply with the water, energy and other natural resources; predatory destruction of tropical forests of Amazonia and so on and so forth.

The main resource of any ecological war is the speed of its spreading in time and space and transformation of natural ecosystems. It's a very important point because of permanent technological innovations of human activity across the world. The further the more the time rhythms of natural ecosystems' developed in the course of the Biosphere evolution have lags behind of the permanent acceleration of the time-rhythms of man-made artificial ecosystems.

Finally, we are now living in the period of the intensive feedbacks activity of wounded Biosphere in relation to the so-called socio-sphere constructed by humanity. To my mind, it's a real warship against humanity.

References

- Beck U. 1992. Risk Society. Toward a New Modernity. London: SAGE. 260 pp.
- Beck U. 1999. World Risk Society. Malden, MA: Polity Press. 184 pp.
- Burawoy M. 2008. What is to be Done? Theses on the Degradation of Social Existence in a Globalizing World. *Current Sociology* 56 (3): 351-59.
- Meadows D.L. and Meadows D. H., eds. 1973. Toward Global Equilibrium. Cambridge, Mass.: Wright-Allen Press.
- Kravchenko S. 2020. Being Cosmopolitan and Anti-Cosmopolitan—The Complex Risks of the Covid-19: The Demand to Move from the Society of Normalization to 'Global Medical Surveillance.' *European Sociologist*, Issue 45 Vol. 1. URL:

[https:// www.europeansociologist.org/issue-45-pandemic-impossibilities-vol-1/theorising-being-cosmopolitan-and-anti-cosmopolitan-complex-risks](https://www.europeansociologist.org/issue-45-pandemic-impossibilities-vol-1/theorising-being-cosmopolitan-and-anti-cosmopolitan-complex-risks) (last access: 11 June, 2020).

Meadows D.H., Meadows D. I., Randers J.W. 1989. *The Limits to Growth*. A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind. 2nd ed. N.Y.: Universe Books.

Pfister S. Theorizing – The Social Definition of the Corona Pandemic//Pandemic (im)possibilities. 2020. *European Sociologist*: issue 45: VOL. 1. URL: <https://www.europeansociologist.org/issue-45-pandemic-impossibilities-vol-1/theorising-%E2%80%93-social-definition-corona-pandemic> (last access: 11 June, 2020).

Yanitsky O. 2015. Are the Sociologists Well Prepared to the Modern War? *Journal of Social Sciences Research*. 2015, Vol. 6 (3): 1090-1098. Available at: http://cirworld.com/journals/index.php/jssr/article/view/3680/pdf_99

Yanitsky O. 2016. Sociobiotechnical systems: a New Approach to Man-Nature Interactions, in: Yanitsky O. *On Globalization and its Environmental Consequences*. Moscow: IS RAS' pp. 123-135. Available at: <http://www.isras.ru/index.php?id1198&id=4603>

Yanitsky O. 2019. *Perechodnyi Period: Tseli Izucheniya, Teoriya, Prtaktika* [A Transition Period: The Research Aims, Theory, Practice]. Moscow: Political Encyclopedia Editorial House. 287 pp. (In Russ.).