

Introduction

Johann GÜNTHER

Jiangnan University, Wuhan, China

Although everyone was affected by the COVID19 pandemic, they had experienced the crisis in very different ways. Those affected by the virus themselves or relatives / friends of those affected, medical staff, priests. It was annoying for family members with and without children. It was difficult at work.

Many individual experiences, which then became a common destiny society that had no limits. COVID19 meant an abrupt break in known lifestyle habits. It affected private life and public society.

The situation was discussed and explained publicly from different perspectives and by different scientific disciplines. Camps had formed. Supporters and opponents of various theories. Economists, social scientists, philosophers, theologians, educators, technicians and psychologists came up with possible solutions. Self-proclaimed experts appeared on social media.

Many different technologies have been used to maintain communication. Video conferencing for meetings and lectures and the exchange of electronic documents. But the real reference was missing and created longing.

During the pandemic, there were 2 Billion high school and university students in a digital classroom worldwide. 90 percent of all schools and universities were closed.

Our knowledge society will not regress after the pandemic. The trend towards online learning will continue to grow. Learning has acquired a new status, which is above all in line with the rapidly decreasing half-life of our knowledge.

Learning and teaching will play a different role in our society in the future. The international situation and cooperation will also have changed. During the time of the pandemic, tools were developed that will certainly continue to be used in the future. In that sense there will be a change.

The Rector of the University of Bologna Francesco Ubertini on whose shoulders the responsibility of leading the response of that university had fallen adapted his university to the new situation. The lessons which he shared included the importance of transparency and honesty for building trust with the whole university community and the importance of direct communications. He had written to the entire community on a daily basis to build that trust. This university had developed resilience, had become more flexible and needed to maintain energy throughout the different stages of their response.¹

The pandemic has given politics more influence on society. Special ordinances and laws made things possible that under normal circumstances would not have been enforceable in democracies.

Today - under pressure from legal regulations - services such as home office and video conferencing, e-commerce and online shops are increasingly used. New digital products and new digital business models are emerging. That has become a reality in a short time and is developing dynamically - now it is simply possible.

Product groups change faster. The car industry decline is only accelerating now, but is not a new trend. The following generations are no longer "owners". They are a "user". An "On Demand Generation". They no longer have their own CDs, but listen to music from the Internet whenever they feel like it and need it. They no longer have their own car, but rent it if necessary.

¹ UBERTINI, Francesco: „What lessons are we learning from Covid-19?“, Webinar, 18th September 2020, Magna Charta

Corona gives this trend an additional boost. The trend itself existed before that. Even furniture will no longer be owned, but only rented. Rent for the time they are needed. People who wear glasses will no longer own their own glasses, they will only have "rented" them and so can switch to a new model at any time - following a new fashion trend.

For decades, eLearning and distance learning have been referred to in educational institutions. Now it had to be done and was implemented in a very short time. Many people were not prepared for this. Employees were ordered to work from home and had a 20-year-old PC at home or a poor Internet connection.

Countries reacted differently to the pandemic. Some have scaled back and paralyzed the entire professional and private life of the residents. They have put people's health first and the economy second. There are fewer deaths from an economy shutdown, but there is a large economic loss. Other countries gave priority to the economy and accepted that more people would get sick and more died. But since it is mainly the elderly who die, this also has an impact on the state economy. Pension recipients fall away. They are not a service provider for the state and only benefit recipients.

This political decision was described by Thomas More 500 years ago in his book "Utopia". If the sick are incurable, suicide is recommended: "Meanwhile, if the disease is not only incurable, but also torments and tortures the sick constantly, then the priests and authorities encourage him to consider that he is no longer able to cope with all the professional duties of his life to be a burden to others and difficult to bear for oneself and thus already survive one's own death; therefore he should not insist on nourishing the epidemic and contagion and not hesitate to go to his death ..."² Thomas More goes even further in his description of the ideal state and recommends that old people generally from a certain age and when they no longer make a contribution to society should be sacrificed to the vultures.

The first variant shown here of how politics reacts to the pandemic creates a complete re-parsing of our monetary system. With the enacted disease rights, the money cycle is not only inflated, but vice versa. A global transformation process like never before has been set in motion. A reversal of the polarity of money that has never been seen in our western culture. Until now, money has been made through work. It was passed upwards - to the state and its administration - via taxes and duties. It was partly used for administration and partly redistributed downwards. The distribution key was determined by politics. A social state managed, for example, a redistribution from the rich to the poor.

A colleague defined the change as follows: "The new money economy seems to be running differently from now on. If you believe the politicians, the money will soon be generated by the government in the central bank and distributed to the citizens through distribution organizations (ministries, banks, chambers, NGOs, state-affiliated corporations, etc.). The "flow direction" of the money tilts in the other direction. From bottom-up to top-down."³

By "prioritizing people over business" there will be fewer dying and sick people, but there will be "dying companies". Perhaps this is also a reorganization of our society. New businesses with new orientations and a (perhaps) new culture can emerge. The pandemic has revealed weaknesses that will (perhaps) be eliminated.

"Never waste a good crisis!"

² MORUS, Thomas: „Utopia“, Munich 1997, page 129

³ KOTAUCZEK, Peter, Institut for Human Informatics, Vienna