

The value and moral system from the time of liquid modernity to solid modernity

Received date:10/01/2026 Accepted date:11/05/2026 Published date:12/06/2026

Si Mohamed louiza¹, Ammari Amel²

¹University of Bouira, Algeria, **Email:** llouiza658@gmail.com
+0009-0006-8207-2674

² University of Algiers 2, Algeria, **Email:** ammarisocio@yahoo.com
+0009-0003-5761-9277

Abstract:

Continuous modernization has been the hallmark of modernity from its inception to the present day. Perhaps the most prominent and most documented form of modernization is the reality that liquid modernity transmits in our time, as the latter is an affective and mental reflection of the state of rigidity. The continuous modernization process has led to the dissolution and liquefaction of a large group of stable fixed entities or entities that derive their survival and continuity from within them in a stable manner. Among these entities that have undergone major transformations and continuous dissolution are social structures, human bonds, behavioral models and value models.

Keywords: modernity, solid modernity, liquid modernity, system, values, ethics

Corresponding Author: Louiza Simohamed, **Email:** llouiza658@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Western modernity has made many promises to itself, the most important of which is to subject the world to human will and rational interpretation, and this is after breaking the spell and unfolding the unseen on the world, and excluding the language of fate and destiny to replace it with the language of will, entitlement and responsibility.

According to the Polish thinker Zygmunt Baumann, the era of modernity was divided into a solid modernity characterized by its quest to deny the unseen and dominate the world, define rules, build the state, and create a solid nationalism, as well as the quest for material certainty based on the claim of the ability to control, and to a liquid modernity based on the logic of consumption in its deep sense of place, values, things and relationships, in light of the era of globalization, and it does not give us a fixed snapshot of a static image, but rather explains to us modernity in its movement, trajectory, and transformations. It moves in its analysis from describing solid modernity, which seeks to negate the unseen and dominate the world, define rules, build the state, create solid nationalism, and pursue material certainty based on the claim of the ability to control, to liquid modernity, which is based on the logic of consumption in its deep sense of place, values, things, and relationships in the context of globalization. Liquid modernity seems to be an absolute negation of solid modernity, but upon closer examination, we find that liquid modernity is more than just the opposite of solid modernity; in fact, it reflects the hierarchy of values adopted by solid modernity.

The modern era is characterized by its tendency to cross borders and break down restrictions by influencing all existing institutions and reference frameworks and throwing all public forms, fixed units and patterns on which interaction takes place within societies to reshape and reformulate them. Therefore, individuals find themselves facing



new patterns, perceptions, rules and behaviors modeled by modernity as correct and appropriate, Bauman approaches modernity in the way he views social events, and he helps in understanding problems and the challenges an individual faces in a time of rapid changes. He is also able to understand a person in a clear and simple critical way regarding their personal pathways, and he grasps the changes occurring around them due to changes in economic, political, and social systems, which also affected values, human relationships, and relations of production. These changes directly impacted identity, which dissolved in the midst of the shift from solid modernity to liquid modernity. It is notable that Bauman provided a social analysis in a critical manner of the situations that modern societies have reached, many of which were placed at a difficult crossroads between preserving their original culture or transforming into a new culture, which was born from many variables imposed by the social, political, and especially economic reality with the dominance of capitalism. Accordingly, the issue I would like to raise in this topic is: On what basis is the value system in modern and post-modern society founded according to Zygmunt Bauman?

2. the concept of modernity and postmodernity:

Modernity in the broad sense refers to all the changes and transformations on the social, cultural, political and economic level that occurred in Western Europe beginning in the middle of the sixteenth century. With this modernity, the central ideas of Eurocentrism, estrangement and difference were established, and all the early theorists, philosophers and sociologists were unanimous and expressed in different ways about the uniqueness of modern European society from all other societies. (Bhambra, 2016, pp12-13)

Therefore, social dynamism is one of the most fundamental topics that sociology relies on in its study of modernity and postmodernity. The main event focused on distinguishing between important social

structures in their historical diversity, which later led to the emergence of the so-called comparative sociology of societies, and was associated with the initial transformation of what is social in the first place. The initial shift to what is primarily social through the work of many Enlightenment theorists such as, the Scottish Ferguson and Smith and French theorists such as, Montesquieu and Turgot, and with the development of sociology and the increasing interest in many topics that were the subject of philosophical interest, especially during the Enlightenment era, which is associated with the works of Hobbes, Locke and Bacon. (Bhambra, 2016, pp62-63)

One of the leading sociological interpretations of modernity is that of Auguste Comte, who based his interpretation of modernity on the transformations in societies, arguing that social arrangements did not only enter the desired framework, but were historically created, and that the issues and questions that persisted in the aftermath of the French Revolution were only the result of the continuation of the basic and ancient metaphysical principles at the same time, such as those ideas about natural law and human rights. According to Comte, these historically emergent changes led man to introduce a system of beliefs based on positivism and scientific and objective knowledge that replaced the controversies that were destructive to societies and an obstacle to social reconciliation, the latter of which was based on religion and religious institutions. However, it is now based on science, and thus Comte believed that history is governed by steady shifts from one mode of knowledge to another, from the theological to the metaphysical to the scientific mode, where each development depends on what preceded it. (Mooney & Evans, 2009, pp80-81)

Thus, the term modernization refers to the transformation of traditional or semi-traditional systems and their change to technological patterns accompanied by the emergence of new forms of social structure, orientation, values and social standards, as Szymon Chodak believes that the term modernization expresses the

existing view between the level of development of society and other more advanced and modern forms, which aims to step into higher levels of behavior, work and ways of thinking that are more modern , more rational, more productive and profitable and, in general, more useful and beneficial. (Imad, 2006,p214)

Therefore, there are those who see modernity as a new and unprecedented reality that is separated from the past and with the traditional society with all its features, structures, values and mechanisms, while there are those who see modernity as a continuation of the past and heritage. But between this and that, many consider that modernity carries at its core the defense of human greatness and its rights, and the use of reason, matched by the use of technology and science. In this context “Anthony Giddens” provides (the same previous reference) a concept of modernity as a civilization project based on several foundations, including individualism, rationality and positivism and that human history is in a constant upward spiral, from a simple society to a more complex society, with the possibility of diversity and multiplicity of development between different social models, which makes the observation of difference, diversity and complexity between societies more obvious. (Jürgen Habermas,2002,pp14-17) .

Modernity was characterized by several indicators showcasing changes in all political, economic and social structures, the most important of which is the transition of society from traditional to modern society, that is, from the use of simple techniques and means to the use of advanced scientific and technological knowledge, and the increased use of the machine instead of the exploitation of human power. Societies have reached a high rate of economic growth by increasing production and consumption on a permanent and continuous basis to make consumption one of the main indicators of modern societies. Society has also witnessed a shift at the political

level to what is called the modern national state, which replaced the traditional state.

Based on the above, it is clear that modernity, through all its theorists, is characterized by the scientific desire to create images, concepts, and scientific articles that claim to be completely correct and objective and have made a total break with everything that is traditional, which does not establish a society of movement, production, and consumption.

However, postmodern thought emphasizes its violation and categorical rejection of drawn boundaries and skepticism of any attempts to define things definitively and conclusively. Consequently, it is not possible to establish a single and stable definition of postmodern theory, thought and time. The main principle of postmodernism is that the claim to know things objectively and comprehensively is a fantasy and has no basis in reality. Therefore, things become chaotic in their meaning, rejecting the simple, deterministic and holistic form that the scientific explanation puts on them. (Inglis& Hughson,2013,p207.)

It is always believed that the postmodern era began in the second half of the twentieth century, that is, after World War II, to consider the postmodern euphoria to be the postwar euphoria, so that postmodernism shares its roots with post-structuralism, which is a philosophical method that seeks to overturn the central pillars of Western thought that are categorized under the umbrella of postmodernism.

Among the most important postmodern theorists is the French philosopher Jean-François Lyotard, who categorizes the postmodern stage as a phase that evaluates the principle of questioning the grand narratives or theories that explain the fundamental nature of human experience or the world in general. According to him, religions are “the most successful narratives because they have been able ,over thousands of years, to convince people and guide their behaviors, activities, thinking, and experiences without any clear and factual

evidence. But, postmodernism establishes concepts related to modernity such as the nation-state, human progress, rationality, and scientific integrity, all of which are not as innocent as we think they are because they have always been associated with global capitalism and under its control. All these concepts have been replaced, according to Lyotard, by small stories, operating within the framework of all that is contingent, local and utilitarian, which allowed the dissolution and collapse of the distinction existing in the midst of modernity, especially in the cultural and political sphere. The postmodern reality and the thought prevailing in it put an end to the so-called distinction between “high culture” and “low culture,” which led to the welcoming of cultural diversity and difference, and even led to hybridity, and its cultural and social acceptance. While politically, it led to the disappearance and collapse of the national boundaries that existed within the national state.

This is why in the postmodern era, all objects and topics are “mocked” and “quoted” and everything is questioned because originality in this time is no longer present and nowhere to be found. (Mooney & Evans, 2009, pp237-238) while for Marxist Frederic Jameson, postmodernism is not a mockery, but a weak interstitial masquerade that has lost its satirical edge and its ability to be exposed to the discussion of any ideological judgments or positions. Unlike all postmodern thinkers, Habermas, one of the representatives of the Frankfurt Critical School, claimed that modernity is not linked to a specific historical stage, but is always renewed whenever social and human relations are renewed by relying on what is old, and awareness of the characteristics of what is coming and future. According to Habermas, modernity has no end because it is in continuous and permanent development that opens up to the unknown despite the existence of contradictions and negatives in it, but what Western modernity produced and what led to achievements in science, systems, ethics, law, and freedoms cannot be denied. (Imad, 2006, pp224-225)



This is why Habermas calls for more recourse to reason and achieving a higher degree of transparency of communication, whether within one society or between different societies. This communication transparency is achieved thanks to information technology, which, in his opinion, seems capable of creating many and renewable fields of public opinion, thanks to the speed and fluidity in societies by exchanging information. It crosses societies while carrying the interactions of the social, economic and political reality of societies, which increases the ability of the latter to self-correct their mistakes and dynamically adapt to the social changes taking place.

2- From Solid Modernity to Liquid Modernity by Zygmunt Baumann:

The Polish philosopher and sociologist “Zygmunt Baumann” relied on the concepts of modernity and postmodernity to explain and evaluate many of the social phenomena that swept the contemporary world, but in fact when using these two concepts there is generality and blurring when distinguishing between them through the opinion of many theorists to whom this topic has caused much controversy, but “Baumann” by adding two adjectives to these two concepts gave more clarity and accuracy. Many of his works, especially after the seventies of the last century, were characterized by his proposal to use solid modernity and liquid modernity, instead of modernity and postmodernity respectively, as solid modernity is that era inaugurated by the Enlightenment era in the eighteenth century, based on major changes and transformations that have grown since the end of the Middle Ages and “solidified” in the era of “rationality”, an era characterized by the emergence of the use of major concepts such as “society”, ‘culture’, “modern state”. This era was characterized by the stability and clarity of borders and major landmarks and the dedication of efforts to consolidate and improve the principle of national sovereignty and the exceptional borders between states and societies by surrounding sovereign borders with impenetrable boundaries, but

liquid modernity is that phase that followed World War II, a phase that many theorists call the “postmodern stage”, as this era is characterized by the loosening of features, dissolution and overlapping of borders and the increasing blurring and similarity of borders to the point of talking about fluidity or dissolution of state borders and societal landmarks. In addition to the continuous, permanent and unstoppable collapse of the importance of spatial distances and the possibilities of defending borders, today it has become easy to observe the dense human flow across all fronts, i.e. “migration”, although this phenomenon has raised and continues to raise many reservations, resentment and resistance in many receiving countries, especially the developed Western countries, which today have become known as countries of immigration par excellence, and for this reason the solid Enlightenment modernity no longer exists to be replaced by a liquid modernity that has removed all borders between countries and societies. (Baumann, 2016D, pp10-15)

Baumann expressed liquid modernity through several indicators, the most important of which is the way power is exercised within societies, which in his opinion is a good example of the way in which the boundaries have changed to transform societies from clear vision societies to full vision societies, as there has been a shift from the authority's control of society and individuals to permanent control by the society itself, and a major shift in the ways in which rules and norms are imposed and followed and submitted to them. Following these rules and norms used to be through coercion and compulsion, in the era of liquid modernity it is done through attraction and temptation.

In addition to all of this, there has become a clear domination of private over public, as in the era of modernity, there is a clear focus on private life and individual affairs in a major field, and this in a humanized and globalized model, thus eliminating the clear distinction that existed in the era of solid modernity between the

private and the public, and the evidence for this is the totality of the factual conditions and circumstances in our era that have given clear indications of this transformation, as there are no longer citizens, as was the case under the banner and control of the national nation-state in the era of solid modernity. Rather, there are individuals with new ideas, new practices and new behaviors, without any consideration of national or state citizenship, and with hybrid identities that have eliminated the prevailing thought that set boundaries and distinctions between identities, as it is now possible to have small populations with different identities from the original identity of the society in which they are located, depending on previous membership in groups. Bauman also provided another analysis of liquidity and linked it to the emergence of a pattern different from the prevailing and dominant order in human society, but individuals in society can offer life alternatives that bring about a change in reality, through which the humanity of the modernist model can be restored.

3. Reasons for the transition from solid to liquid modernity:

Abdelwahab al-Messiri, echoing Baumann sees that the beginning of the modern economic vision in Western societies was based on what he called the “austerity stage,” and the main driver of the producer was utility, because the ultimate goal of man in the solid stage is to produce and increase production, so there must be a process of repression of individuals, so that man becomes a producer rather than a consumer, and his moral duty within society was to produce and his reward was consumption, and for this reason the Protestants stood out in the phase of solid modernity and their work ethic prevailed. The social status of individuals was determined by his production, then came the stage of austerity, accumulation, increased production and heavy industry, and this is why this phase was characterized by stability, solidity and cohesion, and this stage was characterized by a clear class hierarchy within societies through the existence of exploiters and exploited, and workers suffering from the

continuous squeezing of surplus value from them, so that social mobility knows a permanent rise and fall in the social ladder.(El-Messiri&Triki, 2012,pp47-48)

According to Baumann, the shift from solid modernity to liquid modernity has created a new and unprecedented situation in all social, political, economic and cultural fields. According to him, the social forms and structures that used to determine individual choices, and the social institutions that used to guarantee social control and ensure the permanence and continuity of accepted customs and patterns of behavior in society, have become today, in a time of fluidity, incapable to maintain their form, roles, and policing power. They are decaying, and dissolving to the point where they no longer represent the reference for the actions of individuals within societies, and there is no more strength and solidity for social institutions to enable them to build long-term social strategies because the life span of these institutions, according to Baumann, has become shorter than that required to realize a “life project”. (Baumann,2017,p25)

4. The Value and Ethical System in the Time of Liquid Modernity:

Continuous modernization has been the defining feature of modernity since its inception to the present day, and perhaps the most notable and solid form of modernization is the reality that liquid modernity reflects in our current era, as the latter is an affectional and intellectual reflection of the state of solidity; the continuous process of modernization has led to the dissolution and liquefaction of a large and diverse group of fixed and stable entities or entities that derive their permanence and continuity from within them in a fixed manner. Among these entities which have undergone great transformations and continuous dissolution are social structures, human bonds, behavioral models and value models...etc. All of these entities have been experienced liquefaction and weakening of their power and grip on the

human model of existence in the world, and are among the behavioral and value models that are prevalent in the age of liquid modernity.

4.1 Consumption Values:

Man now lives in a globalized society of consumers, and it has been necessary and inevitable that consumption behavior affect all aspects of life, whether in the field of work or family life, and for this reason the man of the contemporary world lives under the pressure of the necessity of increasing consumption permanently and continuously, which naturally leads to man himself becoming a commodity in the markets of consumption and labor, so that consumption activity becomes a template and a model for the way citizens in Western societies nowadays view all their activities, and given the prevalence of the consumption model in all areas of contemporary society, it has become not strange that consumerism has become a kind of default philosophy for all modern life lived by man.(Baumann, 2016D,p86)

The relationship between time and place has been transformed by modern time, as places are consumed by the market's seizure of areas, and all over the world, places that were once obscure have become well known. As through this logic, places have become the property of those who own, rule, and direct; while consumers in this era have become gasping for goods to keep pace with the conditions of the place including lifestyle, manifestations of consumption and forms of social positioning.

The consumer society is based on the satisfaction of human desires, a promise this society makes to its members. However, this promise of satisfaction does not retain its charm until after the satisfaction and doubt of the true and complete satisfaction of the desire, because in fact believing that there are objective limits to desires and setting modest plans to achieve the goals, inevitably eliminates the consumer



society, but the lack of satisfaction of desires and the existence of a permanent belief, every activity or action aimed at satisfying these desires is the real engine of the global capitalist economy centered around consumption.

Baumann emphasized the influence of material values on consumption, making the 'desire to possess' one of the most important topics for individuals, followed immediately by the disposal of those possessions or consumer goods and replacing them with other consumer goods. Consequently, the traditional value associated with human attachment and long-term commitment to goods and products has ended, replaced by a new value that is welcoming everything new and discarding everything old. Accordingly, a society of consumption can only be a society of excess and waste, and therefore it is a society of waste by excellence.(Baumann, 2016C,p115)

Consumption has created a series of fears and motives, and this latter leave the consumer in constant anxiety and tension. One of these motives is to keep up with the fashion followed by other prestigious people, those who are trusted and have become a reference for most people, and whose acceptance draws the line between success and failure and the attachment to fashion to survival, which is the only way to confirm that the need for respect is constant and abundant enough. Fashion is now linked to ensuring a sense of security, leaning on self-confidence and the certainty that one is on the 'right path', because it has become a promise of the acquisition of belonging, acceptance and integration with others and the avoidance of abandonment and loneliness.

However, this integration and belonging in keeping up with fashion is not eternal and permanent, it offers no lasting relief because it remains temporary, tied to the limited duration of a particular trend, so that this cycle continues by keeping up with a new fashion and getting rid of those needs associated with a fashion that has expired, based on the principle that tools and methods that worked in the past will not

work in the present, which means that the consumerist life is a life of rapid learning and rapid forgetting, if the moral principle of productive activity, aimed at satisfying current and immediate needs that ensure the individual remains in constant motion. If, according to Max Weber, the ethical principle of productive activity is the postponement of gratification, then the ethical principle of consumerist life is the illusion of gratification. (Baumann,2016C,p128)

The life of the modern man is a momentary life; it is momentary because it pertains to the consumer-individual who is perpetually racing to satisfy desires and grasp new lived experiences. In this life, the 'new' becomes 'old' in a very short span of time. The reason for this frantic haste is not merely the desire for material possession or accumulating as much as possible, but rather the urge for disposal and replacement to the greatest extent this consumer can manage.

4.2 Social Bonds:

The essence of the change carried out by the modernity project was philosophical, social, and psychological, and Baumann searched for the effect of this change on the individual's emotional, sexual, emotional, and, therefore, social choices. If the modern consumer society generates needs continuously, and transforms everything old into something reprehensible and socially unacceptable that deserves to be abandoned and thrown into the waste of the past, has this effect reached the point of destroying all affectional relationships characterized by permanence, spontaneity, and genuine affection.

Baumann believes that the sociological state that modern societies live in does not require the retention of the concept of relationships, that deep description that reflects complex, deep social choices, and that has a price in a cohesive society. Instead, this sociological state only requires the use of the concept of "Connections and Networking." Because the man of liquid modernity does not really want to pay a



price, nor to invest time or sacrifice in order to obtain the advantages of social communication or sexual contact. Modern man as Baumann puts it, have moved from the "clarity of social relationships" to the "ambiguity of fleeting connections" amid the growing liquidity surrounding them. Consequently, "societies" have transformed into mere "human aggregates. (Baumann, , 2016B,pp15-16)

In the time of modernity, man's desire to control landmarks and achieve his individual self has increased, making the resistance against death one of its most significant fronts. This is manifested in the attempt to treat all signs foretelling its arrival, particularly by erasing the marks of aging. Accordingly, entire industries have been established under the slogan "Fighting the effects of aging and its symptoms" especially those industries related to the cosmetic industry, and the emergence of many medical specialties such as cosmetic medicine and dentistry, sports have also transformed into a massive industry with its mechanical and pharmaceutical products. All these practices have turned into an obsession that denies the human cycle of life and makes it its mission to confront the creep of death by all means, methods, and costs, even if the price, as John Gray puts it, is 'humanity itself.'" (Baumann, 2016B,p19)

Today's man lives an emotional life in which trust and sacrifice have vanished, replaced by a prevailing spirit of adventure. A man who enjoys transient relationships without any price or cost, where the marketing machine takes charge of promising the peak of pleasure, the ultimate ecstasy, and the height of enjoyment. Today's world is a world of fleeting connections, where human relationships can be discarded just as a commodity is discarded after consumption. Bauman likens today's world to the world of spare parts, humans replace one another even before the 'warranty period' of their relationship has expired. The scene has become in need of a radical change to restore that lost humanity "communal humanity", as capitalist modernity has ensured and dedicatedly the production of its

human being that suits it, and the state has ensured through many institutions, educational tools, and cultural apparatuses from the birth of this human being on utilitarianism and narcissistic thinking. Consequently, all structural human bonds and relationships have disintegrated over decades. Therefore, the State's powerful presence cannot be ignored even in the sexual relations of individuals; for it is the State that shaped the contexts leading to those moments, emptying them of their compassionate, cultural, temporal, existential, and even metaphysical meaning. Today, nothing remains but a 'relationship of bodies'—bodies that, in the end, are stricken by boredom or grow weary of another body that has itself been overtaken by exhaustion."(Baumann, 2016B,p16)

As for the relationships between individuals, they have become remarkably fragile, linking network units that are characterized by extraordinary flexibility, because – the network – unlike a group or any other type of macro-social training, is characterized by the fact that the individual participates in it and directs it towards the individual, making this latter the center, the fixed and indelible part. Through networks, “belonging” becomes one of the (soft and changing) sediments of identity, transferring belonging from “pre-identity” to “post-identity,” thus making relationships based on single-factor links that are easily dissolvable, relationships without a specific time frame or conditions, and unburdened by long-term commitments, which is completely at odds with membership or affiliation groups. (Baumann,2016 B,pp165-166)

The real reason for all this is the loss of social security and safety for individuals in their perception of the world around them. Today's world is a collection of products accumulated for immediate consumption, and even individuals within today's consumer societies have become a collection of consumer goods. Therefore, it is always difficult to talk about lasting human connections, because individuals, in order to fulfill their desires, cross all boundaries and do not tolerate



any obstacles that stand in their way. Every human being is willing to abandon others in order to fulfill their needs and desires. For this reason, consumption is always an individual activity by nature, even if it is practiced in the company of others, unlike production, which creates lasting relationships between individuals because it always requires concerted efforts to achieve it. (Baumann, 2016 D, pp234-236)

4.3 Freedom, Individuality, and Democracy:

Modernity and its philosophical and sociological theories have changed the position of humans and ethics within the universal knowledge system. It has removed humans from history and elevated them to a false god outside of it, and it has removed ethics from history, causing it to lose its effectiveness. Modernity has also blocked any real interaction between the active human self and the historical subject. The fulfillment of human needs remained a relative matter subject to each society's perceptions of itself and its natural and human environment. The survival of society became the justification for the use of ethics and the production of values. Bauman emphasized this by supporting Durkheim's proposition on ethics and values in one sentence: Every society has the ethics it needs. (Baumann, 2014, p16).

Therefore, ethics have come to express the needs of every society, and the production of values is linked to that society's need for those values.

4.4 Human rights and individual freedoms:

In the age of liquid modernity, it has become possible to talk about individual and collective rights and freedoms and the civil rights of individuals. If the project of enlightenment is to achieve the autonomy of individuals and self-affirmation, then humanity as a whole must

first free itself from the tyranny it has experienced throughout history. Liberation from physical slavery that prevented humans from doing what they wanted to do, and spiritual slavery that prevented them from being guided by reason in all their ambitions and future. The slogan "liberty, equality, fraternity" was one of the most important slogans raised during the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. It was an accurate expression of a new philosophy of life and new intentions, and the cry of a people who had been oppressed throughout history. (Baumann,2016D,pp6-7)

According to Baumann, the "free individual" is a social creation in all forms and stages of social development from ancient, modern, and contemporary times. Therefore, the circle of freedom may narrow or expand in one type of society compared to another, and it takes different forms and meanings from one era to another. Here we find the point of disagreement between Bauman and the natural rights philosophers (Hugo, Gretius, Samuel Pufendorf, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau), who argue that freedom is a "natural right" that exists and that we must build a society that does not allow it to be violated. For Zygmunt Baumann, however, it is the creation of society and social order. (Baumann, 2016A ,pp6-7)

When discussing human rights, individual freedoms, and freedom of choice in contemporary society, we wonder whether human rights and freedom of choice are truly respected in this society. Do people actually enjoy these rights? If so, what is their source and where do their limits lie?

If individual freedoms are the recognition of the individual as a creative and innovative being, capable of initiative, thought, and freely choosing their lifestyle, and if individual freedoms are the right of the individual to choose their lifestyle, their manner of dress, freedom of creativity, freedom of bodily autonomy, and freedom of belief, which

is the mother of individual freedoms, then that is what allows the individual to choose the religion that he or she deems appropriate and responsive to his or her spiritual and material needs. If, in reality, individuals in contemporary society enjoy all of these individual rights and freedoms, what is the source of these rights in a global society characterized by fluidity at all levels?

Baumann has shown us that the game of human liberation was in fact a game of control. According to him, even if the enlightenment project was a noble dream of spreading freedom, justice, tolerance, peace, and prosperity, in reality and in practice it turned into a tool that reinforced the ambitions of the modern state and the mechanisms of control aimed at domination and discipline. In the end, it became clear that the promised paradise was nothing more than a large, ideal prison permeated by relations of power and domination, an ideal prison established by the modern state through its widespread institutions and ministries everywhere. Bauman summarized freedom in the age of fluidity in a way that carries deep and precise meanings, an image in which form contradicts content, expressing the reality of things rather than their forms and orientations. Where are the existing state institutions that claim to serve individual citizens, yet work against them in a way that is, to say the least, strange? The real goal behind all this is to monitor individuals. Baumann described all state institutions and ministries as working to create ideal prisons. The Ministry of the Interior, which claims to work for mutual support, love, and solidarity, actually works with all its institutions to spy, arrest, forcibly disappear, and torture people. A prison in which the foreign ministry claims to be the guardian of the rights of its citizens abroad, but becomes a tool for humiliating them, breaking their spirits, and falsifying their voices. (Baumann, 2017, pp9-15.)

States have become ideal prisons in which their media institutions claim to serve "the truth." but are in fact institutions of lies, falsification, misinformation, intolerance, and incitement to exclusion and violence. Freedom in a world where regimes spread their own cultural institutions to be an obstacle to culture itself and distort its values. Freedom in a time when institutions of justice are established to defend the weak, yet they are a support for injustice and tyranny. And what freedom is there in a society where economic wealth is poorly distributed among individuals and groups, where economic institutions distribute capitalist gains and direct policies that serve the elites and the ruling and loyal classes? What freedom is there for individuals in the shadow of wars that serve the military machine that manufactures and consumes weapons?

It is true that we have moved from solid modernity to liquid modernity, but at the same time it has become possible to combine the ideal prison with the ideal nightclub, oppression with seduction, pain with pleasure, intimidation with enticement, in a society fraught with danger due to the domination of modern individualism over human beings, Modern society lives in a state of permanent emergency after replacing the groups and entities that used to define the rules of protection and monitor their application with the individual duty of self-interest, self-care, and self-help. (Baumann,p 77)

Baumann believes that modern liberalism, as much as we observe the existence of human rights in their modern sense, has in fact created groups of individuals who live their daily lives with a great deal of emotional and human detachment. Modernity has dismantled society in its organic, solidarity-based sense and made the physical presence the theater of daily life. Therefore, the newly acquired individual freedoms are caused by the collapse and significant dissolution of traditional bonds, leading to a true modeling and organization of human behavior carried out by the state through new means and new

strategies, to delude modern man into believing that he lives in a society and state of rights, freedoms, and citizenship, when in fact it has only replaced that obligation with choice and presented it as freedom of choice.

5. CONCLUSION

From all of the above, it can be seen that, on the one hand, there is boasting about the existence of modern moral values and human rights that express the modernity of society, in which individuals enjoy their individual freedoms and dignity. On the other hand, upon closer examination of reality, we see that the achievements that individuals boast about in contemporary society are merely ideological claims that obscure the reality of the situation, a reality that serves certain classes in society, namely the dominant classes, at the expense of other classes. This contradiction between the moral concepts of ideology and reality, such as the concepts of a full life, an independent life, and personal dignity in public life. These three principles are in fact more different than they are similar, because while the first principle (a full life) leads to the idea of the self, the last (personal dignity in public life) leads to social ethics that constantly conflict with the idea of the self. As for the second (independent life), it leads either to an extreme individualistic life or to a rational idea and necessary control over emotions and instincts. Between these two extremes, humans in contemporary society live in a state of alienation and helplessness, without any real power, as expressed by Hegel. They suffer when they lose control over their reality of products and possessions, which are ultimately used for the benefit of others instead of them controlling this reality and using it for their own benefit. Returning to the true pursuit of the humanities, which seeks the natural and human foundations as well as the logic of social, economic, political, and cultural systems, all of this aims to demonstrate the capability and proper management of human communities without falling into chaos.

This is due to the rapid changes in rules that do not serve the stable structures in society. These sciences aim for dominance and control, but once there is any disruption in these structures, conflict arises and fluidity and flexibility are not accepted. This represents a dialectical struggle between two poles: one seeks permanent control and positioning, while the other advocates for change and modernization. Here, we illustrate the condition of our Arab Muslim nation, which must reclaim its role in this material world. Modernity has encroached upon us on various levels and has infiltrated every aspect of life, and individuals live through this change either willingly or unwillingly. Therefore, the Arab Muslim should strive to understand their role and to build a more cohesive and dignified society.

6. Bibliography List :

1. Baumann,Zygmunt, (2014) Modernity and the Holocaust, Trans. Hajjaj Abu Jabr,1st ed ;Madarat for Research and Publishing, Cairo.
2. Baumann,Zygmunt, (2016)Does Ethics Have a Chance in a World of Consumers? (Ethics in the Age of Liquid Modernity), Trans. Saad Al-Bazei&Bothayna Al-Ibrahim, 1st ed, Abu Dhabi Authority for Tourism and Culture (Kalima, Abu Dhabi.
3. Baumann,Zygmunt,(2016) Freedom, Trans. Ferial Hassan Khalifa, Madbouly Library.
4. Baumann,Zygmunt, (2016) Liquid Love: On the Frailty of Human Bonds, Trans. Hajjaj Abu Jabr, 1st ed,Arab Network for Research and Publishing, Beirut.
5. Baumann,Zygmunt, (2016) Liquid Life, Trans. Hajjaj Abu Jabr, 1st ed,Arab Network for Research and Publishing, Beirut.

6. Baumann,Zygmunt, (2016) Liquid Modernity, Trans. Hajjaj Abu Jabr, 1st ed, Beirut,Arab Network for
7. Baumann,Zygmunt, (2017) Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty, Trans. Hajjaj Abu Jabr, 1st ed, ,Arab Network for Research and Publishing, Beirut.
8. Baumann,Zygmunt, (2017) Liquid Surveillance, Trans. Hajjaj Abu Jabr,1st ed,Arab Network for Research and Publishing, Beirut.
9. El-Messiri,Abdel-Wahab&Triki,Fathi, (2012) Modernity and Postmodernity, 2nd ed, Dar Al-Wa'i for Publishing and Distribution, Algeria.
10. Habermas Jürgen, (2002) Modernity and its Political Discourse, Trans. George Tamer ,Dar Al-Nahar Publishing,Beirut.
11. Imad,Abdel-Ghani, (2006)Sociology of Culture: Concepts and Issues, from Modernity to Globalization, 1st ed, Beirut Center for Arab Unity Studies, Beirut.
12. Inglis,David & Hughson,John, (2013) An Invitation to Social Theory (Introduction to the Sociology of Culture), Trans. L. Mansir, 1st ed, Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies, Beirut.
13. Gurminder,Bhambra, (2016) Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination, Trans. Ibtisam Sayed Allam&Hanan Mohamed Hafez, 1st ed, National Center for Translation,Cairo.
14. Mooney,Annabelle & Evans,Betsy, (2009) Globalization: The Key Concepts, Trans. Asiad Souqi, 1st ed,Arab Network for Research and Publishing, Beirut.