

КРАЈ РАДА ИЛИ НОВО РОПСТВО? END OF WORK OR NEW SLAVERY?



Часлав Ј. Оцић, редовни члан САНУ

Српска академија наука и уметности,
Одељење друштвених наука
Кнеза Михаила 35, 11000 Београд
ocicc@sbb.rs

Časlav J. Očić, full member of SASA

Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts,
Department of Social Sciences
Kneza Mihaila 35, 11000 Beograd
ocicc@sbb.rs

АБСТРАКТ

Key words:

work, globalization,
world economic
crisis, automation,
unemployment,
cyborg, Europe,
the Balkans

Does humanity go towards a society without work? Whether due to robotization, the global economic crisis, and rising unemployment, the work also (as well as history, geography, the state, the nation, family, religion, ideology...) will come to an end? What is the relationship of work and looting? Work and war? How general commercialization and corporatization affect the work? Whether new economic imperialism or new slavery is on the horizon? Neo-feudalism? Neo-mercantilism? What is the future of postmodernist experiment of deconstruction – in the world, in Europe, in the Balkans?

САЖЕТАК

Кључне речи:

рад, глобализација,
светска
економска криза,
аутоматизација,
незапосленост,
киборг, Европа,
Балкан

Иде ли човечанство ка друштву без рада? Да ли ће због роботизације, светске економске кризе и растуће незапослености и раду (као и историји, географији, држави, нацији, породици, вери, идеологији...) доћи крај? Какав је однос рада и пљачке? Рада и рата? Како општа комерцијализација и корпоративизација утичу на рад? Да ли је на помолу нови економски империјализам или ново ропство? Неофеудализам? Неомеркантилизам? Каква је будућност постмодернистичког експеримента де-конструкције – у свету, у Европи, на Балкану?

Раг примљен:
20.5.2016.

Paper received:
5/20/2106

Раг прихваћен:
12.7.2016.

Paper accepted:
7/12/2016

ENDISM

Is humanity heading towards a society without work? During last decades of the 20th century, the global ideosphere was dominated by endist constructs such as “end of ideology”, “end of history”, “end of geography”.

- *End of ideology* should have marked downward impact of classes on politics, where left and right accept the *class peace* of the welfare state.
- *The end of history* has come, because, as Fukuyama says, what at the end of the second millennium appears as a form of social organization and system solution in the developed western countries, represents the last step in the previous thousands of years old eunomic quest of man, searching for prosperity: the *system of liberal democracy*, it is argued, is the best possible and there will be no search for a new one nor aspiration for change. Paradoxically: history thrown out the window, has come back in a big way – even condenses, which makes it epochal; some concerned thinkers – whom their opponents accuse of moral panic – anxiously perceive that epoch as pre-apocalyptic.
- *The end of geography* was announced by McLuhan: the electronic media have made of the Earth a “global village”. Various technological determinists have developed an idea and transferred it to other systems of information – when at the same moment all the “global” citizens would be able to get any information, it means that the physical distances no longer exist, i.e. that *space* is abolished as, allegedly, “the end of history” abolishes *time*.

ERA OF GLOBAL CIVILIZATION: VICTORY VS. THE TRUTH

At the end of the last century most western, and intellectuals in the transition countries believed (or it seemed to them) that the time of universalization was coming, instead of *Huntington's clash of civilizations*, that the *era of global civilization* was coming. It was a time when the global potentates intensified their work on a kind of historical engineering: unconditional command of the new *RS* (Rules

of Service), which guarantees the survival and expansion of the global civilization, is in the sign of Capital and it reads as follows: authentic politics and culture should not stand in the way of economic expansion of transnational capitalism. And at the cost of self-destruction of this civilization, which seems immanent therein, since the absolute, global turbo-capitalist civilization is fighting against everything that is basically a *singular*, authentic: against the nation and the nation-state, against the law, against science, against education, against the family, against religion, against tradition in general, and even against work. In simple words, against a quality, and for quantity! Against values and for a utility; against creativity and for imitation and simulation; for uniformity and against diversity; for drab existence and boredom of mediocrity; maximizing the quantity and speed...

Actually: “Victory and business are its only imperatives. The slightest affection, feeling, law, legislation, love, emotion, religion – all of which can endanger the full freedom [of choice, added Č. O.] is a concession to competition, a stumbling block and a sign of defeat. Everything is allowed, but only after ensuring economic victory, only after predominance [of capital, added Č. O.] becomes certain,” wrote in the novel *Gomorra*, several years ago, the Italian writer Saviano.

A century earlier, in an interview conducted for the *Chicago Tribune* in 1916, industrialist Henry Ford said: “History is more or less bunk. It's a tradition. We don't want tradition. We want to live in the present and the only history that is worth a tinker's dam is the history we make today”. Therefore, *We* make history, *We* are the gods of the earth, demiurges, and masters of the world!

Who are *We*? I mentioned *modernist* Ford. Here's another radical, subversive, response:

*With disdain I will throw my gauntlet
Full in the face of the world,
And see the collapse of this pigmy giant
Whose fall will not stifle my ardor.
Then will I wonder godlike and victorious
Through the ruins of the world.*

*And, giving my words an active force,
I will feel equal to the Creator.*

Who is the author of this poem? Karl Marx! Tracing Marx, postmodernists go a step further, and without looking back at the lessons of the past, they guide us towards the future: Honor the Past – Imagine the Future! Political leaders acclaimed, economic experts, instant-reformers, seconded. In doing so, we are required not only to imagine the future but also to anticipate it and to fight for it (usually in various colored revolutions).

WORK: POWER AND MEANING

Let us return to our main character, the hero of post-heroic era – Henry Ford. A hundred years ago, he said that workers should be replaced by robots because they “in any case have no union with which we must negotiate”. Thus, the *central economic issue* is nevertheless the *question of power and interests*. From it are derived questions of technical progress, efficiency, and cost-effectiveness.

Whether *automation*, global economic *crisis*, and rising *unemployment* indicate a *society without work*, that is, *the end of work*? Are *cyborgs* new *slaves* (which will be governed by some contemporary Henry Ford or mega-bankers) or are they new *masters*, and even perhaps – as neo-Marxist Antonio Negri believes (it seems to me: naively) – subjects of the new (communist) revolution, instead of a vanished industrial working class?

Kant argued, more than two centuries ago, that man is the only creature with the existential need to work; it is not the need for work *per se* but rather the *need for meaning*.

TRANSNATIONAL LIBERALISM AND GEO-ECONOMICS

“The history of mankind, understood as the history of the states, is a contest between two and only two principles. The man has two and only two ways to provide for himself the necessary goods: the economic way of providing goods is work, and a political way is a robbery.

Economic way means peace, freedom, fraternal community, camaraderie, humanity. *Political* way means war, lack of freedom, egoistic society, domination, barbarism.” Thus, more than eight decades ago, the German sociologist Oppenheimer *a priori* antagonized political and economic domains at the expense of the first, and in favor of the second.

Make trade, not war! – That message to outgoing feudal absolutist monarchies was sent by market capitalism on arrival. Nowadays, in contrast to that (seemingly) peaceful transitional slogan, the opinion about the economy as the basic sphere of conflict of interest at the global level prevails. Opinions differ according to whether as primary actors of confrontation are perceived the *companies* or the *states*, or the nations. *Transnational liberals* and *geo-economists* lead heated discussions about that, giving a new framework for two centuries old controversy about the role of economic and non-economic factors (primarily, the states) in the economic development of individual countries.

Proponents of geo-economics claim that after the cold war, the main battle is economic; it is waged between the different types of national capitalism. Competitiveness is the key because globalization is a *zero-sum game*. Not companies, but cities, nations, states, blocks mutually compete. The growing interdependence of world economic processes is not denied; But, *We* need to respond to globalization by being *stronger* relative to our competitors. Here you can see also the new role of the state: instead of the *welfare state*, it becomes the *competition state*, which should give a major contribution to our *victory*; American geo-economist Edward Luttwak wrote in 1993 a book entitled: *The Endangered American Dream: How to Stop the United States from Becoming a Third World Country and How to Win the Geo-Economic Struggle for Industrial Supremacy*.

Critics reproach geo-economists that they fall into the trap of territorial, assuming that the economies can be defined – mathematically speaking – in discrete territorial terms. Reich believes that the idea of competitiveness is

used to reduce the tax and for the suppression of workers' interests. Chomsky also believes that geo-economics is an ideology that serves the interests of the wealthy to push workers to work harder for less reward. Krugman argues that it is incorrect that the leading nations of the world, in some significant degree, economically compete with each other. Companies, not nations compete in a global economy. Geo-economics serve national rather than transnational business interests and leads to protectionism.

The proponents of transnational liberalism are the coalitions of elites in liberal states, international institutions, and transnational corporations. For them, free trade and open markets are the key to economic success and prosperity. According to them: globalization is positive for all: it is the *non-zero sum game* in which everybody wins. State interference in the economy is bad: protectionism has disastrous consequences. The role of the state is to create the best business climate for corporations. The world consists of states that are "friendly" or "hostile" to the market (measured by indices of freedom by Freedom House). The danger are not other states but protectionists; enemies in other countries are in fact enemies of the market – thus, neoliberals (ideologically) intone their arguments.

WORK AND WAR

Even Carl Schmitt argued that the *war* was a way out of the crisis: a way out from a small crisis is small, and from a great crisis – a great war! (Some historians and economists believe that the world came out of the Great Depression in the 1930s only and finally with the Second World War). Creating crisis hotspots and launching of wars without winners (no win war) and by proxy (war by proxies) after the Korean War in the mid last century (the first such war) has become a matter of routine for powerful. And it seems it has become a necessity, because the structure of production and consumption, for example, in the US, has changed drastically in favor of the military-industrial complex, so that any dynamization of

economic activity, or more exactly a way out of the crisis, means growth of production of tools, weapons, and ammunition. A demand can be increased only if you move into a new war. There are also the biggest profits that are quickly realized. Therefore, investment in the war in economies with such a structure is the most profitable investment. How does this affect the labor market? In addition to increased demand for tools, weapons and ammunition, there is a growing demand for mercenaries (janissaries), prostitutes and (voluntary and involuntary) donors of human organs. And given the fact that for a long time we have been living in a post-heroic age, it is considered "normal", and whoever in the domain of those "new" services succeeds, he is the hero of the new reality (example: Bernard Kouchner).

The terms used in today's economic debates are substantially defined by the semantic heritage from previous debates. Thereby, the influence of other so-called exact sciences is visible in economic terminology: first of all of physics (equilibrium, oscillations...), then biology (roundabout or circulation, growth, development, seed capital), medicine (shock therapy) and more of military science (economic sanctions, economic security, economic warfare, hybrid war, cost-benefit analysis of strategic migrations as a weapon of war, strategic management...). The militarization of the economics (the science of the economy) is undoubtedly the result of the militarization of the economy. Many criticize the use of military terms in the economic sphere; they consider that militarization as an expression of neo-mercantilism and economic nationalism; according to them, it inevitably leads to conflicts.

For real and "surreal" (speculative) economy (based on military and political power, and not on economic efficiency) permanently upset the equilibrium (primarily of capital and labor) necessary for a sustainable economic (and overall) development. Whether the point of singularity has been crossed there? If so, then here, in terms of the future of humanity, no science can help; not even the Institute for New Economic Theory (INET) for the establishment of which the well-known magnate

Soros provided four billion (of course, not his!) dollars. The previous economic science, said Soros, was unable to solve the problem of unemployment; that issue will be resolved by new economic theorists from INET's! The outcome of the collision of *knowledge* and *power*, economics and politics, is known from experience. An example of the choice between *growth* and *power* illustrates the paradox of economic reforms under socialism – from the Soviet NEP to the Serbian Dragoslav Avramović. It turned out that the *reform* can not be understood only as an *economic* process (even less as only *monetary*, on what was once essentially reduced Avramović's Program I) which aims to increase the growth rate of economic aggregates – it is also a *social* process in which the *interests* of heterogeneous social groups clash (which was immediately evident as soon as the Program II raised the question of the state and ownership or changes in the constellation of power). The outcome of that conflict is known. Notwithstanding the ingenuity of Avramović's idea and success in the first phase of its implementation, poor grandfather Abraham (*deda Avram*) was declared the "enemy" and thus gave an original contribution to the typology of enmity.

According to the Baudrillard's *genealogy of enmities* (in slightly modified Byung-Chul Han's interpretation) enemy in the first stage appears as a *wolf*. He is an external enemy who attacks and from whom people defend themselves by making fortifications and building walls. In the next stage, the enemy takes the form of a *rat* who conducts operations in the underground; the fight against it is kept with hygienic means. After the next stage of a *bug*, the enemy takes the viral form: "The fourth stage are the *viruses* [...] against the virus it can be more difficult to defend, as they are at the heart of the system". The virus is a "phantom enemy that spreads over the entire planet, penetrates everywhere [...] and enters all the cracks of power". (According to Baudrillard, *terrorism* is a major figure of the viral force.) Even in the viral form, enmity follows the immune scheme. But the genealogy of enmity does not match the genealogy of (hard) power. The force of

positivity does not assume any enmity (except auto-chauvinism). Therefore, the *neural force* is less visible than viral force, because it inhabits the *space of equal* (devoid of negativity) in which there is no polarization of friends and enemies, internal or external, or of their own and other people's. Baudrillard and Byung-Chul Han believe that new forms of power are immanent to the system; precisely because of that they do not stimulate the immune defense. They may be right when it comes to the developed, mature, oversaturated and overworked Western societies. It seems to us that this might not be valid for Balkan Barbaro-geniuses who are being brainwashed with media carpet bombs by spin doctors and other muddlers and political wheeler-dealers 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks per year. It is rather an attempt to manipulate the consciousness by imposing self-hatred and/or depression, which in any case should result in the absence of the will to live. So that a disturbing factor puts-an-end-to-himself. Endism at work...

ENDISM AND TRENDISM

The complex and contradictory reality (and counterproductivity of propaganda), however, have called and constantly call into question the reductionist character of endist intellectual creations. Those theories have not originated only as a result of serious aspirations for explanation and understanding of the phenomena and processes, they implicitly both justify and direct (which is the role of *ideology*, so there is no question of some kind of their end, because there is no end to interests: they even universalize), therefore, those theories, in addition to analytical and explanatory, they play (more precisely: they have primarily) *legitimizing* role.

Modern Rationalism (as opposed to the passions and heroism of Romanticism) has brought the universalization of interests and their legitimization. And not only as the legitimacy of the interest of survival and development, i.e. improving the lives of individuals and communities, but also with regard to the real constellation of power, as the legitimacy of the interests of subjugation, exploitation and

destruction of others (weaker): “If we see that Germany is winning we ought to help Russia, and if we see Russia is winning, we ought to help Germany, and that way let them kill as many as possible”, Harry Truman said in 1941 in the US Senate, giving a paradigmatic example of understanding the interests of great powers (Harry S. Truman, Senate Speech, *US Week*, July 5, 1941).

Such understanding of “bare” interests devoid of feelings and of principles, on the verge of cynicism, has obviously become dear to the heart of the local lords who apply it to their own subjects.

COMMERCIALIZATION AND CORPORATIZATION

At the same time, the tendencies of *commercialization* and *corporatization* are growing stronger. Everything is a subject of buying and selling, including humans, their bodies, and even souls. Local and regional markets joint in a global flea market of sold souls. The *mainstream* neo-liberal doctrine legitimizes it by the freedom of choice in the world’s – the only real – (labor) market: therefore (“fair”, without a guilty conscience) I work for whoever pays me more. It has become more and more crowded in this market in recent years: the supply is growing at an exponential trend, because increasing supply follows the general trend of mass impoverishment (most of the second-world countries have been turned, by transitional robbery, into the third-world countries, and there is a growing gap between the traditionally developed and undeveloped) and therefore, the prices for treason, in accordance with the theory, are rapidly falling.

What was once commonly thought about it? “A nation can survive its fools, and even the ambitious. But it cannot survive treason from within. An enemy at the gates is less formidable, for he is known and carries his banner openly. But the traitor moves amongst those within the gate freely, his sly whispers rustling through all the alleys, heard in the very halls of government itself. For the traitor appears not a traitor; he speaks in accents familiar to his

victims, and he wears their face and their arguments, he appeals to the baseness that lies deep in the hearts of all men. He rots the soul of a nation, he works secretly and unknown in the night to undermine the pillars of the city, he infects the body politic so that it can no longer resist. A murderer is less to be feared. The traitor is the carrier of the plague.” – Cicero wrote two thousand years ago. What has changed since then? Much of it, especially since the end of World War II; which, in the case of England, can be seen in the book *The Meaning of Treason* by unrivaled Rebecca West.

Maximum amount and maximum speed are superior and (only) values; they replace each skill – and, of course, a virtue. Die Schnellen fressen die Langsamern (fast devour the slow) wrote Heike Leitschuh-Fecht, in 1997, in an article called: *We will all be the First one day*, thus defining the essence of the (turbo) capitalist ideology.

Therefore: *as much as possible and as quickly as possible!* This is the only measure of success. And in order to be successful we must *incorporate*: the government has become a corporation, the party has become a corporation, and the hospital is a corporation, it is both the school and research institute, even the church, the army is professional, mercenary (*soldiers* kill for *soldi*)... Goal function of the corporation is the maximum profit. So, the school no longer educates and brings up, scientists do not seek the truth, soldiers do not defend the country, politicians do not care about the common good (statesmanlike behavior is considered to be a throwback to the past), priests do not care about the souls of believers, economics has become the new religion, they are all in the business sector in the race for maximum profit. Tendencies to replace culture by entertainment (i.e. oblivion; these words – *zabava*, *zaborav* – have the same root in Serbian and other Slavic languages: *zabit*’ = to forget) dominate in the world, training replaces education, techniques of persuasion (by *brainwashing*) suppress, even abolish the science, and the political scene takes on more characteristics of the circus and of the livestock market.

By discrediting them, the autonomy of some social spheres (politics, science, health, education, sports, media...) is lost, their quality is degraded, and their authenticity and reason for existence are lost. *Personalities* are becoming *individuals* (reduced to the function of the *taxpayers and consumers*); however, there are fewer and fewer producers that could be taxed, and who would emerge with their earnings in the market of consumer goods as effective *demanders*. Budget revenues are falling; demand is falling; so crises arise.

The *meaning of existence* is lost, people become redundant: it is considered that in the developed Western countries more than half of those who now enter the working age span will never get a job.

The ideology of modernism has killed God, the ideology of postmodernism kills the man. His successor, “post-human” or “superhuman”, according to the understanding of “transhumanists”, will be asexual *cyborg* filled with implants (the law on the *third* gender has already been passed in Germany), which will be propagated by means of artificial insemination, while having the ability to exist in a variety of “bodies”. The main tendency is – the achievement of (biological and “digital”) immortality and the creation of a “super-intellect”, according to which man would be a creature of a lower order.

Fukuyama warned, even a decade and a half ago, at a potential threat to liberal democracy posed by the use of new biotechnologies for transhumanist purposes. He sketches a brief history of changes in the human understanding of nature: from Plato’s and Aristotle’s belief that human beings have a “natural end” to Utopian ideals and dictators of modern times who want to transform society for ideological purposes. Manipulating DNA of descendants of one person, however, will have profound and potentially terrible consequences for the political system, even though it may be done with the best intentions.

The *meaning of development* is lost by that. Prospects to see an end to the global economic crisis in our lifetime remain weak. The *crisis* has, in fact, become a *permanent condition* that

needs getting used to. Various reality shows serve that goal. The ideology of postmodernism relativizes all that, levels all values, and by deconstructing the past and the present, prepares us for the posthuman (or: a posthumous) future.

PEACE AND STABILITY

In the meantime, we are constantly being advised that we should live in peace and stability. “Stability” here stands as a euphemism for “control”. In the new speech, therefore, “stability” might mean (and usually does): everything is under control! More precisely: under *our* control. This is the essence of the old and the new imperialism. In the old imperialism, control is done directly (by using hard force, land invasion, for example) and in the case of the new, so-called economic imperialism control is done with subtlety: by using soft and smart power as defined by Joseph Nye. Economic imperialism occurs when one country controls the other and uses the resources needed for that control. The ideological *justification* of the controller is: it is cheaper for the country-victim; therefore, it “allows” to be controlled. A critical *contestation* of the controlled: country-victim always has the possibility to say “no”, there is no long-term solution, i.e. sustainability of economic imperialism, because dominance lasts as long as the resources last that are used for control. From the standpoint of the interests of imperial power, the solution is: make the country-victim dependent on the “controller’s” resources, for example, by *borrowing*. (Classic occupation is much riskier and more expensive.)

It is relevant (and paradigmatic) the case of the Greek debt bondage. Yanis Varoufakis, a former Greek finance minister, on the 6th of February, in 2015, summed up the problem in one sentence: “A clueless political personnel, in denial of the systemic nature of the crisis, is pursuing policies akin to carpet-bombing the economy of proud European nations in order to save them”.

Before our very eyes, “the old order” is crumbling (or is already in ruins) before the forces of arrogance (*We* make history!) and

cynicism (deconstruction experiment). In the growing process of sovereignty decline, i.e. historical de-subjectivization, numerically small and economically deprived nations become an object (“guinea pigs”) of a “new” order: “The current policy of Europe leads to its dismemberment. The worst case scenario of the crisis is Kosovization of Greece, Spain, Ireland, Portugal, Italy and so on, in protectorates that use the euro, under the regency of the European Commissioner and local kleptocrats, with young people as the only important export item”. With these words, Varoufakis predicted, at the end of 2014, the post-crisis development of Europe and Greece in the absence of a radical step forward from the worst financial and economic crisis since World War II.

Is there, in this bleak global landscape, any chance for differences and diversity, for universal principles and rules, for common values, for the small, the weak and the poor, “talented but not lucky”? The *pessimists* do not see them (because, as Oscar Wilde’s weaver interprets the common fate: “In war, the strong make slaves of the weak, and in the peace the rich make slaves of the poor”), *optimistically* radiant faces of scientists and techno-bureaucrats profess unreserved belief in the imminent bright future. And the *realists*? They – roll up their sleeves!¹

THE EUROPEAN UNION OR THE EUROPEAN UNIONS?

The last decade in Europe was marked by stronger (simultaneous) integration and disintegration processes. The forces of convergence and divergence have been intensified. The global economic crisis, the crisis of the eu-rozone, threatening with “Exits” (first Grexit,

1 With the motto “When the devil knocks at your door – you should work!” sixty eminent *real-optimists* gathered recently under the auspices of SASA and compiled a voluminous book *Possible Development Strategies of Serbia*. The result of their strategic thinking and acting is the (new) Institute for Strategic Techno-Economic Reflection (ISTER), which should respond to the challenges of survival and development that lie ahead.

It is encouraging the initiative of the Department of Social Sciences of SASA to start all-departmental, therefore, a multi-disciplinary project under the working title “The future of Serbia”, which should answer the question: where does Serbia go (or should go)? So: the work never ends. Work – in freedom.

now Brexit...), enlargement fatigue, a growing democratic deficit in decision-making, migrant crisis, terrorism on the territory of Europe (Paris, Brussels), antagonism with Russia (Ukrainian crisis), the war in Syria, influence the emergence of new (strategic) economic, political and security ideas that will undoubtedly affect future geoeconomic and geopolitical architecture of Europe. Thus, they also speak about “the European Unions” (Nordic, Germanic, Mediterranean or Latin, restored EFTA) as an interim (or transitional) phase of deeper and long-term European integration.

How will the Danube strategy and the New Silk Road strategy in Europe affect the future (re)design of the continent? Whether these two strategic (European and global) projects are competitive, or whether it is possible to harmonize their implementation?

One of the dominant characteristics of the modern development of Europe, primarily of Western Europe, is a process of close political and economic *cooperation*, and finally of *integration* that combines a number of very important European countries. The main content of that process is expressed in the view that the frameworks of nation states are insufficient for ensuring the smooth economic development of European countries and that in the interest of further and faster development it is necessary to create a wider economic space that would (on the principle of *economies of scale*²) enable a more rational division of work, i.e. a more dynamic scientific, technological and economic development.

But those demands were in practice (since the end of WWII until today) subordinated to (geo)political motives³: until 1989, i.e. to the

2 On that (economy of scale) principle is based the famous Cecchini report *The Costs of Non-Europe*. That study was done in 1988 at the request of the European Commission for the plan to establish a single market by 1992 (Treaty of Maastricht). The report analyzes the economic consequences of the single market with the prediction of long-term economic growth and improved competitiveness of the European Community. It was calculated in the report that with the removal of existing barriers (border control, technical and tax barriers, etc.) the savings of 200 billion ECU could be realized, which would lead to a reduction in consumer prices, faster economic growth and to the creation of at least 1.8 million jobs annually.

3 So that later they would give way to the geo-economic motives.

fall of the Berlin Wall, integration in Europe took place with the active support of one of the two great powers: the United States had political influence on the Western European cooperation and integration, and the Soviet Union was in charge of the Eastern European integration. But while the basics of the *east European* cooperation and integration were exclusively *political* in nature and therefore were not able to expand on the broad European regional plan, carried out on the basis of Stalin's conception of the existence of two parallel world markets, socialist and capitalist, the *western European* concepts – in whose emerging the political aspects played a significant role, i.e. the existing division of the world, especially of Europe, and the desire of Western European governments to promote new European policy at the international level – aspired more for *economic* solution, and thereby to the creation of such instruments of international economic cooperation, whose partial realization led to very significant changes in the physiognomy of contemporary Western Europe.

With the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the situation has radically changed. Only western European macro-regional integration⁴ has remained on the scene. Continuing previous trends, it has led to a more or less coherent *economic-political-security* concepts of integration (*the three pillars*) whose (onerous) implementation has nowadays a significant impact on international relations⁵.

From the very beginning, two approaches to European integration are at work. *One*: Union = Unity. *Other*: Union – yes, Unity – no! Over time, the second dilemma is gaining in importance: deepening – expansion. Then within the enlarged EU: conflict of interest of old and new member states objectively caused by differences in the development level and the

sectoral structure of their economies. Then: enlargement fatigue. And then: the global economic crisis and the eurozone crisis. The clash of civilizations (cultures, mentalities) between the North–South of Europe. The relationship between the EU and the United States (or transnational power centers). The attitude of the EU (especially Germany – Nord Stream) towards Russia. The relationship between NATO and Russia. The growth of regionalists (secessionists) demands within the EU member states. The requirements for defining the procedures of the disintegration of the EU. The relationship of “converging” countries (those who live in hope that one day will become full members) towards the EU... There are numerous problems that characterize the process of European integration at the beginning of the 21st century. Whether and how those problems will be overcome?

DEFINING EUROPE

Compared to the US and Japan, China, Russia... Europe (more precisely the EU), in the geo-economic vista, suffers from a weakness; namely, unlike other national capitalism, it has no state. Therefore, almost continuously, there are debates about its definition, i.e. on the relationship between economic and political integration processes⁶: whether Europe is the “Europe of citizens”, the “Europe of nation-states” or “Europe of regions”. Whether stronger affirmation of a Europe of the regions should relativize the importance of European nation-states and increase the *cohesion* of the European Union⁷, while simultaneously strengthening European transnational structures which should possibly play the role of the (competition) state in relation to other “national capitalism”.

What is the most appropriate response to the crisis of European integration? How to economically revitalize the EU? – wonders Maurice Allais convinced European⁸. Allais was

4 Even an *experiment* of the *Eurasian integration* has emerged in recent times.

5 Although it is about the realization of an idea that has sprung up on the basis of very specific factors related to the situation that was created after the Second World War, it should be kept in mind – assessing its conceptual impact and its attractive power – that it is not new in history. Neither idea is new, nor practice: the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, Napoleon, Pan-Europe, Hitler... See [Xoф6aйep 2012].

6 See [Fuše 2000], [Šidanski 2002].

7 Regional policy in the EU is called *cohesion* policy. See [Ederven, Gorter, de Moji and Nahuis 2002].

8 Because, according to Allais, “unity gives strength”.

a proponent of a confederation of sovereign states of Europe. According to him, the confederal formula is the only realistic way of creating a united Europe because only this form of political community would be accepted by all the European nations⁹. Historical experience tells us that the union of more nations and more states can be permanent and stable only if two conditions are met: *first*, not to be too large, and, *secondly*, to bring together countries or peoples who share a common history, culture, similar political tradition. In too heterogeneous communities inevitably occur centrifugal forces so that they usually are doomed.

The political integration of Europe should have preceded economic, and the fact that the order was reversed, i.e., that they accessed to economic integration which was not followed by political was, thought Allais, a big and hard to repair mistake. A direct consequence of that is a technocratic deformation of the European institutions.

At the helm of the EU is a technocratic structure that gives the illusion of democracy. It was constituted on the model of corporate governance, consisting of a set of institutional rules that allow control of company managers in order to take decisions in the interests of shareholders. Transposed to the political institutions, the governance aims to direct the decisions of politicians towards the realization of the interests of *multinationals*.

On the economic front, the goal of European integration was to enable maximum operation of comparative advantages. A prerequisite for this is a huge market, i.e. the abolition of all restrictions on the movement of goods, people, and capital. The liberalization of trade is desirable, but only within the regional organizations that bring together the countries which are approximately at the same level of economic and social development. Each of those regional systems should establish an appropriate institutional framework that would ensure its *reasonable protection*. Respect for

this principle is an essential condition for the development of each country, and vice versa – if this principle is not respected, violent and anarchic globalization becomes an instrument of destruction.

The constitution of such regional entities within the EU would not in any way mean their mutual opposition nor endangering of the third countries.

In this regard, expansion of Europe in April 2003, according to Allais, represents “an incredible stupidity and unacceptable mistake”. GDP per capita, at the time of acceptance, was in Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia from 40% to 60% lower than for example in France and the differences in the level of wages were even higher. However, the agreement of Nice did not envisage a transitional period for those countries joining the EU, which partly explains the problems that those countries and the Union are going through nowadays...

Allais points out that it would be overly simplistic to interpret the political, economic, social crisis through which the European Union is going only with the neo-liberal politics of Brussels. *The crisis* that affects Europe and the whole world is *anthropological* and its causes are complex and numerous. Therefore, the solutions have to be complex and not just economic in nature.

SOLVE ET COAGULA!

However, the political union advocated by Allais, in fact, would mean the disintegration of the current EU and its transformation into a firmer associated confederal union of a small number of countries with about the same level of development. That would concretely mean the formation of a small group of countries from the founding states (or the states of the euro zone). Other members would be in different relations of partnership with that group of countries. [Бујишић 2011: 44].

As for the countries of Eastern Europe (*Intermarium I!*), Allais considered that they previously should be integrated into an economic

⁹ This is the attitude of Václav Klaus [2010] who in this matter stands in contrast to European federalists, for example, Dušan Šidanski [2002].

union similar to the EEC which would speed up their development and contribute to the rise in living standards. After that, the integration of “two Europes” would be possible, but such a development would, in his opinion, “require many years” [Бујишић 2010: 45]. (Liebig’s barrel!). East European part of the New Silk Road might shorten that process.

Over and over: *One Europe, two or more Europe?* Nordic EU? Central European (German) EU? (European Germany or German Europe?), Latin or Mediterranean EU? Balkan EU?

THE BALKANS: PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT?

Peace is the prerequisite and the result of the development process. This is also true for the Balkans (*Intermarium 2!*), which is known as conflicted, unstable and relatively technologically and economically backward – and above all – as the region burdened by stereotypes. How could nowadays be defined the economic, or more exactly general developmental basis of long-term peace and stability in the Balkans? Are they included in the phrase ‘de-Balkanization of the Balkans’ in terms of Europeanisation (or re-Europeanization if the Balkans were ‘the first Europe’)?

Since the beginning of the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire, the Balkan nations have been oriented to European (more precisely: Western) civilization based on scientific and technical progress. The legacy of that empire is: a semi-closed command economy, dominated by redistribution, non-generative cities (consumer-oriented urban enclaves, i.e., the economic dualism) remained – in more or less modified form – an important feature of the Balkan economies; their development may be defined as asymmetrical in relation to the rest of Europe.

The asymmetrical development manifested itself, during the Ottoman rule, in the consumption dependence, and then in various attempts at industrialization as a technological, import, or total development dependence. That dependence (among other factors) has resulted in a constant relative economic backwardness of the Balkan countries: they lagged behind even when they recorded progress. Even the high growth rates of the Balkan economies could not compensate for that lagging, that is, they were not sufficient to enable the achievement of the developed countries. The Balkans was not able to compensate for it under the aegis of capitalism or even under various forms of Balkan communism. Will the Balkans be able to do so in the 21st century, using the comparative advantages of the new model of capitalism based on the information? Will the peoples of the Balkans, in the future, have access to all information that will be produced and used by highly developed countries and whether the inventiveness will come to the fore and in general, the creativity of *homo Balkanicus*?

Probably it will, if – in the developed world and in the Balkans – the development of culture, economy and society are to be based on sound ecological and anthropological principles – these are in essence the principles of conservation and expansion of the imagination, rather than of self-destructive quantitatively dimensioned growth. Otherwise, the Balkans are likely to (become) remain periphery (or at best – dependent semi-periphery), the semi-isolated and marginalized. Hence, the question of the successful economic development of the Balkans is actualized (and) as a matter of integration: integration of related and/or complementary countries in the Balkan region, as well as the integration of the Balkans into Europe and the world.

REFERENCES

1. Бујишић, Б. (2011). Морис Але: Против неприкосновених истина. *ЗМСДН*, 62(134).
2. Вест, Р. (2013). *Значење издаје*. Београд: Алгоритам.
3. Оцић, Ч. (ур.) (2014). *Могуће ствари: историје развоја Србије*. Београд: САНУ.
4. Хофбауер, Х. (2012). *Наручена истина – кувљена правда: Колонијализам Европске Уније*. Београд: Јасен.
5. Vodrijar, Ž. (2007). *Duh terorizma*. Београд: Arhipelag.
6. Ederven, S., Gorter, J., de Moji, R., Nahuis, R. (2002). *Funds and Games: The Economics of European Cohesion Policy*. The Hague: CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy.
7. Fukuyama, F. (2002). *Our Post-Human Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution*. New York: Picador.
8. Fuše, M. (2000). *Evropska republika: Između istorije i geografije*. Београд: Stubovi kulture.
9. Han, B. Č. (2015). *Premoreno društvo*. Novi Sad: Adresa.
10. Kant, I. (1902). *Pädagogik* (1803). In: *Kant's Gesammelte Schriften* (Vol. VII). Berlin: de Gruyter.
11. Klaus, V. (2010). *Evropa i EU: pogled političara i pogled ekonomista*. Београд: Službeni glasnik.
12. Leitschuh-Fecht, H. (1997). Jeder will der erste sein. *Die Zeit*, 39.
13. Naj, Dž. S. (2012). *Budućnost moći*. Београд: Arhipelag.
14. Negri, A. (1991). *Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse*. New York: Autonomedia.
15. Negri, A. (1989). *The Politics of Subversion*. London: Polity Press.
16. Oppenheimer, F. (1935). *System der Soziologie*. Jena: t. 4.
17. Rifkin, J. (1995). *The End of Work: The Decline of the Global Labor Force and the Dawn of the Post-Market Era*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
18. Savijano, R. (2010). *Gomora*. Београд: Geopoetika.
19. Šiđanski, D. (2002). *U traganju za novim evropskim federalizmom*. Београд: Gutenbergova galaksija.
20. Truman, H. S. (July 5, 1941). Senate Speech. *US Week*.