

Some Remarks on the Theory and Practice in Human Security Studies

Ivica Lj. Đorđević¹, Rastko Močnik²

9 | Page

This article is based upon a presentation delivered at the 4th International Academic Conference on Human Security, Belgrade, organized by the Human Security Research Center (Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade), 2-3 November 2018.

Abstract

The goal of the human security studies is “to turn theoretical insights into practical recommendations for policy-making”, i.e. to articulate theoretical considerations with practical policies. In our contribution, we will examine the relation between theoretical backgrounds and their practical consequences. Immanuel Wallerstein’s concept of ‘time-space’ realities (a further elaboration of Braudel’s concept of a hierarchy of historical times) tells us that the longer time-periods a theory takes into consideration, the larger its spatial reach, and the deeper its analytical grasp. In the case of the present ‘migration crisis’, we will argue that, thinking on the level of Braudel’s ‘*temps court*’, i.e. within the co-ordinates of Wallerstein’s ‘episodic geopolitical TimeSpace’, one adopts the point of view of the nation-state and, e.g. installs barbed wire fence on national borders. Reflecting on the level of Braudel’s ‘*histoire conjoncturelle*’, i.e. Wallerstein’s ‘cyclo-ideological TimeSpace’, one analyses the ‘migration crisis’ in terms of the conflict ‘the West vs. militant

1 Associate Professor, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Security Studies, djivica@gmail.com

2 Visiting Professor, Faculty of Media and Communications, Singidunum University, Belgrade, josip.mocnik@guest.arnes.si



Islam', or of the confrontation between 'the West' and the Russian Federation over the Near East, and starts peace talks to end the war in Syria. Taking the view of Braudel's '*longue durée*', i.e. Wallerstein's structural TimeSpace, one realises that the present crisis is an episode in the dynamics of the contemporary world-system. The structural perspective shows that defence of national borders will not solve the problem, nor will the negotiation with the local ruling 'elites' and between the super-powers establish an adequate platform to approach the deepening misery and exploitation of the larger part of the world's population. The former two approaches appear as pertaining to the present world-system structure, and participate in its inherent dynamics: although potentially leading to new re-articulations, they reproduce the system and eventually deepen its contradictions. However, the structural-systemic perspective does not lead towards a univocal analysis, and even less translates into a unique political strategy

Keywords: human security, concept of 'time-space' realities, contemporary world-system.

Introduction

We will examine the relations between theory and practice from the point of view of technological innovation, from the perspective of the critical joint where scientific theories, intervening into production practices and other social processes, transform them and eventually open new epochs in the history of societies.

Theoretical conceptualisation of the socio-historical impact of new technologies seems to vacillate between social determinism and technological determinism. In structuralist Marxism, the existing social relations are presumed decisively to filtrate scientific discoveries that are to yield technical innovations.³ Against the structur-

³ Balibar in *Reading Capital* – Merton's study of scientific discoveries that were ignored as long as the conditions for their



alist view, but equally within Marxist horizon, Italian *operaismo*⁴ claims that technical innovations form an essential part of the periodical transformation of the labour process, by which the capital reacts against workers' resistance. New technical composition of labour power (the imprint of new technology upon the labour and, by the same token, the new mechanism of both class domination and extraction of surplus value) destroys the former political composition of the working class, while the workers' efforts towards a new class-composition then open a new cycle of class struggle. While in the structuralist interpretation, social relations rule over technological change, in the operaist view technology *is* social relations, or at least their most important part.

In the bias that opposes these two theories, one can recognise the two poles between which the present popular reactions to the New Technologies of Information and Communication (NTIC) oscillate. According to one view, we are entering an age of total control and manipulation, the power-holders' secular dream coming true. The opposite view maintains that the NTIC have already liberated humanity, only we do not know it yet and atavistically hold to the old routines: once we realise the emancipation under way, the pre-history of humanity will come to its end. In the first view, NTIC are subordinated to and reproducing, if not intensifying the existing relations of domination and exploitation. In the second view, technology itself revolutionises society. A negative and a positive utopias are coming true: these are obviously ideological projections. By analogy, one can suspect the two opposed Marxisms to be one-sided extrapolations of a more complex theory.

scientifically productive recognition were secured (and were accordingly made twice or thrice), offers some justification to this view (Althusser, 1970: 239; 250; 285; 305).

- 4 Let us only indicate its most important theoreticians: Romano Alquati, Raniero Panzieri, Sergio Bologna; for a summary of some of their theories, see: Rastko Močnik, "Tržište radne snage i sastav radničke klase".



A more comprehensive approach is needed not only to overcome the obvious one-sidedness of popular beliefs and their more sophisticated extrapolations, but also in order to assess the immanent value of the available theories and to control the eventual outcome of our own theorising. We need a broader view, able to detect the main processes of our epoch, their tensions and contradictions. The understanding of the context of theories and their producers requests an insight into historical circumstances of their production. Cox's thesis that "Theory is always for someone and for some purpose" (Cox, 1981: 128), directs us towards the investigation of the historical context of the emergence and applications of NTIC. Such an insight will elucidate their effects on the human condition, including the condition of their study.

Technology in the Capitalist Mode of Production

The comprehensive theory, developed by Marx, explains how the logic of the capitalist mode of production makes capitalism the most technologically dynamic epoch in human history. Products of individual capitals are socialised retroactively upon the market where the value of the commodities is determined by the abstract labour socially necessary for their production. The capital that succeeds in producing its commodities with less than socially necessary abstract labour, appropriates upon the market a portion of the totally produced surplus-value larger than the one that would befall it according to the general profit-rate. This surplus-profit is generally acquired by increasing the productivity of labour, which is achieved by technological and organisational innovation. Accordingly, technological innovation and technical development in general, a permanent technical revolution, are a basic feature of the capitalist mode. Not only are technical developments propelled, they are also *determined* by the capitalist structure of the production and society.



This double relation is evident, for example, in the second industrial revolution, triggered by the introduction of a new source of energy, the electricity (Cohen, 2006). Unlike the steam-machine that required important investment and dictated a centralist organisation of the factory, deployed around the steam-machine, electricity was cheap and 'democratic', as it could be installed in every small workshop. A renewal of small craft and its simple commodity production seemed possible. However, this did not happen: capitalism was already entering its monopolistic stage (Amin, 2012) and a return to a restricted and static production system was just not possible. Equally impossible was the expansion of the full revolutionary potential of electric energy, resumed in Lenin's aphorism: "Communism is Soviet power plus electrification of the whole country" (Lenjin, 1920).

Technical development is thus immanent to the process of valuation of capital and *limited* by it. What we now consider the *human dimension* (and, within it, the human security concerns) enters only secondarily and through various contradictions into the process. Regulation of children's and women's work, and partly regulation of the working time originated in the concerns of the total social capital, *das gesellschaftliche Gesamtkapital* as opposed to individual capitals. In these and similar cases, capitalist state intervened in the defence of the system as a whole against the abusive practices of individual capitals. Enforcement of the human dimension here resulted from the dynamics of the *non-antagonistic contradiction* between the whole of the capital (and its social support the capitalist class juridico-politically organised in the capitalist state) and its autonomised individual parts.

Other achievements in the human dimension, from the eight-hour working day to the social (or welfare) state, resulted from the struggles of organised labour, i.e. from the dynamics of the *antagonistic contradiction* between the capitalist and the working classes. In the core of the capitalist world-system, there were concessions



made by the capitalist state in order to preserve the capitalist system.

Systemic Logic of Capitalism and NTIC

Page | 14

Systemic logic of capitalism is infinite accumulation of capital, which, for individual firms, materialises as the constraint to maximise profits. They achieve this by increasing the productivity of labour (by technological and/or organisational innovation or by intensification of labour, usually by both), or by appropriating a greater share in the overall produced surplus value.

The endeavours of individual firms take place within the larger environment characterised by two main features: the pressures of the global capitalist system upon particular regions and local jurisdictions, and the class conflicts ranging from the factory floor to the global confrontations of various intensity. In general, capital compensates concessions made on the class front by strategies that keep it abreast with its competitors on the world-system front. Classically, what was lost for the capital in the duration of the working day was made up by intensification of labour. Over longer periods, workers' struggles led to the decrease in the living labour input in the production process and to technological innovations. This propels further transformations in two directions: the adaptation of the dynamics of labour to the capacities of machinery intensifies the exploitation of labour power; it furthers concentration and centralisation of capital, and hence accelerates the dynamics of monopolisation. Firms and sectors that achieve a higher rate of accumulation upgrade their equipment, reduce the production cycle and accelerate the capital turnover. This process deepens the gap between large and small business systems, developed and underdeveloped countries. Under the conditions of globalisation, the low accumulation capacity of the underdeveloped countries has additionally hampered their situation.



The introduction of NTIC transformed all these systemic dimensions. NTIC importantly facilitated the delocalisation of labour intensive parts of production processes towards the periphery, and made firms in the core profit from the wage differential, eventually from the more lenient regulation of labour rights, environmental requirements etc. NTIC also supported processes of outsourcing and subcontracting, and enhanced the establishment of the post-Fordist 'lean company'. However, due to the conditions of the systemic decline after the mid-seventies, their main impact was in the financial domain (Lapavitsas, 2011) and in the management strategies (Salento et al., 2013. and Duménil & Lévy, 2016). In the financial domain, NTIC accelerated processes in a spectacular way, and contributed to the creation of 'bubbles' and fictive capital. Yet, their transformation of managerial strategies may have long-term effects.

Contrary to the previous industrial revolutions that were initiated by new sources of energy (steam, electricity), the NTIC revolution is driven by a communicational technology, i.e. by a technology that directly informs human relations and, pertinently for our discussion, shapes the relations of production. Around mid-eighties, the intervention of NTIC into the global mode of production in the phase of the declining long-term cycle, reversed the trend of the falling rate of capital and the decreasing productivity of capital, and triggered the short recovery on the turn of the century. It provided a new momentum to the long 'managerial revolution', as it established a new form of the relations of production that opened new possibilities to the development of productive forces, and secured the means for the aspirations of the top management to assume a decisive position upon the socio-historical scene.⁵

5 Duménil and Lévy compare this transformation to the historical beginnings of capitalism in England, "where new relations of production in a first phase created the necessary preconditions for the later adjustment of productive forces (the adjustment of technology and organisation to the new relations



We see that the changes concerning the human and social dimensions have so far originated in structural contradictions, some non-antagonistic and most antagonistic, and have been consequently the achievements wrought in social conflicts. The contradictions presented so far were *systemic contradictions* – they pertained to the structure of the capitalist system and took their concrete historical forms in the ensuing struggles within the ruling class or between the ruling class and the exploited classes. For the importance of the contradiction in the development of the human and social dimensions, we should examine its concept more closely.

Theoretical Concept of Contradiction

The concept of contradiction as we are practising here, was first proposed by Maurice Godelier (Godelier, 1967). Godelier distinguishes between “internal contradiction of a structure” and the “basic contradiction” of a mode of production. The internal contradiction is immanent to the structure and emerges together with the historical appearance of a particular structure: e.g. the contradiction between the working class and the capitalist class is specific to the capitalist mode of production. On the other hand, the basic contradiction appears only at a certain stage of historical development of a mode of production, and determines the limits of the possibility of its exist-

of production) in a second phase” (op. cit.). They illustrate the importance of NTIC by noting that the percentage of investment in information and communication technologies in the total investment in equipment and software in the U.S. economy was cca. 8% in 1910, and reached 50% in 2000: “investment in information and communication is as important as the sum of investments in industrial equipment, transportation equipment (trucks, buses, autos, aircraft), other equipment (construction machinery, mining and oilfield machinery).” – The authors contend that the world-system is moving from a two-class society (labour and capital) towards a three-class society whose new upper class is the class of managers (Duménil & Lévy, 2018).



ence. It is the contradiction not *within* a structure (as the internal contradiction), but *between* the structures, e.g. in the capitalist mode, between the progressively socialised structure of productive forces and the structure of relations of production, determined by the private ownership of the means of production.

We use the term 'systemic contradiction' for Godelier's 'internal contradiction', referring to the capitalist world-system as a social formation, not only to the structure of the mode of production. While Godelier only writes about antagonistic contradictions, we introduce the opposition 'antagonistic / non-antagonistic contradiction'. The dynamics of the non-antagonistic systemic ('internal') contradiction reproduces the system, as does, e.g. the contradiction between individual capitals and the total capital (*Gesamtkapital*). On the other hand, and against Godelier's conception, we contend that an antagonistic systemic contradiction may challenge the system as a whole. Actually, operaist analyses show that the struggle of the working class (conceived by Godelier as one term of the internal contradiction) periodically reaches a point where the reproduction of the capitalist relations of production can be secured only by a major transformation of the means of production and an adaptation of the relations of production themselves. Another implication of our approach is that the antagonism of Godelier's basic contradiction may be reduced by extra-economic measures, which is precisely the case of the New Technologies of Information and Communication.

NTIC have brought a huge progress in the socialisation of the means of production, and triggered, at their advent, all sorts of optimistic expectations. Juridical regulations of their functioning, adapted to the existing structure of the relations of production (generalised monopoly capitalism) (Amin, 2012), have so far blocked their anti-systemic potential and reduced their transformative capacities. Capitalism has completely ignored the social dimension of NTIC, and it saw in them, above all, a means to increase



profits and tools that would contribute to the consolidation of the system in a global context. As the new technologies have been generated in laboratories whose work was financed by private capital, they have been commercialized from the very beginning, and put to the service of increasing profits. This situation has left very little room for restrictive regulations. Due to their financial position, the creators of new technologies have determined the conditions of their placement and application.⁶

Structural Contradictions and Struggles for Human Achievements

In the past, human achievements in the capitalist system have been mainly achieved by political practices that took support upon objective systemic contradictions. These systemic contradictions were either non-antagonistic, as in the clash opposing the interest of the total capital against the interest of individual capitals, or they were antagonistic, as when interests of the labouring classes resisted the interests of the dominating classes. Pertaining to the core countries of the system, the latter resulted in the politics of the social (or 'welfare') state. However, social state was also prominently established in the 'socialist' or, more correctly, in the post-capitalist societies.⁷ In post-capitalist countries, the basic social achievements were first the central element of socialist revolution. Later, they were gradually introduced by the post-capitalist state within the complex frame of the predominantly antagonistic contradiction between the working people and the party-state bureaucracy.⁸

6 The most drastic case is obtaining the consent for the commercialisation of living organisms. (Đorđević, 2013: 108).

7 For the concept of 'post-capitalist societies', see: Catherine Samary, *Plan, Market and Democracy. The experience of the so-called socialist countries.*

8 For a lucid presentation of the antagonisms in post-capitalism from October revolution to Yugoslav self-management, see: Catherine Samary. – The internal contradictions of the



The achievements in post-capitalist countries were, during the revolutionary phase, *anti-systemic*, as they pertained to the destruction of the capitalist system and were oriented towards the construction of the socialist system, not yet realised. Later, human-dimension achievements in these countries resulted from the working people's resistance to the bureaucratic rule. Although popular resistance was expressing the antagonistic contradiction introduced by bureaucratic domination, the contradiction was not a systemic one, since the reproduction of bureaucracy as the ruling group never composed with any of the socially reproductive processes operating in the post-capitalist societies.⁹ In general, popular movements in post-capitalism were tuned to socialist aspects that were not integrated into the bureaucratic rule. In this sense, they thrived for a concrete utopia. When they detoured from this orientation, they were integrated into the neo-liberal global offensive.

In the retrospect, we see that post-capitalist systems have not abolished the basic feature of the capitalism, the exploitation of natural resources and of labour power. Both systems rely upon the easily accessible primary materials whose exploitation is endangering the survival of not only the opposing systems but also of the living world on the planet. Although there are more environmentally friendly technologies, their massive application has not occurred because it would jeopardize the level of revenue per unit of capital. The ignorant attitude towards ecolo-

post-capitalist society were analysed very early by Yevgeniy Alekseyevich Preobrazhensky in his *The New Economics*. Preobrazhensky introduced the concepts of "socialist primitive accumulation" and of "the struggle between two laws – the law of (capitalist) value and the law of socialist accumulation". Referring to Preobrazhensky's conceptual apparatus, Michael Lebowitz recently proposed the idea of 'contested reproduction'. See his: *Contested Reproduction and the Contradictions of Socialism* (Lebowitz, 2013), and *The Contradictions of »Real Socialism«: The Conductor and the Conducted* (Lebowitz, 2012).

9 Ernest Mandel convincingly developed this explanation of the role of bureaucracy in post-capitalist societies (Mandel, 1979).



gy does not depend on bureaucratic state structures, but rather represents an ideological commitment built into the very foundations of the system's structure.

Many of the present-day ecological concerns are of a similar *anti-systemic* character as were the demands of the revolutionary movements of the 20th century. However, as they have no pendant in the really existing capitalist structure and its systemic contradictions (as traditional revolutionary movements had in the antagonist contradiction opposing working masses to the ruling classes), they have difficulty to organise politically and to gain important popular support. Socio-historical support of many ecological concerns is external to the capitalist system, as the systemic logic of capitalist infinite accumulation cannot bend to the necessity to restrain or even to stop 'development' (Latouche, 2004), to end consumerism, to reorient production from the production of exchange values to the production of the use values (Harribey, 2013), etc.

On the other side, many ecological concerns can be fitted within the frame of the existing system. Damage caused by individual capitals can be handled by state regulation, as a result of political practices objectively supported by non-antagonistic systemic contradiction 'total capital / individual capitals' or by an antagonistic systemic contradiction 'population at large / total capital'. Ecological concerns can be graded according to the structural contradiction that supports particular practices aiming at their enforcement. As we have seen, so can other human concerns be graded as well.

Structural Location of Human Security Practices

The correspondence that links particular human concerns (including human security issues) to particular structural contradictions is of utmost importance to the practices that strive for their realisation. This corre-



spondence explains Marx's somewhat pretentious claim that humankind sets itself only the tasks it is able to complete.¹⁰ The condition for a successful resolution of a 'task' is to determine "the material conditions for its solution". As it follows from our discussion so far, the 'material condition' is to be searched for in a structural contradiction, not in some structural element or instance. This means that the structure does not entail any 'germ' of a solution, nor any element that can, if properly handled, directly yield a transformation of the structure.¹¹ The contradiction is only the place of a possible historical dynamics that an appropriate practical intervention can trigger. If the contradiction is systemic and non-antagonistic, then the intervention will reproduce the structure in its essential features, and, beyond its immediate effects, eventually strengthen it; if the contradiction is systemic and antagonistic, then it will launch a transformation of the structure within its objective historical limits. If the contradiction is anti-systemic, the praxis that targets it may destroy the existing structure and introduce a new one.¹²

10 "Mankind thus inevitably sets itself only such tasks as it is able to solve, since closer examination will always show that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution are already present or at least in the course of formation." (Marx, 1977)

11 Godelier elaborates on this point in his polemics against the Hegelian notion of contradiction: in Hegelian philosophy, a contradiction always in some way entails its own resolution (Godelier, 1967).

12 An antagonistic systemic contradiction can evolve into an anti-systemic contradiction when combined with other systemic contradictions. E. g. the organisational support of the 20th century socialist revolutions was often based upon an ideological translation of the contradiction between industrial proletariat and the ruling classes. Such were the revolutionary parties of the bolshevik type: Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (bolsheviks) in Russia, CPY in Yugoslavia, CPC in China until Mao's change of the line, etc. However, the peasantry provided the mass support to the revolution. In this sense, the 20th century socialist revolutions were 'peasant wars' (Wolf, 1969).



The global scene has revealed the true nature of the capitalist system. The established structure based on the financial power of its elements at the time of absolute domination after the collapse of its ideological opponent insists on applying orthodox models of transition from socialism to capitalism. The applied model of the organisation of the economy and political life in the area of former socialist (post-capitalist) countries can best be understood through the prism of Galtung's theory of structural violence (Galtung, 2009). The elements of the structure by inertia continue to follow the given matrix, although there is no rational justification for this. To follow the ideological model suits socio-political elites better than the effort to start a qualitative transformation of the organisation and functioning of society. After the demolition of the Berlin Wall, while the establishment was still busy praising the victory, a group of enthusiasts started promoting the concept of HS. This concept that contained all the concerns regarding human rights, ecology, health and democratic principles most frequently used in marketing campaigns aimed at promoting the superiority of the Western system in relation to the former Eastern one. While at first glance, HS is an attempt to correct the existing system, a deeper analysis shows that it entails the idea of a radical change of the current principles that form the foundations of the modern capitalism. The idea of social justice and a more even distribution of wealth is something that in its essence resembles Marx's ideas and welfare state, rather than what is implied by the neoliberal arrangement of the modern world.

Articulation of Theory and Practice

At this point, practice requires theoretical support. Theory will determine the contradiction at stake in a particular practical 'task', and will eventually indicate the ways how to approach the contradiction to liberate its transformative dynamics. Such an indication will point to several and differing lines of action, since there is no sim-



ple and direct translation of theory into practice. Such an analysis, and its transposition into practice, need a theory able to detect structural contradictions and their differences of nature. In particular, practices setting in motion anti-systemic contradictions, and consequently eventually lacking intra-systemic instances upon which to seat their actions, may need such a theory to construct their 'perspective' or 'position of enunciation', as a pre-condition of their implantation in social reality.

Fernand Braudel presented an early effort towards such a theory (Braudel, 1958) that was later re-elaborated by Immanuel Wallerstein (Wallerstein, 2001). To Braudel's three types of historical time, Wallerstein adds three spatial extensions, and puts both together to define three different objects of knowledge:

1. The episodic time of mere events limits the view to immediate geo-political space (e.g. the nation-state); consequently, an approach limited to such time-space coordinates is unable to construe a proper object of knowledge and has to paste its event-bits together by some ideology. – This approach starts from a non-antagonistic systemic contradiction and is not properly theoretic. However, it suffices to support human concerns related to, e.g. the conditions of work, security at the work place, wage regime (within the limits of the prevailing accumulation regime), employment arrangements (within the limits of the prevailing accumulation regime), corporate security, etc.
2. Cyclical time covers one phase in the 'long (Kondratyev) cycle' and allows for the horizon of ideological space, i.e. it is framed into how contemporaries ideologically perceive the contradictions of their time (e.g. as the opposition between the East and the West, or between the global South and the North etc.). – This approach situates its point of view in the antagonistic systemic contradiction. Social and political practices it supports may



bring about major transformations within the system (e.g. the non-aligned movement; or measures against cyber-terrorism).

3. Structural time, Braudel's *longue durée*, generates the conceptual construction of structural space, i.e. it belongs to the theoretical production of an object of knowledge that has its own temporal dimensions – its cyclical reproduction and its limitation in history, and its own spatial extension – the world-system. This approach establishes a perspective that views the system from the outside, and can consequently support anti-systemic endeavours.

We can schematically present this classification as follows:

BRAUDEL – WALLERSTEIN				CONTRADICTION APPROACH			
cognitive time	cognitive space	object of knowledge	dimension	type of contradiction	specification	historical form	institutional support
time of events – episodic time	immediate geo-political space, e.g. nation state	events → ideological object	idiographic historiography	systemic contradiction	non-antagonistic	total capital vs. individual c.	bourgeois nation-state
conjunctural time	ideological space representations of contradictions, e.g. East/West, core/periphery in EU	cyclical processes = one of the A/B phases in the cycle	relations among social groups		antagonistic	working classes vs. ruling classes	organised labour
structural time	structural space conceptual elaboration of the historical formation of structures and their contradictions, e.g. capitalist world-system	system changes	relations between the humanity and the environment	anti-systemic contradiction	antagonistic	“allgemeine Repräsentant” vs. ruling classes ?	anti-systemic movements
time & space irrelevant/excluded		non-temporal objects → human universals	nomothetic sciences				

Conclusion

Within the above classification, HS at first glance fits into the first group of objects of knowledge, as it does not directly challenge the existing ideological frame. HS concept is not focused upon fundamental change of the system, but strives for its correction in order to create a more humane environment for the life and work of human population, regardless of their geographical, religious, racial or other affiliation. However, the realisation



of the idea of a qualitative change in living and working conditions is not possible without changes within the current socio-economic paradigm. Capitalism as a world system has survived its age and has already entered the phase when its internal contradictions undermine the system. The system itself has created antagonisms within the existing structure. The transition to a new higher phase is inevitable, as it becomes a question of survival not only of the system, but also of the sustainability of the living world on the planet. Reproduction by inertia of established structures is not capable to resolve the antagonisms within the system. This is revealed in the current global problems that the system produces, but is unable to solve them. The system itself is not able to find an exit from the downward spiral into which it has fallen. Geopolitical concepts from the end of the 19th century are re-activated, protectionism is again returning to the international scene, the functioning of the Organisation of United Nations in some segments resembles the pre-WW II League of Nations, all of which points to the profound structural crisis of capitalism.

HS remains on the level of concept, it is not a theory, since its creators had no revolutionary ambitions to change the existing system. Under the given conditions, any revolutionary pretension would jeopardize the promotion of HS in the public space. The analytical frame presented by HS should draw attention to the immediate and actual problems of people without ideological connotation. Precisely this avoidance of the confrontation with the structures of the system and insistence on the need of its correction has opened the space necessary for the promotion of the concept. By its potential, the concept could lead to changes in the system and contribute to an evolutionary transition of organising socio-economic activities to a new era. The present situation shows that the resistance of neoconservative structures is still strong regardless of the obvious signals that indicate the unsustainability of the existing system. The HS approach allows quantification of dysfunctions and identification of the causes of the



problems, which should convince the establishment of the need for structural changes at the system level.

NTIC, as we have seen, have a dual potential: they further aggravate existing problems on the one hand, and, on the other, they create an environment in which solving the problems of the emergent global community becomes possible. The further development of the events will depend on the strength and persuasiveness of the arguments.

Many problems of the contemporary world are no longer local in nature; they are global phenomena. Citizens of the developed countries need to be aware of the fact that their political choices influence the fate of the entire humanity. How and in what way it will be possible to mobilize the NTIC's potential for the democratisation of the global political space depends not only on political and intellectual elites, but also on the owners of large-scale capital. The academic community should do everything in its power to present the necessity of systemic change to key decision-makers. NTIC offer certain opportunities to promote new views and models for solving the paradigmatic crisis, while at the same time they represent a channel through which the existing system defends itself and prevents reforms. It is urgent that social sciences offer new models and theories that will keep up with technological progress. As things stand now, technology has overtaken the analytical capacities of social sciences. This is one of the greatest security challenges of the modern world. The interests of large-scale capital have imposed the profit logic even in academic environments. Consequently, there is no serious critical analysis of the existing situation. The demise of scientific apparatuses and progressive initiatives has led to regressive responses and to the emergence of reactionary antisystemic movements, whose most drastic forms are religious fundamentalism and the revival of extremist right-wing political options.



REFERENCES

- Althusser, L. and Balibar, E. (1970). *Reading Capital*, Verso: London.
- Amin, S. (2012). The Surplus in Monopoly Capitalism and the Imperialist Rent. *Monthly Review*, Vol. 64, No. 3. Visited 01.VIII 2018. on: <https://monthlyreview.org/2012/07/01/the-surplus-in-monopoly-capitalism-and-the-imperialist-rent>.
- Braudel, F. (1958). Histoire et Sciences sociales : La longue durée. *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, Vol. 13, No. 4, 725-753
- Cohen, D. (2006). *Trois leçons sur la société post-industrielle*. Paris: Seuil.
- Cox, W.R. (1981). Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, 10, 126-155.
- Dorđević, Lj. I. (2013). *Ljudska bezbednost – globalni kontekst i primena u Srbiji*. Beograd: Dosije Studio i Institut za uporedno pravo.
- Duménil, G. and Lévy, D. (2016). Technology and distribution in managerial capitalism: The chain of historical trajectories à la Marx and countertendential traverses. *Science & Society*. Vol. 80, No 4, 530-549.
- Duménil, G. and Lévy, D. (2018). *Managerial Capitalism. Ownership, Management and the Coming New Mode of Production*, London: Pluto Press.
- Galtung, J. (2009). *Mirnim sredstvima do mira*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Godelier, M.(1967). System, Structure and Contradiction in "The Capital", *Socialist Register*, Vol. 4, 91-119.
- Harribey, J.M. (2013). *La Richesse, la valeur et l'ines- timable. Fondements d'une critique socio-écolo-*



gique de l'économie capitaliste, Paris: Les Liens qui Libèrent.

Harribey, J.M. (2015). Au Coeur de la crise sociale et écologique du capitalisme: la contradiction entre richesse et valeur. *Actuel Marx*, Vol. 57, No. 1, 173-185.

Lapavitsas, C. (2011). Theorizing financialization. *Work, employment and society*, Vol. 25, No. 4, 611-626.

Latouche, S. (2004). *Survivre au développement. De la décolonisation de l'imaginaire économique à la construction d'une société alternative*. Paris: Fayard.

Lebowitz, M. (2012). *The Contradictions of »Real Socialism«: The Conductor and the Conducted*, New York: NYU Press.

Lebowitz, M. (2013). *Contested Reproduction and the Contradictions of Socialism*. Visited 15.VIII 2018. on: <https://socialistproject.ca/2013/09/b877/>

Lenin, V.I. (1920). Report on the Work of the Council of People's Commissars. December 22, In: ____ (1964). *Collected Works*, Vol. XXXI. Moskva: Progress Publishers. 513-518; Visited 15.VIII 2018. on: <http://soviethistory.msu.edu/1921-2/electrification-campaign/communism-is-soviet-power-electrification-of-the-whole-country/>

Mandel, E. (1979). Why The Soviet Bureaucracy is not a New Ruling Class. *Monthly Review*, Vol. 31, No 3, 63-76.

Marx, K. (1977). *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Moscow: Progress Publishers. Visited 15.VIII 2018. on: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm>

Močnik, R. (2011). Tržište radne snage i sastav radničke klase. In: Popović, Ž. and Gajić, Z. (eds.). *Kroz tranziciju*. Novi Sad: AKO. Visited 01.VIII 2018. on: <http://www.csi-platforma.org/sites/csi-platforma.org/files/publikacije/kroz-tranziciju.pdf>



- Preobrazhensky, Y.A. (1965). *The New Economics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Salento, A., Masino, G. and Berdicchia, D. (2013). Financialization and Organizational Changes in Multinational Enterprises. *Revue d'économie industrielle*, No. 144, 145-176. Visited 15.VIII 2018. on: <http://rei.revues.org/5710>
- Samary, C. (1988). *Plan, Market and Democracy. The experience of the so-called socialist countries*, Amsterdam: International Institute for Research and Education. Short version: *Neither Capitalist Nor Socialist: The Political-Economy of Post-Capitalist Societies*. Visited 15.VIII 2018. on: <http://www.socialisteconomist.com/2018/01/neither-capitalist-nor-socialist.html>
- Wallerstein, I. (2001). The inventions of TimeSpace realities: Towards an understanding of our historical systems. In: *Unthinking Social Science. The Limits of Nineteenth-Century Paradigms*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Wolf, E. (1969). *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century*. New York: Harper & Row.

