

Dragana Vilić¹

University of Banja Luka
Faculty of Economics
Department for Business
Economics and Management
Majke Jugovica 4, 78000 Banja Luka
dragana.vilic@ef.unibl.org

Original scientific paper

UDC 316.334.3:929 BAUMAN Z.
DOI 10.7251/SOCEN1713043V
COBISS.RS-ID 7191576
Accepted: 22.9.2017.

Zygmunt Bauman – The wicked openness of society

Abstract

In this paper, we will analyze Zygmunt Bauman's understanding of the idea and the reality of "open" society in the age of "negative globalization". He identified many adverse and undesirable effects of this social process, and as the basic one he names the "openness" of modern societies. Under the influence of devastating powers of globalization, the "openness" of societies has turned into its perverted contradiction, to use Karl Popper's definition of this notion. In order to understand Bauman's point of view, we will analyze: a general meaning of the idea of an open society, its manifestations in reality and assumptions regarding it. In the addition, we will investigate a distinction between an open and closed society made by Karl Popper.

Keywords: *Open society, closed society, negative globalization*

Introduction

The advocates of postmodern theory believe that at the end of the 1960s we witnessed the end of modernism and organizational character of the industrial society (culture, style, way of life, way of production etc.) that prevailed in Europe since the 17th century. The lifestyle of the industrial age has undergone a significant transformation, and postmodern theoreticians no

¹ PhD in Sociology, Scientific area Theoretical Sociology, Associate Professor.

longer pay their attention to systems, solid forms and clear expressions, but they turn toward “notions, symbols, skills of interpretation (hermeneutics), the significance of messages inherent in work, activities and behavior of people and a role of the subject in creation and exploration.”² Many social changes and processes clearly indicated this turn – the dissolution of tradition, secularization, individualization, automatization, globalization, the collapse of ethical contexts, accumulation and weakening of authorities, the lack of a spiritual powers etc.³ To distinguish between modern and postmodern age, Zygmunt Bauman uses the categories of – “solid” (rigid) and “fluid” (flowing) modernity – which suggest that he (as well as Giddens), in the theoretical elaboration of a late modernity, cuts down a social reality to the system of binary oppositions.⁴ By analyzing the society of “fluid” (late) modernity, Bau-

² Ivan Šijaković i Dragana Vilić, *Sociologija savremenog društva*, Banja Luka: Ekonomski fakultet, 2010, p. 61.

³ Zygmunt Bauman in conversation with Aleksandra Klich – *NISAM PROPOVJEDNIK, JA SAM DIJAGNOSTIČAR*, translation of polish original by Tanja Miletić Oručević, tačno.net, 20.01.2013. <http://www.tacno.net/novosti/zygmunt-bauman-nisam-propovjednik-ja-sam-dijagnosticar/> [12.07.2017.] or polish original published in *Magazyn Świąteczny Gazeta Wyborcza* and on wyborcza.pl 18.01.2013 http://wyborcza.pl/magazyn/1,124059,13259382,Boimy_sie_wolnoscii__marzymy_o_wspolnoscie.html?disableRedirects=true [20.12.2017]

⁴ Referring to American sociologist Jeffrey Alexander, who focused on the binary oppositions used by certain theoreticians in order to give meaning to the social changes that surrounded them, Valerio Baćak critically analyzes the theoretical elaboration of late modernity by Anthony Giddens and Zygmunt Bauman, that is, their interpretative apparatus - (simplified) polarization of social reality (provisionally - inexcusably, individually - collectively, freely - inexplicably etc.). Jeffrey Alexander, *Modern, Ante, Post and Neo: How Intellectuals Have Tried to Understand the Crisis of our Time*, *Zeitschrift fur Soziologie*, 23 (3), 1994, pp. 165-177; Jeffrey Alexander and Philip Smith, *Social Science and Salvation: Risk Society as Mythical Discourse*, *Zeitschrift Fur Soziologie*, 25 (4), 1996, pp. 251-262. In: Valerio Baćak, *O pojednostavljivanju modernosti: kritika Baumana i Giddensa*, *Diskrepancija*, Volume 8, Number 12, Zagreb: Faculty of Philosophy, 2007. Bauman seeks out to resolve the key sociological ambivalence between individuals and societies within binary oppositions (heavy / easy modernization, individualization / community, security / freedom, etc.), for which he finds the inspiration in later works by Sigmund Freud. Ozren Biti, *Potruga za odgovorom na nedefinirano pitanje: Zygmunt Bauman i sociologija protočne potrošnje*, *Philosophical Research* 125, God. 32, Vol. 1, Zagreb: Croatian Philosophical Society - Faculty of Philosophy, 2012, p. 116. When speaking about civilized life, Bauman recalls in particular *Civilization and its Discontent* (1929): “Do you remember what Sigmund Freud said in 1929 in a book that was published in Poland under the title ‘Kultura jako źródło cierpień’? That a civilized life is a trade exchange - we give part of a value in exchange for other values. And when Freud spoke, the reality was solid. Freud’s diagnosis was published: all the mental problems of man are rooted in fact that we traded a huge part of freedom for security - security from destiny, illness, violence. I’m sure if Freud would give you an interview today, he would turn the diagnosis. He would say that the suffering of a contemporary man is fueled by the enormous unprecedented personal freedom in return for

man points out to its complexity, unpredictability and the lack of “the central organization that could define common goals.” Instead of it, the activity is organized through small groups and individual actors, whose behavior is a subject of frequent changes, therefore they appear as social subjects focused only on activities aimed at reaching individual goals.⁵ The aftermath of this changes and activities is – a “fluid” world populated with free, self-sufficient and self-indulgent individuals (process of individualization), that don’t have any security and support (state of uncertainty and insecurity) – neither in family, community, intimate relationships, workplace, nor in the networks of meanings and materiality of early “solid” modernity.⁶ A consequence of rapid dissolution of social norms and institutions (liquefaction), is the loosening of social ties, which simultaneously represent preconditions and obstacles for the realization of individual freedom.⁷ According to Bauman, security and freedom are inseparable, (slavery – security without freedom, anarchy – freedom without security) necessary and fundamental conditions for dignified life, although they don’t speak the same language (because only by giving a part of our freedom we can obtain more security, and by giving up a part of security we can achieve more freedom). Historical development of the freedom is not a straightforward path, but more “the movement of the pendulum”. The life of a man in the contemporary society is best described through the feeling of uncertainty (physical, social, emotional etc.), the loss of privacy and the weakening of social relationships and ties.⁸ It is undoubtedly clear

giving a huge part of security. And it’s not about security from terrorist. It is about security in the sense of social position, faith in its decisions, confidence in the authorities. That all is lost. “ - Zygmunt Bauman in conversation with Aleksandra Klich – *NISAM PROPOVJEDNIK, JA SAM DIJAGNOSTIČAR*, translation of polish original by Tanja Miletić Oručević, tačno.net, 20.01.2013. <http://www.tacno.net/novosti/zygmunt-bauman-nisam-propovjednik-ja-sam-dijagnosticar/> [12.07.2017.] or polish original published in *Magazyn Świąteczny Gazeta Wyborcza* and on wyborcza.pl 18.01.2013

http://wyborcza.pl/magazyn/1,124059,13259382,Boimysie_wolnoscimarzymy_o_wspolnocie.html?disableRedirects=true [20.12.2017]

⁵ Ivan Šijaković i Dragana Vilić, *Sociologija savremenog društva*, Banja Luka: Ekonomski fakultet, p. 62 – 63.

⁶ Valerio Baćak, O pojednostavljanju modernosti: kritika Baumana i Giddensa, *Diskrepancija*, str. 10 -11.

⁷ Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000, p. 170. In: Ozren Biti, Potraga za odgovorom na nedefinirano pitanje: Zygmunt Bauman i sociologija protočne potrošnje, *Filozofska istraživanja* 125, God. 32, Sveska 1, Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo - Filozofski fakultet, 2012, p. 115. (109 – 119) i Valerio Baćak, O pojednostavljanju modernosti: kritika Baumana i Giddensa, *Diskrepancija*, p. 11.

⁸ Zygmunt Bauman in conversation with Aleksandra Klich – *NISAM PROPOVJEDNIK, JA SAM DIJAGNOSTIČAR*, translation of polish original by Tanja Miletić Oručević, tačno.net, 20.01.2013. <http://www.tacno.net/novosti/zygmunt-bauman-nisam-propovjednik-ja-sam-dijagnosticar/> [12.07.2017.] or polish original published in *Magazyn Świąteczny Gazeta Wyborcza* and on wyborcza.pl 18.01.2013

that we are trying to escape from the familiar “here”, into the unknown and unpredictable “there” (with or without our will, guided or misguided by our actions). Therefore, according to Bauman, this crossover (or escape) “cannot be defined by the period of transition, because transition means going from ‘here’ to somewhere ‘there.’”⁹

In order to analyze Bauman’s understanding of the idea of “open” society in the age of “negative globalization”, it is necessary, to answer following questions: What is a general meaning of the idea of an open society? What are the hypothesis of an open society? What manifestation does an open society have? What are distinctions between open and closed society, according to Karl Popper?

Open society – the idea

The idea of an open society, for Karl Popper originally represented “a rational and critical”¹⁰ society and stood “for the self-determination of a free society proud of its openness”¹¹ in the case of Zygmunt Bauman. Either way, it would represent a society that develops all kinds of free and diverse forms of *intern* (between individuals and groups, groups and states, among or inside political institutions and organizations) and *extern* communication (relation to the environment). The “openness” of a society, both internal and external, manifests itself (or can be traced) through the basic elements of its structure - economy, social relations, politics and culture. The open society is also characterized through the free market, modern technology, competition, basic business regulations, high quality standards of goods and services – inside of an open society this is reflected through the free access to financial, investment and organizational centers, equality and protection of property, free and equal access to different resources and support for creative and entrepreneurial spirit. Toward the environment, an open society functions through the open market without monopoly, without protectionism, with no high

http://wyborcza.pl/magazyn/1,124059,13259382,Boimy_sie_wolnoscii_marzzymy_o_wspolnocie.html?disableRedirects=true [20.12.2017]

⁹ Zygmunt Bauman in conversation with Giuliano Battiston, *ZYGMUNT BAUMAN O BAUKU POBUNE I DRUŠTVENOJ NEJEDNAKOSTI*, 12/05/2014, <https://radiogornjigrad.wordpress.com/2014/05/12/intervju-saintervju-sa-zygmuntom-baumanom-bauk-pobune-bauk-po-bune/> [07/07/2017.] republished from noviplamen.net, translation by Jasna Tkalec

¹⁰ Karl R. Popper, *Otvoreno društvo i njegovi neprijatelji*, I-II, translation Branimir Gligorić, Sarajevo: Pravni centar Fond otvoreno društvo Bosne i Hercegovine, 1998.

¹¹ Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Fear*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006, p.90

customs or taxes, no pressure on small countries and companies by large corporations, and with dynamic social relations, high social mobility of citizens followed by a good standard of living (the possibility of finding employment, changing jobs and professions). The inner openness of society in the sphere of culture means a pluralism of ideas, attitudes and opinions, free creativity, free expression and adoption of new cultural styles and artistic “trends”, followed by the easy access to cultural institutions. Toward a broader environment the cultural openness of society implies an openness for different cultural influences, exchange of ideas, creative impulses and integration of technical innovations. The foundations of an open society are: a high degree of freedom, right and possibility to vote and choose, tolerance, freedom of speech and information, political fair-play, citizen participation in all social structures and institutions, etc. The absence of these characteristics, postulates and manifestations of “openness” create closed, isolated and self-sufficient society (for example, the China from the period of dynasty, different forms of “eastern despotism” or Indian caste system).¹²

Karl Popper: a rational distinction between notions open and closed society

Although there is a general believe that Karl Popper was the first one to use the syntagm “open / closed society”, he himself suggested it was Henri Bergson who used it in his work *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*, in which he makes a *religious distinction* between these two notions – and determines an open society as a product of mystical intuition, taken “fresh from

¹² The economic closeness of the society is characterized by an autarchy (self-sufficient) economy, permanent state interventionism, dominance of political structures and government over economy and overall economic flows, no pluralism of property, protection from domination and monopoly of one type of property, no free market, weakness of technological development, low quality products and services that are used only in local frameworks, economic exchange with the environment is under the strict control of the state or the dominance of lobby groups, high customs rates and other forms of “protection” of domestic economy or the absence of it. This society is characterized by social stativity or poor social mobility - a small number of rich and privileged and the majority of the poor population, is achieved through manipulation, corruption, monopoly, loyalty and connectivity with political and other centers of power and influencing groups. Also, in this society there is political closeness (absence of political tolerance, culture, freedom, pluralism, etc.) in internal and external communication, domination of ideology (liberalism, nationalism, communism or religious ideology), cultural closeness (resistance to external cultural influences and internal cultural pluralism), psychological closeness (fear of change, distrust, lack of trust and environmental influence).

the hands of nature”¹³ Contrary to this definition, Popper’s terms point to a *rational distinction* – closed society is characterized by the believe in magic taboos, while in an open society people learn to be critical and base their decisions on the authority of an intelligence. “It is about the desire of countless people to free themselves and their spirit from the tutelage of authority and prejudice. It is about their attempt to build an open society that does not accept self-originated and tradition based absolute authority, instead of that they are trying to preserve, develop and establish, old or new tradition that would be a sum of their standards of freedom, humanity and rational criticism. It is about unwillingness to lay back and surrender the entire responsibility of governing to some human or superhuman authority, and willingness to share the responsibility for the suffering that can be avoided, and should be avoided.”¹⁴ As Aryeh Neier notes, this vision of an open society contains skepticism towards all systems and authorities, and a full trust in an autonomous, intelligent, reasonable and free individual; every attempt (or excuse) to limit a freedom in the name of an ideology or utopian ideal is fully rejected.¹⁵

According to Popper, an expression of longing for the lost unity of a closed society and a reaction against the rationalism of an open society, could be found in the notion of mysticism by Henri Bergson “I fully agree that there is an irrational or intuitive element in any creative contemplation; but this element can also be found in rational scientific contemplation. Rational thinking is not less intuitive; it can be seen as an intuition subordinated to experiment and control (in contradiction to unconstrained intuition). Applying it on the problem of creating an open society, I admit that people like Socrates were inspired by intuition; however, by allowing this fact, I believe that it is the rationality, by which the founders of an open society can be distinguished from those who tried to stop its development and which were, also as Plato, inspired by intuition – only by intuition uncontrolled by rationality ...”¹⁶

As Popper observes, the application of terms open (rational, critical) and closed society (magical, irrational) on a concrete example is impossible with-

¹³ Henri Bergson, *Les deux sources de la morale et de la religion*, In: Karl R. Popper, *Otvoreno društvo i njegovi neprijatelji*, translation Branimir Gligorić, Sarajevo: Pravni centar Fond otvoreno društvo Bosne i Hercegovine, 1998, p. 264.

¹⁴ Karl R. Popper, Introduction to second edition, *Otvoreno društvo i njegovi neprijatelji*, translation Branimir Gligorić, Sarajevo: Pravni centar Fond otvoreno društvo Bosne i Hercegovine, 1998, p.13.

¹⁵ Aryeh Neier, Introduction in Karl R. Popper, *Otvoreno društvo i njegovi neprijatelji*, translation Branimir Gligorić, Sarajevo: Pravni centar Fond otvoreno društvo Bosne i Hercegovine, 1998, p. 16.

¹⁶ Karl R. Popper, *Otvoreno društvo i njegovi neprijatelji II*, translation Branimir Gligorić, Sarajevo: Pravni centar Fond otvoreno društvo Bosne i Hercegovine, 1998., footnote 58, p. 452

out idealizing it. He emphasizes that even in the “most open” societies the magical belief that circulates among its people, has never disappeared nor it can completely vanish. According to Popper, a useful criterion for the transition from closed to an open society, is the overthrow of social order framed by the awe toward a supernormal (magical); a moment when a person becomes conscious, active subject, a creator of social institutions, personal and group interests, goals and their changes.¹⁷ The characteristics of the tribal way of life are: rigidity of social customs, a magical or irrational attitude towards them, non-differentiation between conventional rules of social life and those found in “nature”, mixed with the belief that both of them are subordinated to supernatural forces. Relatively rare changes in this kind of life are made due to the rational attempts to improve social conditions, rather they occur through the religious transformation or an introduction of new magical taboos (tribal institutions), which dominate all aspects of life (and regulate it rigidly), by determining a “right” way of acting, without doubt, critics and without leaving a room for personal responsibility. Instead of rational act and a response, they establish certain forms of collective responsibility based on magical ideas (authorizing the power of the fate).¹⁸ Therefore, for Popper this kind of a society is closed and he points on the traces (remains) of such a life in modern society – taboos regarding food, superstition, amulets, etc. We habitually adhere to this taboos or beliefs, with the difference that between them and state laws there is a broad field of our own personal rational decisions (based on the assessment of possible consequences and with them associated responsibilities), which can change both of them (knowingly making a choice) and make us aware of the importance of this question (a rational reflection on this issue begins with Heraclitus). In opposition to the closed society, stands an open society in which, according to K. Popper, “individuals are faced with a set of personal decisions”.¹⁹

The deepest revolution through which mankind has passed and which didn't happen consciously, is the transition from a closed to the open society. In order to understand it, Popper will return us to the source of Western civilization – the ancient Greece. The first step from tribalism toward humanism was made by Greeks. The collapse of the “organic” tribalism and closed societies began with an increase in the population by the ruling class of landowners. The collapse was postponed initially by an “organic” solution: by settling colonies the cities were created. Simultaneously, colonization has enabled

¹⁷ Karl R. Popper, *Otvoreno društvo i njegovi neprijatelji I*, translation Branimir Gligorić, Sarajevo: Pravni centar Fond otvoreno društvo Bosne i Hercegovine, 1998. p. 388

¹⁸ Ibid. p. 226-227

¹⁹ Ibid. p. 227-228

various cultural exchanges and the birth of trade that labored a new class of traders and maritime workers. In the 6th century BC exactly this represented a threat for the closed Greek society and led to a partial dissolution of the 'old life', to a multitude of political revolutions and reactions (due to an attempt to force and preserve tribalism) and to a great spiritual revolution (the discovery of the critical discussion and thinking liberated from magic). As a price for every increase in knowledge, understanding, cooperation, mutual help and the opportunity to survive and increase in number, a civilization has set before us a burden of the demand (rationality, renunciation of some emotional needs, self-care, self-responsibility), related to the problem that appears for the first time - the tension between the classes (first class problem starts). For the members of the ruling class in the Greek society, slavery and class domination did not appear questionable, but was rather considered as "natural" result of ruling's class superiority, followed by need for security and exuberance. In the tribal community (later "city") each member mastered and played a certain role, provided to him by community and with the warranty of protection from enemies and dangerous magical powers. With the collapse of closed society, members of the privileged class were more likely to feel this burden than those who were oppressed by them; they felt fear and anxiety due to the collapse of their "natural" world and privilege.²⁰ Aspirations and problems of slaves do not necessarily create anything that the rulers would feel as an important problem within the society, because for them slaves never represent a significant part of it. The main danger for ruling class was the increase of population. An attempt to stop social changes in Sparta was done through the subjugation of neighboring tribes by conquering their territories and controlling their population growth (infanticide, birth control and homosexuality).²¹ There are six main tendencies of Spartan politics: the protection of captured tribes, anti-humanism, autarchy, anti-universalism (or particularism), rulership, fixed territory. Apart from the latter, other tendencies essentially correspond with the characteristics of modern totalitarianism – imperialist tendencies do not contain elements of tolerant universalism, anti-humanism and rulership are two important points in totalitarianism, and their justification is based on the salvation of state (or people) from its potential enemies.²²

At the beginning of our civilization, an open society has affirmed humanism as a new and only possible religion, it set standards of living in accord-

²⁰ Ibid. p. 231-232.

²¹ Ibid. p. 389

²² Ibid. p. 238-239

ance with the egalitarianism,²³ found and established the tradition of criticism and discussion, and with it the art of rational thinking.²⁴ The important values of an open society were: individualism, egalitarianism, trust in reason and love for freedom.²⁵ Although attempts to oppose an open society never disappeared, Popper expressed the conviction that we would never again return to the situation that preceded it. “Once we begin to rely upon our reason, and to use our powers of criticism, once we feel the call of personal responsibility, and with it, the responsibility of helping to advance knowledge, we cannot return to a state of implicit submission to tribal magic. For those who have eaten from the tree of knowledge, the paradise is lost. The more we try to return to tribal heroism, the more surely do we arrive at the Inquisition, at the Secret Police and at the romanticized gangsterism. Beginning with the suppression of reason and truth, we must end with the most brutal and violent destruction of all that is human. *There is no return to a harmonious state of nature. If we turn back, then we must go the whole way – we must return to the beast.* (...) But if we wish to remain human, then there is only one way, the way into the open society. We must go in the unknown, courageously, using what reason we have, to plan for security and freedom.”²⁶

Nevertheless, in the most appreciated experience of friendship and solidarity, in the movements of young people (scouts), in certain clubs, the group spirit of tribalism was manifested through the middle of the last century. According to Popper, under the influence of tribalism are almost all social movements (both totalitarian and humanistic). In English school system of that time, a conscious and a successful attempt to revive the tribal spirit, to enclose society and perpetuate a class rule has been made.²⁷ In spite of many problems, temptations and challenges that the mankind had through the history, Popper states: “Mankind, I believe, has not done so badly. In spite of the treason of some of its intellectual leaders, in spite of the stupefying effect of Platonic methods in education and the devastating results of propaganda, there have been some amazing successes. Many of the weak have been helped, and for a hundred years, slavery has been practically abolished.”²⁸

²³ Ibid. p. 240

²⁴ Ibid. p. 242

²⁵ Ibid. p. 257

²⁶ Ibid. p. 259-260

²⁷ Ibid. p. 417

²⁸ Ibid. p. 419-420

Zygmunt Bauman: the idea and reality of an “open society” in the age of “negative globalization”

Rightly and reasonably, Zygmunt Bauman identifies himself as a diagnostician of global society (lat. *diagnosis*, gr. *διάγνωση* - cognition, recognition, distinguishing). Through a careful analysis of all aspects, phenomena, features, processes and relationships in the contemporary global society, Bauman identifies and determinates its “illnesses” – predisposition of everything to doubts and critique, unsatisfactory functioning of institutions, corruption and carelessness of political organs, inefficiency of the old and the absence of new instruments of action.²⁹ Analyzing the contemporary society, he points out that the reality of such society is characterized by (negative) manifestations of basic processes – uncontrolled, incomplete and negative globalization, which without any obstacles annihilates weak boundaries and/or drills holes into ones that resist destructive forces. Also, the “openness” of the modern society has been changed, i.e. it has experienced its opposite – a perversion in relation to Popper’s definition of this concept. It does not appear as a precious product of stressful, courageous, self-confident effort, but “negative globalization and its offshoots (the unprecedented degree of extra-territoriality of capital, trade, information, crime, terrorism) have, however made all such tested instruments of sovereignty by and large ineffective”³⁰ As further noted by Bauman, heteronomous, vulnerable population overrun by uncontrolled and unreasonable forces, concerned only about the security of their borders, experience “openness” of their society as a horrifying fact. “On a globalized planet, populated by forcibly ‘opened’ societies, security cannot be gained, let alone reliably assured, in one country or in a selected group of countries: not by their own means, and not independently of the state of affairs in the rest of the world. Neither can justice, that preliminary condition of lasting peace. The perverted ‘openness’ of societies enforced by negative globalization is itself the prime cause of injustice and so, obliquely, of conflict and violence.”³¹ Negative globalization has fully, materially and intellectually opened all societies. In the contemporary world, everything is fluid – dangers and fears, for which there are no means and ways to stop them – man has

²⁹ Zygmunt Bauman in conversation with Giuliano Battiston, *ZYGMUNT BAUMAN O BAUKU POBUNE I DRUŠTVENIJ NEJEDNAKOSTI*, 12/05/2014, <https://radiogornjigrad.wordpress.com/2014/05/12/intervju-saintervju-sa-zygmuntom-baumanom-bauk-pobune-bauk-pobune/> [07/07/2017.] republished from noviplamen.net, translation by Jasna Tkalec

³⁰ Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Fear*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006, p. 90

³¹ *Ibid.* p. 90-91

lost a secure shelter.³² Manuel Castells also highlights the negative impacts and influences of globalization that undermine the stability of societies at national and international levels. By analyzing networking, cooperation and linking between powerful criminal groups and organizations from different regions and countries (Cosa Nostra, Yakuza, Colombian and Mexican cartels, Russian and the US mafia etc.), Castells points out that in the global network the activities of drug, weapons, human and organs trafficking, survive, blossom and escape control of state organs by exploiting and using economic globalization and international transport. Although they pursue their “specific” activity, criminal organizations share and organize global space, extending beyond their national frameworks – they act in areas where they have established a relative institutional control, in markets where their products are highly demanded, following the logic of “enterprise network” organizing and penetrating, undermining and regulating the stability of society in general.³³

For Bauman, in the network of interpersonal dependence, our acts and actions influence everyone’s future. Nevertheless, he questions the concept of a risk in fluid society, because possibility of calculating losses, damages and other discomforts, reducing the suffering caused by them and avoiding all possible malaises, could produce a substantial amount of automatized habits, routines, regularities, repetitions and monotony – that would eventually only serve for make more accurate and reliable calculations and statistics.³⁴ “This is not, however, what the ‘negatively globalized’ world is like. In such a world as ours, the effects of actions spread far beyond the reach of the routinizing impact of control and beyond the scope of the knowledge needed to design it. What makes our world vulnerable are principally the dangers of *non-calculable* probability, a thoroughly different phenomenon from those to which the concept of ‘risk’ commonly refers. *Dangers that are non-calculable in principle arise in a setting that is irregular in principle, where broken sequences and the non-repetition of sequences become a rule, and normlessness a norm. They are uncertainty under a different name.*”³⁵

Theoretician Anthony Giddens believes that the concept of risk was commonly adopted around 16th and 17th centuries, from a vocabulary of Western explorers, which used it to describe the “uncharted waters”. Later, con-

³² Ibid. p. 91

³³ Manuel Castells, Organizational Globalization of Crime, Cultural Identification of Criminals, *The Information Age Economy, Society, and Culture: Volume III End of Millennium*, Second edition, With a new preface, (Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), p. 172 – 178. In: Dragana Vilić, Kriminal – socijalni rizik u savremenom društvu, *Политема*, Nr.13, year VII, Banja Luka: Fakultet političkih nauka, 2017, p. 98 - 99.

³⁴ Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Fear*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006. p. 92

³⁵ Ibid. p.92

notations broadened and had not only spatial but also temporal dimension,³⁶ marking possible consequences that could arise in the field of economy and money investments. According to Giddens, 'the risk' is connected to the concepts of possibility and uncertainty, linked to the activities whose outcome is unsure. The word 'risk' was unknown in the traditional ancient cultures (old Rome, ancient China, Egypt etc.), dominated by religion, tradition and anchored in the cult of nature. The concept was broadly adopted in modern, future-oriented societies, like western ones that were under the influence of industrialization. From industrialization onwards, the notion of risk got new, positive and widespread connotations: a risk became a source of energy, a well anticipated generator of wealth, carefully evaluated confiner for fertile opportunities and a "mobilizing dynamic of a society bent on change."³⁷ Giddens distinguishes two types of risk: external (comes from the external order of tradition and nature) and produced (manufactured by our knowledge about and impact on the world). Recently we started to take more care about the consequences that our activities leave on nature and less care about nature's influence on us – here we can also notice the influence of globalization on produced risk and its power over external one. The rise of risk is connected to the possibilities of statistical predictions and calculations.³⁸ As Giddens observes, in relation to previous periods, our society is not 'riskier' or more dangerous, but it is exactly the relation between risk and danger that has been changed – produced hazards represent an equal or greater threat from the external ones, and some of them have even catastrophic effects of the whole planet (ecological risks, nuclear technology or crash of economy), and some on personal, individual level (genetically modified nutrition, health, drugs, medicine, family etc.).³⁹

According to Bauman, a dense network of interdependencies is responsible for our mutually produced hazards and dangers. The problem arises in our traditionally limited (endemic) moral imagination – reduced to the circle of people who are spatially and temporarily close to us. Hope for solving this problem can be found in the appearance of 'information highways', whose "electronically mediated *tele*-proximity, may be a stimulus towards such an advancement – but to catch up with the scope of objective responsibility already attained an 'institutional stretch' still needs to be laid, paved and policed. Such a stretch is still stuck at the drawing-board stage; worse still, for

³⁶ Anthony Giddens, *Runaway world: how globalization is reshaping our lives*, Routledge, NY, 2000. p. 39-40

³⁷ *Ibid.* p. 42

³⁸ *Ibid.* p. 44-45

³⁹ *Ibid.* p. 48

all we know construction work is unlikely to start as long as the conditions of negative globalization prevail. If anything, the gap between the extent of our objective responsibility and the responsibility accepted, assumed and practiced is presently widening rather than being bridged.⁴⁰

Bauman makes distinction between ‘risks’ and present ‘uncertainty’ in the way they spread: risks are growing as they are spatially and temporarily approaching to the actors and their activities, in the case of uncertainty it is the opposite. “As the *spatial* distance grows, so does the complexity and density of the mesh of influences and interaction; as the temporal distance grows, so does the impenetrability of the future, that notoriously unknowable, ‘absolute’ other. Hence the paradox noted by Jonas – a paradox he struggled in vain to resolve: the effects of our actions, now reaching fair into the life conditions of yet unborn generations, demand unprecedented circumspection and an immense power of foresight; a power that nevertheless seems unattainable – not because of rectifiable and so hopefully transient faults in our cognitive faculties and efforts, but due to the essential and incurable aleatoriness of the future (of the ‘not yet’). The impact of the resulting contingencies expands at an exponential pace with every step our imagination takes as it stretches to catch up with the even longer duration of the direct results and side-effects of our decisions. Even the tiniest modification of the initial conditions, or a minuscule departure from the early developments anticipated, may result in a complete reversal of the end-states expected or hoped for.”⁴¹

There are numerous paradoxes of fluid society, and one of them is that our generation although fully technologically equipped to grasp time and space, is the most insecure, helpless, paranoid, endangered and confused one - because we firmly doubt our resources and our actions could help eradicate past and existing evil. “Just how insecure we feel living on a negatively globalized planet, and how the ‘moral lag’ – responsible for the deepening contradiction between the remoteness of the effects of actions and the short range of the concerns that shape them – makes any escape from the state of endemic uncertainty, and the insecurity and fear it breeds, hardly conceivable, have been brought home in a highly dramatic way by the rise of global terrorism.”⁴²

Indeed, this form of terrorism, as noted by Radomir Milašinović and Saša Mijalković, has a vast number of different manifestations, spiced up with the effect of surprise that is deepening fear, insecurity and uncertainty: abduction of people, stealing of vehicles, armed attacks on people and objects, car bombs,

⁴⁰ Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Fear*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006. p.93

⁴¹ Ibid. p.94

⁴² Ibid. p.95

assassinations, mental manipulations, political-ideological indoctrination, use of poison, harmful gases and other dangerous chemical substances. The root of terrorism is ideologically and politically motivated. From the importance of the victims (politicians, businessmen, journalists etc.), importance of locations (embassies, airports, hospitals) and a spectacle of the terrorist act, depends the 'echo' of a terrorist message. Terrorist act delivers a certain message – a demand for the realization of their requests and goals, with the warning on a possible consequence that would follow in the case that their demands are not fulfilled. Terrorist act is characterized by its *symbolism* (the victim is the symbol of the goal and an 'object of exchange'), expected *effects and reaction* (creating fear, panic, paranoia and direct reactions from states and other internationally legal bodies, as well as public and media), *systematic acts* (targeted, planned and organized crimes), almost *economical--effectiveness*, etc. Compared to traditional ones, the characteristics of contemporary terrorism are significantly altered by the increase in number of terrorist organizations, groups and individuals, a frequency of terrorist acts, their distribution and international dimension, spectacularity, mass victims, increased material damage, links between terrorism and organized crime, etc.⁴³

According to Bauman, military actions against modern forms of terrorism show endemic inefficiency and even complete counter-productiveness. In support of this attitude, Michael Meacher observes that the effectiveness of al-Qaida arose two years after September 11,⁴⁴ and according to Mark Danner, in this two years the terrorist organization became a world political movement, 'al-Qaedaism' – "a loose coalition of a score or so groups" and "homegrown spontaneous groups of friends".⁴⁵ Indeed, various reports of terrorist attacks that grow in number rapidly, show that anywhere in the world, every armed individual can make a small or a big size catastrophe. Intelligence services and state police have once waged a war on terrorism, but today, according to Bauman, not even the most powerful and well-equipped army in the world could win it, rather their actions produce opposite results in Afghanistan and Iraq – "the establishment of two brand new global magnets, greenhouses, powerhouses and training grounds for global terrorists, where the tactics of the 'anti-terrorists forces', their foibles and weaknesses,

⁴³ Radomir Milašinović i Saša Mijalković, „Terorizam kao savremena bezbednosna pretnja“, In: Vlada Republike Srpske, Ministarstvo unutrašnjih poslova, Uprava za policijsko obrazovanje Visoka škola unutrašnjih poslova u saradnji sa Hans Zajdel fondacijom, Suprotstavljanje terorizmu – međunarodni standardi i pravna regulativa, *Zbornik radova*, Banja Luka: Visoka škola unutrašnjih poslova, 2011, p. 3, 4 i 5.

⁴⁴ Michael Meacher, „Playing Bin Laden's game“, *Guardian*, 11.05. 2004, In: Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Fear*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006. p.96

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* p. 96

are studied by the terrorists and their global recruits, while new and yet more sophisticated outrages are plotted and rehearsed before they are staged in the anti-terrorists' homes.⁴⁶ The cruelty of USA counter-attacks and the anger of American community create conditions for the escalation of violence and unification of small, scattered military terrorist groups, with a horizontal and ad hoc 'structure' that act 'on their own' and successfully 'post' their 'deeds' on social media, into an organized terrorist cells. Thus, an integral part of the terrorist strategy is resorting to the means that are enabled by the process of globalization. "The worldwide notoriety promptly offered to the glory sights of even minor and comparatively inconsequential and insignificant terrorist acts can multiply their fear-inspiring potential, reaching the parts which the relatively scarce and often primitive and home-made arms at the terrorists' disposal (no comparison to the ample and high-tech weapons of their declared enemies) would never be able to reach, let alone seriously harm. That notoriety made possible by the worldwide television network and the web can also push the universal fears of vulnerability and the sense of ubiquitous danger far beyond the limits of the terrorists' own capacity."⁴⁷ The reactions of modern-equipped state militaries seem to be clumsy and awkward - in relation to terrorist attacks, they involve larger areas, cause vast number of 'collateral victims', produce more terror, more revolt and a general destabilization of the world. Thus, such a state reactions become an integral part of terrorists' plans, the main source of their strength and huge media news. The "closure" of open societies and the destruction of human freedoms seem as a long-term plan for various terrorist groups.⁴⁸ Europe is also facing this problem. Here we will give a listed details about the frequency of terrorist attacks and the number of victims for the period of March 2004 to August 2017: March 2004 bombing attacks on three trains in Madrid by Al Qaeda - 191 killed and about 2,000 people were wounded ; suicide attacks by four terrorists in London July 2005 - 56 killed and 700 wounded; a terrorist attack carried out by radically right extremist Anders Behring Breivik on July 22, 2011 on the island of Utoya - 77 died and more than 200 wounded; armed attack on the satirical magazine "Charlie Hebdo" in Paris on January 7, 2015 - 12 people were killed and 11 wounded; Attack of ISIS in Paris on 13 November 2015 - 130 killed and 368 wounded; a suicide attack on the airport and metro station in Brussels by ISIS on March 22, 2016 - 32 killed and 270 wounded; an attack by truck in Nice on July 14, 2016 - 84 killed and injured dozens of people; IS supporters truck ran over 12 people on Berlin Christmas

⁴⁶ Ibid. p. 96

⁴⁷ Ibid. p. 99

⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 100

Fair in 2016; car attack in London on March 22, 2017 - killed 4 people; in the tragedy of a stolen truck in the pedestrian zone of Stockholm in April 2017, five people were killed; a suicide bomber killed 22 people at the concert of Ariana Grande in Manchester on May 22, 2017; truck run over 14 people Barcelona on August 17, 2017.⁴⁹ Pierre de Bousquet, director of the French National Intelligence Service claims: "Hard-core Islamists are mixing with petty criminals. People of different backgrounds and nationalities are working together. Some are European-born or have dual nationalities that make it easier for them to travel. The networks are much less structured than we used to believe. Maybe it's the mosque that bring them together, maybe it's prison, maybe it's the neighborhood. And that makes it much more difficult to identify them and uproot them."⁵⁰ After the attack in Barcelona, prime minister of Spain Mariano Rajoy, characterized this attack as "jihadist terrorism" and noted that it demands a global response: "Today the fight against terrorism is the principal priority for free and open society like ours. It is a global threat and the response has to be global."⁵¹

According to Bauman, all of this is enabled by negative globalization: opening of state boundaries only with the goal to achieve better economic interests (free flow of capital, goods and information) has also enabled unrestricted movement of people. The solution for winning over terrorism requires a lot of time and effort, it is not in military operations and police actions, but in solving social, economic and political problems (debt write-offs for poor countries, opening up markets for their basic products, supporting education for children who do not have access to any school, etc.). But the governments of the richest countries (usually western ones) do not recognize this as a possible solution to the growing problem – ten times more money from their budget is spent on weapons than on aid for poor countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe.⁵² Supporting the claims of Zygmunt Bauman, we can quote the data of the International Peace Research Institute in Stockholm, according to which the USA continues to have a leading position in global weapon exports in the previous five years (1/3 of the share),

⁴⁹ Večernji.hr, *Ovo je 14 terorističkih napada u Europi posljednjih 10-ak godina*, 18/08/2017. <https://www.vecernji.hr/vijesti/ovo-je-14-najgorih-teroristickih-napada-u-europi-u-zadnjih-10-ak-godina189084> [28/08/2017.]

⁵⁰ See: Eliane Sciolino, „Europe meets the new face of terrorism“, *New York Times*, 1.7. 2005 quoted in Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Fear*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006. p.101

⁵¹ Slobodna Evropa, *Teroristi iz Barselone i Kambrilisa planirali veće napade*, 18.08.2017., <https://www.slobodnaevropa.org/a/28683738.html> [28.08.2017.]

⁵² Britain sets aside 13.3 per cent of its budget for armaments, spends 1.6 per cent. For the US, the disproportion is still far greater: 25 per cent against 1per cent. In: Zygmunt Bauman, in Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Fear*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006. p.102

rising for 21% in the period between 2007 and 2011 (and almost half of it is exported to the Middle East). On the second place is Russia, with around 1/4 of the world's exports, exporting to India, Vietnam, China and Algeria. On third, fourth and fifth place are China, Germany and France.⁵³

The policy of wealthy countries apparently does not analyze the causes, nor it solves the problem of terrorism. The latest data are showing increasing social inequalities in the world – more than half of the world's wealth is owned by 1% of the population, which is the best prove that on the deeper level, as Bauman states, there is no real interest in eradicating the terrorism. The International Organization Oxfam, in January 2017, before the start of the World Economic Forum in Davos, warned on the problem of poverty and inequality. In the study “Economy for 99 percent”, the global crisis of inequality continues to spread unharmed: the 8 richest people in the world have a wealth greater than a half of the world's population (\$ 426 billion), or 1 percent of the world population possesses 50, 8% of the world's wealth and resources, much more than expected. To its successors, 500 richest people of the world will transfer \$ 2.1 billion in the next 20 years, making it more than India's GDP. For less than \$ 3 a year, in the period from 1988 to 2011, the earnings of the 10% of the poorest people in the world grew, while in the same period incomes of the 1% of the richest people grew for 182 times. Therefore, in the past 25 years, 1% of population at the top gain more income (earnings) than 50% of those at the bottom. The key role in this change played super-rich individuals and big corporations, which in the period from 2015 to 2016, gained profit larger than the income of 180 countries together.⁵⁴

Analyzing global tendencies, Bauman also speaks about the phenomenon he calls – *religionization of politics*, referring to Juergensmeyer's exploration of inter-ethnic hostilities in Punjab, and later Kashmir, Sri Lanka, Iran, Egypt, Palestine, Israeli settlements, etc. This phenomenon is notable in the areas where in the name of religious denomination and spilled blood, the separating lines between tribes and classes are drawn. In these areas, religious language formulates all levels of social life (individual and collective identity), but it does not diminish or alter hardships and troubles people face (feeling of

⁵³ Sputnik Srbija, *SAD i Rusija su najveći izvoznici oružja u svetu 2012-2016.*, 20.02.2017., <https://rs-lat.sputniknews.com/naoruzanje/201702201110096165-SAD-Rusija-izvoz-oruzje-ranglista/> [12/05/2017.]

⁵⁴ OXFAM BRIEFING PAPER–SUMMARY: *AN ECONOMY FOR THE 99% - It's time to build a human economy that benefits everyone, not just the privileged few*, January 2017, https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/file_attachments/bp-economy-for-99-percent-160117-summ-en.pdf, p. 2 - 3.

alienation, marginalization and social frustration).⁵⁵ Similar to this phenomenon, is the one that Charles Kimball noticed in the political vocabulary of the USA administration, started in period of Ronald Reagan, and enhanced during the presidency of Bush Junior; vocabulary marked with political polarization of the world, by “cosmic dualism” between the forces of good and evil, “crusade” and “mission” under the Divine command of American military etc.⁵⁶ For the seekers of clarity, purity, freedom from suspicion and indecision in the contemporary world, the last shelter is a monotheistic religion paired with Manichaeic visions of the world. “They promise the treasures which the rest of the world blatantly and obstinately denies: self-approval, a clear conscience, the comfort of fearing no error and always being in right.”⁵⁷ It seems that our world, seen by Bauman, is an overloaded ship of non-coordinated rowers without helmsman and a reliable compass, where everyone struggles for absolute values, but no one believes nor declares that he or she is pursuing their own selfish interests. We, the inhabitants of the fluid part of the planet focus only on short-term projects and short-lived desires. Given that people face immediate dangers, it is expected they find instant, immediate solutions, which would function instantly here and now. In fact, fundamentalist difference in monotheistic religions, fulfill the desires of negative globalization.⁵⁸ Trust in contemporary human governance and state government is completely lost, again been replaced by trust in God’s administration. What today’s fundamentalist preachers are offering to their potential followers, according to Bauman, “is only an open and blatantly desecularized version of the totalitarian temptations that accompanied the whole of modern history, being tested with particular zeal ant to most spectacular effect by communist and fascist movements of the century that has just drawn to its close.”⁵⁹

The economy of the modern world is based on the high consumption of crude oil, hence the root of the conflict between west and different Islamic states that control resources. “What renders the opacity (the ambivalence, the irrationality) of such a plight yet deeper is that the Muslim world itself, by geopolitical coincidence, seems to be placed across a barricade. It so happens that the economy of the rich, ‘advanced’ countries is grounded in extraordinarily high oil consumption (dependent not just on the petrol destined to be burned in car engines, but also on oil-derived raw materials for essential

⁵⁵ Mark Juergensmeyer, „Is religion the problem?“, *Hedgehog Review*, 2004, p. 21 – 33. in Zigmunt Buman, *Liquid Fear*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006. p.103

⁵⁶ Charles Kimball, *When Religion Becomes Evil*, in Zigmunt Buman, *Liquid Fear*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006. p.104

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* p. 105

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* p. 106

⁵⁹ *Ibid.* p. 107

industries), while the economy of the US, by far the largest military power, thrives thanks to petrol prices being kept artificially low. It also happens that the most profuse supplies of crude oil, and the only ones promising to remain economically viable by the middle of the century, are under the administration of Islamic (more exactly, Arab) governments. Arabs hold their fingers on the lifelines of the West – the main taps from which the life-giving energy of the opulent and powerful West flows. They may – just may – cut its supply, with virtually unimaginable, but certainly dramatic (catastrophic from the point of view of Western powers) consequences for the planetary balance of power.”⁶⁰

Conscious of their privileged positions, dictators and kings of Islamic regimes play double roles, first they accept the help of “advanced” societies in power and material goods (for example US helping Iraq to fight Iran or additional military equipment or even western cars) and second they pretend that western culture and products is something they should fight against (for example free elections, women’s rights, minorities rights etc.).⁶¹ Therefore, the supporters of religious teachers which are fighting against secularized liberal democracy, could be found everywhere among the powerful ones and among millions of subordinated ones, both willing to dedicate their life for the voluntarily exercise of a violent sacrifice. “Another effect of the peculiar concatenation of circumstances is apparently the opposite: the selectively ‘Westernized’ section of the elite in the rich Islamic countries can stop wallowing in their inferiority complex. Thanks to their ‘nuisance power’, their potential control over riches which the West needs but does not possess, they can feel strong enough to attempt the final step: to claim a status superior to those who so blatantly depend for their survival on the resources which they, and they only, can claim to command. Nothing is so reassuring about one’s might as the fact of being bribed by the mighty...”⁶² Although, by selling of crude oil Islamic states are capable of buying more weapons, they are aware that it is far away from being enough to win over military powers of the mighty West. Therefore, they count on their most powerful “weapon” – a potential for creating antagonisms and insecurity in western societies – paralysis of large cities, such as New York or London, can be achieved with fewer weapons, people and actions than is needed to capture terrorists or their leaders hiding in the caves of non-urban neighborhoods.⁶³ To raise the waves of “general insecurity”, it is enough to have a dozen of terrorists always ready to kill. “Insecure

⁶⁰ Ibid. p. 109

⁶¹ Ibid. p. 111

⁶² Ibid. p. 111

⁶³ Ibid. p. 113

people tend to seek feverish for a target on which to unload their gathering of anxiety, and to restore their lost self-confidence by placating that offensive, frightening and humiliating sentiment of helplessness. The besieged fortresses into which the multi-ethnic and multicultural cities are turning are habitations shared by both the terrorists and their victims. Each side confirms the worst fears of the other and adds substance to their prejudices and hatreds. Between themselves, locked into a sort of liquid modern version of the *dance macabre*, the two sides won't allow the phantom of a siege ever to rest.”⁶⁴

David Lyon, in his study on surveillance technologies, widely installed in most capital cities after September 11 (intensified monitoring of ordinary people's everyday lives), speaks about not-intended consequences. They can only observe, capture and record visible, outdoor objects, but not what stands behind them, not what is inside – individual motives and choices. The consequence of this widespread surveillance is to change the category of individual suspect into “suspicious categories”. “Ordinary inhabitants of urban space, citizens, workers, and consumers – that is, people with no terrorist ambitions whatsoever – will find that their life-chances are more circumscribed by the categories in which they fall. For some, those categories are particularly prejudicial, restricting them from consumer choice because credit ratings, or, more insidiously, relegating them to second-class status because of their color or ethnic background. It is an old story in high-tech guise.”⁶⁵ But the surveillance continues. Last year, after two attacks – in Nice and Berlin, security and surveillance increased.⁶⁶ After the attacks in Spain, when 14 people were killed and more than a hundred injured, members of Muslim community in Spain gathered in order to send a message that not all Muslims are terrorists.⁶⁷

The greater amount of horror and larger group of terrorized people are planned products of terrorist attacks. Globally generated anger easily floats through the whole global space, bringing with it urge for the revenge in the name of all that feel victimized. Soil for the growth of terrorism is prepared all across the globe. Therefore, terrorists can hope to triumph everywhere, because on each corner they can easily find listeners of their messages. “The meeting between messages and listeners is greatly facilitated on a planet

⁶⁴ Ibid. p. 113

⁶⁵ David Lyon, „Technology vs. ‘terrorism’: circuits of city surveillance since September 11, 2001“, u: *Cities, War and Terrorism: Towards an Urban Geopolitics*, ed. Stephen Graham, Blackwell, 2004, p. 297 – 311 in: Zigmunt Buman, *Liquid Fear*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006. p.114

⁶⁶ Slobodna Evropa, *Teroristi iz Barselone i Kambrilisa planirali veće napade*, 18.08.2017., <https://www.slobodnaevropa.org/a/28683738.html> [28.08.2017.]

⁶⁷ b92, *Muslimani u Barseloni: Nismo teroristi, islam je mir*, 19.08.2017. https://www.b92.net/info/vesti/index.php?yyyy=2017&mm=08&dd=19&nav_category=78&nav_id=1294814 [28.08.2017.]

turned into a mosaic of ethnic and religious diasporas. On such a planet, the past separation between the ‘inside’ and the ‘outside’, or for this matter between the ‘center’ and ‘periphery’, is no longer tenable. The ‘externality’ of life-threatening terrorism is as notional as is the ‘internality’ of life-sustaining capital. Foreign-born words become flesh inside the country of arrival; alleged ‘outsiders’ prove in most cases to be locally born and bred individuals inspired/converted by ideas *sans frontières*. There are no front lines – only separate, widely dispersed and eminently mobile battlefields; no regular troops – only civilians turning soldiers for a day and soldiers on indefinite civilian leave. Terrorist ‘armies’ are all home armies, needing no barracks, no rallies and no parade grounds. The machinery of the nation-state, invented and groomed to guard territorial sovereignty and to set insiders unambiguously apart from outsiders, has been caught unprepared by the ‘wiring up’ of the planet.”⁶⁸

In the modern age under the influence of globalization, the idea of politically determined borders, set on the model of national states verified by Westphalian peace from 1648., is no longer functional. Bauman additionally reminds us that the notions of national state and their materializations is something very European, and that the mankind survived for longer historical periods without it. Only through Westphalian peace the ideas of national state, political sovereignty, territoriality and unification of faith was promoted. Therefore, there are no convincing evidences nor statements on the necessity of linking certain political framework to a certain ethnic and cultural organism, namely there is no evidence on the impossibility of establishing and maintaining one frame without the other. But, this unfortunate symbiosis amounts to the form of national state. In modern world, due to the limited rule (most of it is in the hands of big corporations), many national states are reduced to the fate of plankton. Different European ethnicities are equal in terms of their specificity, separation and insufficiency in the need for protection by the powers greater than theirs. This does not mean that some are not stronger than others. “If they are nullified from the level of national state and reoriented to a higher, European level, which I think is necessary today, the essential features of human solidarity should remain (such as a sense of shared belonging and mutual responsibility for a common future, or the ability to fight for each other and to take care for the welfare of others and to find lasting and friendly solutions for sporadic conflicts), though they have need to refer to institutional creation of public opinion an common will. The European Union claims (moving, though horribly slow, with hesitation, one step forward and two steps back) a rudimentary or embryonic form of

⁶⁸ Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Fear*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006. p. 115-116

a similar institutional framework, but encounters on its path, as the most obvious obstacle, a political establishment of already existing national states and their unwillingness to renounce the leftovers of their sovereignty (pieces that survived, explicitly said, thanks to the existence of the European Union's shield)."⁶⁹

All tested instruments of sovereignty, modern inventions of legal regulations (passports, visas, right to stay and its denial, naturalization and rejection), have generally been inefficient by the negative globalization and its spurs – “to retain an ability to act in a new world of diasporas and the tangle of ‘external’ and ‘internal’ connections and clashing loyalties which can no longer be united and held apart, while still preserving space for maneuver when faced with rapidly changing situations in the future – the powers that seem to be veering towards making *ambivalence* of legal status, rather than an unambiguity of residence and civil rights, ‘indefinite.’ All that does not promise an early freedom from ambivalence, that profuse source of anxiety, insecurity and fear suffered in equal measure by people caught in it and people living their lives in their obtrusive presence. No quick fix is conceivable, let alone at hand. With the increasingly diasporic spread of the world's populations and with the orthodox hierarchy of cultures all but dismantled, any suggestion of a replacement is likely to be hotly contested.”⁷⁰

Power and politics are increasingly moving in opposite directions. They were pushed out of violent open society under the pressure of the negative globalization and became fundamental global problems, which require global solution – the way to rejoin them (to concur them in the state).⁷¹ Old ways of dealing with current situation are no longer valid, while the new ones are not yet there. Before, people made a mutual agreement on authorized agent who is delegated in the name of others and in the order to fulfill task others can't. Most often this agent was a state that had simultaneously power (ability to do things) and politics (ability to decide which things are to be done). Today, however, such agents don't exist. Power and politics are divorced. In dealing with current and future problems, we are left on our own, to our own individual (re)-sources, inadequate compering to the size of a task. Finance, capital investment, trade, speculations, export of weapons, drug trade, criminal and mafia are ‘the powers’ that shape our world and our living conditions. They

⁶⁹ Zygmunt Bauman in conversation with Giuliano Battiston, *ZYGMUNT BAUMAN O BAUKU POBUNE I DRUŠTVENIJ NEJEDNAKOSTI*, 12/05/2014, <https://radiogornjigrad.wordpress.com/2014/05/12/intervju-saintervju-sa-zygmuntom-baumanom-bauk-pobune-bauk-pobune/> [07/07/2017.] republished from noviplamen.net, translation by Jasna Tkalec

⁷⁰ Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Fear*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006. p.117

⁷¹ Ibid. p.118

are beyond the reach of all existing political organs, because they have a global and extraterritorial character. While, politics, especially the state one, has a local character, sealed within the borders of a particular country. If we have a situation in which it is necessary to make certain decision, a vital problem would appear – an impossibility to choose an agent to which we would delegate the task. That is why today we have a ‘mild’ politics: diffused, confused and disoriented. The basic crisis, is the crisis of adequate agents and instruments of action. A hope that parliaments and other governmental institutions can save us, as Bauman points out, is inevitably lost – it drives citizens on the city streets and squares in search for alternative instruments of political action to suit the size of the challenges they are facing today (unemployment, breakdown of economy, insecure income, terrorism etc.).⁷²

In contemporary open societies, as Bauman claims, many demons became domesticated, but the worst of them is fear, born out of unsecure present and uncertain tomorrow – and perpetuated through the feeling of powerlessness. “To make our situation still worse, we lack the tools that could allow our pol-

⁷² The new model of political action fully emerged in Poland, patterned by Lech Walens, the legendary leader of the *Solidarność* that began the destruction of the Soviet Empire - he, together with shipyard workers, miners and factory workers who stubbornly remained on their posts, begun in 1989 a permanent occupation of squares, streets and other spaces until their demands were met. By staying on squares, people expressed a desire for a change, even this change being an emotional synchronization with others. “At first tried out on Facebook and Twitter, now it is tested on live ‘stock’. And it didn’t lose main characteristics of online enjoyment: a possibility to indulge in the present without thinking about tomorrow, to exercise all rights without any obligations. An amazing and contagious sense of communion, to be together and not to be alone anymore (...) Solidarity on Demand, solidarity lasting as long as the request (no a minute more). The solidarity not consisting so much in aspirations toward the common goal, as in the fact that the goal finally exists: me, you and everyone else, the rest of us (‘us’, people in the square), people who have goals and whose life finally got some meaning. (...) None of these movements have leaders, all enthusiastic supporters are coming from a different backgrounds, race, religion, and politics, and what unites them is their refusal to leave the things as there were. Each one of them has a barrier, a wall in the head that should be crashed. These barriers can be different from country to country, but each is blocking, preventing a path to better society and hospitable humanity, each barrier is seen as the one whose plundering will mean the end of the suffering that caused protests. About the shape things will get afterwards, should be asked only when everything else is already done, when once and for all a place for a new and better society is thoroughly cleansed (...) Combining a unique demolition model with a blurry picture of the world to come, the one that would appear after the demolition, is simultaneously the power and the weakness of the people on the streets. We’ve already seen that the movements of indignant people are all-powerful when they act as demolition teams. Still, we don’t have a prove of their capability to build and create.” Zygmunt Bauman in conversation with Giuliano Battiston, *ZYGMUNT BAUMAN O BAUKU POBUNE I DRUŠTVENOJ NEJEDNAKOSTI*, 12/05/2014, <https://radiogornjigrad.wordpress.com/2014/05/12/intervju-saintervju-sa-zygmuntom-baumanom-bauk-pobune-bauk-pobune/> [07/07/2017.] republished from noviplamen.net, translation by Jasna Tkalec

itics to be lifted to the level where power has already settled, so enabling us to recapture and repossess control over the forces shaping our shared condition, and thereby to define the range of our opinions as well as draw limits of our freedom to choose: the kind of control which has presently slipped out – or has been torn out – of our hands. The demon of fear won't be exorcised until we find (or more precisely construct) such tools"⁷³

Conclusion

Bauman's interpretation of the contemporary man, as the one defined through fears and uncertainties, perpetuated by the pressure of the negative globalization, doesn't give us much space for optimism and positive outlook on the future directions in which global society should move. We cannot fully accept Bauman's exclusive black and white imagery of the world (he ignores the importance of modern technology, its rationalization of time and space and a help it has in communication and education, etc.), nor we can claim as Popper that "all is not so bad". The direction in which the modern man walks, his dreams and wishes have changed – he is afraid of the 'surplus freedom' and prays for security, not knowing how long the current situation will last. There is no clear vision of the future – we do not know exactly where we want to be. Old is not functional, new is not there.⁷⁴ Trust in humankind, in righteousness and reason, three pillars of open society are undoubtedly vanishing. Unlike the "original" meaning of an open society, as critical, rational, free society, Zygmunt Bauman sees the "openness" of societies as a solely imposed by negative globalization. According to him, this openness is the cause of injustice, conflict and violence. In fact, globalization did not open state borders, but destroyed them, blew them away and enabled only a passage for capital to move smoothly, followed by information and terrorism. Terrorism became a daily reality of the 'open, liquid man'. Lack of security, surveillance and fear spread like a virus. Also, social inequalities are constantly increasing.

Under the influence of negative globalization, the borders of national states are collapsing (sovereignty is jeopardized) and power and politics are

⁷³ Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Fear*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006. p.118

⁷⁴ Zygmunt Bauman in conversation with Aleksandra Klich – *NISAM PROPOVJEDNIK, JA SAM DIJAGNOSTIČAR*, translation of polish original by Tanja Miletic Oručević, tačno.net, 20.01.2013. <http://www.tacno.net/novosti/zygmunt-bauman-nisam-propovjednik-ja-sam-dijagnosticar/> [12.07.2017.] or polish original published in *Magazyn Świąteczny Gazeta Wyborcza* and on *wyborcza.pl* 18.01.2013 http://wyborcza.pl/magazyn/1,124059,13259382,Boimy_sie_wolnoscii_marzymy_o_wspolnocie.html?disableRedirects=true [20.12.2017]

apart (power without political control and politics without power). Regardless of many (global) problems, fears, dangers and insecurities that are now largely beyond our control, it is urgent for all social subjects to quickly find effective responses to crisis we are dealing with.

Literature

Alexander, Jeffrey, Modern, Ante, Post and Neo: How Intellectuals Have Tried to Understand the „Crisis of our Time“, *Zeitschrift fur Soziologie*, 23(3), 1994, p. 165 – 197. U: Valerio Baćak, O pojednostavljivanju modernosti: kritika Baumana i Giddensa, *Diskrepancija*, Svezak 8, broj 12, (Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, 2007), str. 5 - 19.

Alexander, Jeffrey and Philip Smith, Social Science and Salvation: Risk Society as Mythical Discourse, *Zeitschrift fur Soziologie*, 25(4), 1996, p. 251 – 262. U: Valerio Baćak, O pojednostavljivanju modernosti: kritika Baumana i Giddensa, *Diskrepancija*, Svezak 8, broj 12, (Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, 2007), str. 5 - 19.

Baćak, Valerio. O pojednostavljivanju modernosti: kritika Baumana i Giddensa, *Diskrepancija*, Svezak 8, broj 12, (Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, 2007), str. 5 – 19.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Liquid Modernity*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000). U: Ozren Biti, Potraga za odgovorom na nedefinirano pitanje: Zygmunt Bauman i sociologija protočne potrošnje, *Filozofska istraživanja* 125, God. 32, Sveska 1, (Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo - Filozofski fakultet, 2012), (109 – 119) i Valerio Baćak, O pojednostavljivanju modernosti: kritika Baumana i Giddensa, *Diskrepancija*, Svezak 8, broj 12, (Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, 2007), str. 5 – 19.

Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Fear*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006)

Zygmunt Bauman in conversation with Aleksandra Klich – *NISAM PROPOVJEDNIK, JA SAM DIJAGNOSTIČAR*, translation of polish original by Tanja Miletić Oručević, tačno.net, 20.01.2013. <http://www.tacno.net/novosti/zygmunt-bauman-nisam-propovjednik-ja-sam-dijagnosticar/> [12.07.2017.] or polish original published in *Magazyn Świąteczny Gazeta Wyborcza* and on wyborcza.pl 18.01.2013

http://wyborcza.pl/magazyn/1,124059,13259382,Boimy_sie_wolnoscimarzymy_o_wspolnocie.html?disableRedirects=true [20.12.2017]

Zygmunt Bauman in conversation with Giuliano Battiston, *ZYGMUNT BAUMAN O BAUKU POBUNE I DRUŠTVENOJ NEJEDNAKOSTI*, 12/05/2014, [https://radiogornjigrad.wordpress.com/2014/05/12/intervju-saintervju-sa-zygmuntom-baumanom-bauk-pobune-bauk-pobune/\[07/07/2017.\]](https://radiogornjigrad.wordpress.com/2014/05/12/intervju-saintervju-sa-zygmuntom-baumanom-bauk-pobune-bauk-pobune/[07/07/2017.]) republished from noviplamen.net, translation by Jasna Tkalec

Biti, Ozren, Potraga za odgovorom na nedefinirano pitanje: Zygmunt Bauman i sociologija protočne potrošnje, *Filozofska istraživanja* 125, God. 32, Sveska 1, (Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo - Filozofski fakultet, 2012), (109 – 119).

b92, *Muslimani u Barseloni: Nismo teroristi, islam je mir*, 19.08.2017. https://www.b92.net/info/vesti/index.php?yyyy=2017&mm=08&dd=19&nav_category=78&nav_id=1294814 [28.08.2017.]

Castells, Manuel, Organizational Globalization of Crime, Cultural Identification of Criminals, *The Information Age Economy, Society, and Culture: Volume III End of Millennium*, Second edition, With a new preface, (Wiley-Blackwell, 2010). U: Dragana Vilić, Kriminal – socijalni rizik u savremenom društvu, *Polumeua*, broj 13, godina VII, (Banja Luka: Fakultet političkih nauka, 2017), str. 84 – 113.

Anthony Giddens, *Runaway world: how globalization is reshaping our lives*, (Routledge, NY, 2000)

Milašinović, Radomir i Saša Mijalković, „Terorizam kao savremena bezbednosna pretnja“, U: Vlada Republike Srpska, Ministarstvo unutrašnjih poslova, Uprava za policijsko obrazovanje Visoka škola unutrašnjih poslova u saradnji sa Hans Zajdel fondacijom, Suprotstavljanje terorizmu – međunarodni standardi i pravna regulativa, *Zbornik radova*, (Banja Luka: Visoka škola unutrašnjih poslova, 2011), str. 1 – 16.

OXFAM International, *OXFAM BRIEFING PAPER-SUMMARY: AN ECONOMY FOR THE 99% - It's time to build a human economy that benefits everyone, not just the privileged few*, January 2017, https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/file_attachments/bp-economy-for-99-percent-160117-summ-en.pdf, p. 2 - 3. [11.09.2017.]

Popper, Karl R., *Otvoreno društvo i njegovi neprijatelji*, translation Branimir Gligorić, (Sarajevo: Pravni centar Fond otvoreno društvo Bosne i Hercegovine, 1998).

Slobodna Evropa, *Teroristi iz Barselone i Kambrilisa planirali veće napade*, 18.08.2017., <https://www.slobodnaevropa.org/a/28683738.html> [28.08.2017.]