

Professor Slobodan Vukićević¹¹ University of Montenegro*Received: 16 December 2012 Accepted: 31 December 2012 Published: 15 January 2013*

Abstract

Anthropocentrism magnifies the importance of existence in relation to man's essence. This degrades the generic essence of the man and his genuine need for nature. The principles of sustainable development are at stake. The way modern man lives and works stands in deep contrast with these principles. Thus, the central issue of sustainable development is: where are the causes of alienation of modern man from the principles of sustainable development? For the answers have to look at human nature and the nature of the human community. Their synthesis may direct socio anthropogenesis of modern man in the direction of accepting the principles of sustainable, that is responsible development, in which the principle of needs is more important than the need itself.

Index terms— anthropocentrism, existence, essence, sustainable-responsible development, eco needs.

1 Anthropocentrism: Existence against Essence

Professor Slobodan Vukićević I.

The Limitations of Anthropocentrism generic essence of man and his community is inseparable from nature. The process of creating a man and his community went gradually so the satisfaction of man's material and spiritual needs couldn't only be made on the basis of logos components of generic essence. This process inevitably includes a historical component in form of the existing natural and creating social assumptions that is the achieved degree of development of man and his community. The attitude of society towards nature, which is constituted in every society in a specific way, is an important context of continuous dynamic sublimation of human existence and essence. So, the relation of man toward nature, we cannot explain at the level of existence only, but by a mixture of human existence and essence, which follows the simultaneous emancipation of consciousness and emancipation of sensibility. Thus, the question of certain passions, desires, aspirations is always derived from the point of the generic essence of man and society. It is not possible to establish a oneway line here. At the point at which the Great Work of Nature and the Great Work of Man meet, the passions and interests come together and it is important to have in mind the authenticity of either of them. This eternal Law of Nature and Man and his Community "follows" the Author: Montenegro. Doctor of Sociology Science, University professor. University of Montenegro, Faculty of Philosophy -The Institute of Sociology and Psychology, Nikšić. e-mail: vukicevic@t-com.me whole history of humans and human community. Its action we must have in mind while constituting all social institutions, first of all while constituting institutions and institutionalization of social relations and relations toward nature too. The whole dynamics of history has a character of contemporaneous existential and essential development of generic essence of man and his community. This is particularly evident through the consequences of existential and essential activities, without which sociological science couldn't constitute its holistic interpretation of social phenomena. Consequences cannot be predicted accurately, but the probability that positive or negative consequences will happen to the man, society and nature can be predicted.

Economistic approach is particularly invalid in terms of predicting the consequences which are not only non-economic, but are quite the new phenomena in relation to the causes which initiated them. Every choice based on this is invalid with many negative consequences. The result of economistic theory and practice are serious social crises. "From these crises arose a terrible combination of inflation and depression"(John Ralston Sol, 1901, 1922). The world is in state of crisis of human values (inflationary paradox of needs—"putting into circulation" many artificial needs pernicious for human nature and nature in general) followed by depression, and depression as a result of globalization refers to the human nature, the nature of human society, and the relationship to nature in general, and certainly not just on economics, business, customs, oil, inflation, energy crisis, unemployment,

etc. These economic categories and individualism based on them unify their citizens; stifle their personality and ethnocultural identity. Such citizenry is against human nature and the nature of human community. It is a very predictable consequence. In the minds of globalization technocrats (political and managerial structures, especially contemporary transnational bourgeoisie) the problem remains aside. They deal with various aspects of the recession (the energy crisis, inflation, unemployment, economic stagnation) based exclusively on the market and claiming that they can be successfully overcome only in the system of globalization, where the economy of "forced growth" is absolute, raising more artificial barriers between man and nature. Globalization is transforming into a system dedicated to the system (only a market system even), and not to the man and his society. By applying a critical sociological approach we discover a colossal sociological fact that with absolute market based on the principles of neo-liberal economics, the market necessity is declared as social necessity, which is a complete theoretical and methodological failure. It is the absurd assumption that all the necessity is at the market, that human nature is determined by the market, as well as the nature of the society. Such an environment, or the logic of the situation as Popper said, cannot make man behave in a responsible way towards nature.

Global economism ignores the fundamental fact that a man is manifested as a social being and that his social being is created by subliming the overall biological, psychosocial and cognitive structure of an individual in the essential ambience (spirituality, culture, philosophy, religion, moral, norms, etc.) of his community. Therefore, the central scientific and social issue has always been to what extent man's 'contemporaneity' and 'contemporaneity' of man's community qualitatively interfere or disagree? And why do they disagree? The man and society meet here in a complex process of sublimation of their essential and existential determinations, which cannot be reduced only to their meeting at the market and because of the profit, as neoliberal economists think. The important elements of this process and their relations get a specific form and typology as a special social objectivity, so that their identification is a necessary scientific basis for answering the above questions.

All important causes of the crisis: 'enforced growth', lack of energy, insatiable consumption and similar are finally realised as a violation of the natural system. This necessarily means a violation of human nature and nature of human community. Liberal globalism shows some kind of care for protection of the nature by physical-technical and technological means, and not its logic. The violation of the logic of the natural system, which has not only its physical, but also its metaphysical side, means a violation of human nature and the logic of human community. Technocrats are not aware of this or they do not want to be aware, that is this awareness does not reach their conscience. More precisely, the politics and ideology of liberal globalization, based on the dominance of the developed countries in relation to the non-Western world, does not allow establishing of the ethics of responsibility for the consequences that liberal globalization has for the whole humanity.

It has been calculated (UNESCO: Berghahn Books, 2008, third: Discussions of 21 st century) that if the American model of spending was implemented in all modern societies, we would need 3-4 planets Earth more. It is obvious that despite the fact that the USA applies the aforementioned principle of consumption by using natural and other resources beyond its means, the exhaustion of the country's military and economic potential reveals a serious crisis of American society. Koitsiro Matsuura, UNESCO Secretary General, said, based on the findings of the UNESCO book that mankind could be saved only if we combine growth and sustainable development, rather than considering them as opposites. Understanding, not only the objective, but also the subjective substantiality of technology, we can avoid the limitations of technical and technological determinism. 'Technological determinism assumes that the direction of technical changes is essentially determined by technical factors especially by the internal logic of technologies itself' ??Johnston, McGregor, Taylor 2000, 321). This ignores the full meaning of technical as a general model of our relation to nature, shapes of consciousness and relationships between people, i.e. technology as a meeting point between the human spirit and nature. Modern society which is based on a scientific and technicaltechnological development is seriously threatened by technical-technological determinism.

Technicaltechnological determinism assumes that the direction of technical changes is essentially determined by the technical factor, especially by the technology itself. At the same time, an important fact that every technology 'produces' a social relationship is ignored, and we must not underestimate the power of technology in changing the brains (especially those of young people), because it is a fundamental change in our culture and our nature. Ignoring these facts brings the progress of society into question.

A progressive combination of growth and sustainable development can be based only on the responsible approach to nature which entails a permanent overcoming of the contradictory relationship between gender and the individual. Neoliberal economy and liberal globalism produce a disastrous treatment of the nature. Leading political management structures refer to the nature as if it was the exclusive property and ownership of this generation, especially the political elite. In the domain of ownership they enact laws that establish a monopoly of one generation (current generation) over the natural resources, and in the domain of property, natural resources turn into their personal, a narrow group's property. They show no regard for the generations who have preserved the nature nor of the future generations who should ensure their survival in the only nature we have. Sustainable development cannot be provided without the differentiated institutionalization of human, generational and individual property rights in relation to nature. Thus differentiated property rights can ensure the constitution of an ownership structure which will operate on the principles of responsible development and which is impossible without taking into account the eco needs as cardinal social values. Preservation of nature causes and consequences of its disruption are primarily related to the behaviour of our society towards nature

and to the behaviour of man as a social being towards nature. The basis of this behaviour is the notion eco-need. The character of the relation society-man-nature, based on the principle of need, not the reduced need itself, is expressed through it.

Therefore, the study and identification of types of interdependence of human society and nature from the viewpoint of the established social relations, institutions and organizations as well as from the perspective of socio anthropogenesis of man as a social being, is a specific domain of sociological science. Sociological typology of environmental phenomena can be derived based on a differential analysis of the interdependence of nature and specific ontological content of social groups: social relations, institutions and organizations, formal and informal social structures and special ontic content of the totality of man, and that means cultural, labour, political, family, ethnical, religious and emotional content of his being and existence.

To what extent and in what manner are the econeeds contained in all these relations, that is, what is nature like as a value?

How much does the man harmonize the values of humankind with the values of nature? Does man with his powers exceed the power of nature?

To what extent the established value system implies the eco-needs and its dynamics in the field of consciousness and in the domain of sensibility?

The relation society-man-nature is contained in these matters, and represents the core of the ecological phenomenon which is a part of the formula 'sustainable development', because if the development is sustainable, it's not a development. If 'development' questions eco-needs, in the sense of essential existential connection with nature, it cannot be treated as development. Thus, we will treat the term sustainable development as a process of meeting fundamental human needs, with eco-needs at its core. The eco-need contains the principle of the ethics of responsibility and this qualifies 'sustainable development' as a responsible development in terms of qualitative mediation of essential and existential determination of man and his community with nature.

It is well-known that the man has gone away from the direct touch with nature; direct belonging to the nature, but that does not mean that he has completely abandoned it. Not only is the man by origin a natural being, but his total existence is still not separable from the law of nature which cultivates his social being through a specific relation with nature. This specific method assumes an essential and sensitive domain of the human generic essence.

A sociological examination of the influence of natural factors on the spiritual and social life of people and their communities must be based on the indisputable fact that man is a subject (of course with an overall ontic definiteness and limitations, cognitive and motivational) of that relationship, which in a creative way gives this relation spirituality and sociability. This is explicitly manifested through the fact that same or similar natural conditions will never produce the same spiritual and social life of people and their community, and this immediately means a different sort of econeeds.

Man's position as the subject establishes a reverse turn in the understanding of the impacts of natural factors in the social and spiritual life of the people and their communities. 'Therefore we can say that the impact of natural factors and phenomena on human spirituality is first of all understood as an activity of spirit itself, and after that as an 'influence' of natural factors themselves" (Zunec, 1984,14). This simply means that any relationship between man and nature cannot be seen as simply adapting the human to the natural conditions. A man is a creator of that relationship, but this in any case does not mean that he is in a position to create a total subjugation of nature to himself and his plans and ideas. Establishing a relationship between man and nature based on anthropocentrism is not only beneficial for the nature, but more so for the survival of man himself. It convincingly shows the total current history, especially the contemporary social reality. The relationship between man and nature is manifested primarily through man's relation to his generic essence. In the generic sense of man and society, the relation with nature stands out, personal and overall nature, as an essential feature of their being and existence.

Existence, as realisation process of that relation, depends substantially on the reached level of culture of individualism and culture of collectivism in one society. When we say process, this means that there can be no talk of an established state, but it represents the life dynamics of direct and daily behaviour of individuals, enterprises and institutions of a society. Of course, this life dynamics has to be based on social assumptions on which cultures of individualism and collectivism are built and typified.

Culture of individualism manifests itself as the culture of the individual, the citizen, based on his motives, needs, interests, preferences, the level of culture and behaviour, and society as a concept that takes the individual as the primary unit of the institutional and legal structure.

Culture of collectivism has also two levels: collectivist elements contained in the culture of the individual-citizen, and in particular, the concept of a society in which the collective is primary in the relation to the individual.

Eco-need is a part of the general culture of society and personal principle of behaviour and acting. These are important contents of the meeting of essence and existence between man and nature, as an expression of the generic essence of man and his community. This meeting is also a border of their freedom. The level of culture in a society (culture of individualism and collectivism) is determined by the level of qualitative, logos-historical mediating of its essence and existence. Therefore, the existentialist anthropocentrism is unacceptable, because it significantly reduces the eco-need as an eco-culture of a society.

2 II.

3 Crisis of Human Nature

Understanding the relationship of man to nature in the modern society is very complicated in the depths of produced crisis of the human nature itself. Anthropologists warn: 'It is not a question of what is the human nature like, but the question is whether we need it at all? Today the man is on the verge of no longer defining himself as a man' (Sekulic, 2002, 365). A man has to define himself as a man, as a part of the society and nature, as his cultivated nature becomes a special culture. These are the indispensable premises of his existence, his existence as a man. 'The man is now able to produce people in a test tube for reagents. So, the man becomes a product, and thus fundamentally changes the relationship of man to himself. He is no longer a gift of nature or of God the Creator; he is his own product. 'The man walked deep into the crater of power, at the source of his own existence' (Ratzinger, 2006, 15). The man produces himself independently of nature and God. Does this call into question his essence as a human being? Does this reduce his essence to existence? In a survey conducted about the 21st century in 1958, Isidora Sekulic, poetically and prophetically said: 'Today's man is rushing as no one ever has. His victories are magnificent, superhuman, he lights a volcano wherever he wants, in the tiny atom or of the entire continent and people. Are limitations to come to him too? Does he have to get back to the land and bread? And if it ever comes to it, what will happen to him, what will he be?' (Sekulic, 2009).

It is not just that the relation of man to himself is changing, but his being and existence is fundamentally changing, his relation to nature, religion, way of looking at things, attitude towards society and the cultivating of own nature.

(Here's one anecdote that best illustrates the relationship of modern man to nature: Direct from a bar, a drunk man went home, but on the way fell asleep next to the river. Only when he woke up he noticed the river next to him, and because he was thirsty after a huge amount of alcohol, he said the following words: "What you ran, you ran." His main goal was to satisfy thirst as his current need. What consequences the disappearance of the river will have for people, society, nature, and for himself does not affect neither his conscience nor consciousness).

4 III.

5 Ecological Phenomenon is Originally a Local Phenomenon

Ecological problem is a civilizational and cultural problem of modern society par excellence.

However, this cognition remains only an abstraction that does not mean much, if the environmental problem is not defined as a local problem, as the Greek word 'ecology' means the study of your own home. This doesn't mean negligence of general knowledge and principles, but it means respecting those theories and principles that were confirmed in empirical generalizations. Only in this way can we perform the most important task of every person 'to learn to manage ourselves in relation to nature' (Bernadski, 1994, 34) and be saved from wandering, mindless steps, behaviours and actions.

Affirming the local approaches in the study of environmental problems does not mean accepting partial observation of such a complex phenomenon, like ecological. Local approach represents a transition from the general theory and broader empirical research on applicable, practical level of study and creation of scientific and professional knowledge, which also must have a theory, its methods, strategies, tactics and resources. Only in this way will the ecological theory, environmental projects and environmental programs remain a 'dead letter' without any acceptance by social actors to which they apply.

In every local community we have the specific parameters of the environment and their relationship with certain productions and activities. In addition, there are specific elements of culture, morality, psychology, behaviour of individuals, groups, institutions that have a crucial impact on the development of environmental awareness and sensitivity. All of these make every ambience special, with its "logic of the situation" and its dynamics, which we can environmentally understand, interpret and effectively act based on specific interdisciplinary research. Only in this way will environmental plans and programs, short and long term, on which in Montenegro as an Ecological State is constantly working, will not have a utopian character, whose utopian character has no basis to be realized. Instead, they will be real utopias which have realistic foundations to become a part of the history. This approach is a realistic assumption for achieving the desired connection between environmental changes and social actors: individual citizens, social institutions and organizations, to the state as an entirety. A Man with the Principle of Sustainable Development-First and Basic Assumption

The first and fundamental prerequisite for a responsible development is man who incorporates the need for sustainable development as eco-need. This is a man to whom the principle of the need is more important than need itself. This is a man who at any time approaches nature as a whole, other people, production (life cycle assessment of production and its consequences, environmental marking and environmental aspects in standards); resource economics, public goods, business (from the point of view of the combined eco-management and quality management), urbanization and cultural heritage, his community and other communities with the principle of need, not the need itself. The principle of need sets every person, every community and every institution and organization at the beginning in terms of the principles by which one lives and works, and that means a state of constant ethic of responsibility for the consequences of their actions, deeds and behaviour, conscientious attitude towards the environment at any time.

Conscience and consciousness of man on the eco-need are constantly in touch when it comes to the protection of nature and living in harmony with nature. In a contemporary Society there is a principle of abundance, but in a completely perverted sense of its original meaning. The original meaning of the principle of abundance, even in ancient philosophy, meant that the existence and abundance of existence must be in accordance with the possibilities of existence, that is, with the principle of responsible and sustainable development. In the activities of modern man, consciously or unconsciously, two myths still dominate: the myth of inexhaustible wealth of nature and the myth of unlimited possibilities of its regeneration. The balance between the natural and the cultural system is so disturbed that we have far exceeded the tolerance line. This means that the principle of abundance is destroyed by neglecting the possibilities of existence, since more and more we bring into question the very existence of man and his community. How can we talk about sustainable development in such a situation?

We really need to mark as paradoxical the fact that modern man has not sufficiently understood (received principle use) the fact that the degradation of nature primarily threatens social life, that is, the existence of the man as a man. The fact that the nature has existed without the man for billions of years, but that the man cannot live without nature, is rightly emphasized. The paradox is even more evident when we consider the fact that there has never been more environmental projects, environmental programs, and educational programmes in ecology at all levels of education, environmental movements and organizations, and relation to nature in the operations, procedures and human behaviour has never been more arrogant.

In one of our research on managerial awareness of the environment and the working environment, 97.7% believe that the lack of appropriate culture of living is a greater problem than the lack of environmental education (Vukicevic, 1996, 89). Therefore, the following statement is true: 'For me, the acceptable assumption is that the end of the world will be caused by people themselves, by self-destruction and the destruction of nature, after the formation of the space colonies where, most likely human destruction will settle. At this stage of human development it is better to ask what the cause of human need to know 'the exact date of 'the end of the world' is? Why are people more interested in the date of end of the world, i.e. the destruction of nature, than the date of successful nature conservation?' (Petric, 2011, 1). The question can also be formulated in this way: What is the cause of loss of ecological needs in humans, as that is the main cause of the end of the world? A possible breakthrough in the universe cannot in any way justify the destruction of nature on planet Earth. Such 'progress' does not match the generic essence of man and his community. Egotistical view of the world is prevailing as the result of anthropocentrism, and it is the result of the liberal, especially neo-liberal economies. It's an egotistical vision, by which the disaster will bypass us personally and affect the others. In the neoliberal variety, the economically rich and powerful will provide a 'new beginning' on another planet. This is the ultimate form of existential anthropocentrism based on unconditionality of man in terms of his essential determination. It's about creating a new myth that 'sets free' the main actors of destroying the nature from the ethics of responsibility.

V.

6 Attitude towards our Personal Nature

In the above indicated elements, the central place belongs to the formation of our attitudes towards the sustainable development and growth based on the principle of eco-needs, and the ethics of responsibility. At the individual level, primarily is our relationship to our personal nature, which is indicated by the increasing use alcohol, drugs and other destructive means of our own nature. So we have to start from the relation to our own nature. If a man does not own a principle of sustainable development of his own nature, it is logical that he cannot respect the principle of nature in general, the other man or the community. If the principle of 'forced growth' rules the economy, according to which the only survivors are the ones who have survived at the market, and not the ones who has survived in the nature, in accordance to the possibilities of nature, we cannot talk about sustainable development. This directly(D D D D) D 2013

brings into the question the proper relationship between sustainable development and growth, and they are brought into contrast. Therefore, in the modern ethical codes, in addition to a number of principles for the promotion and protection of human values, the following stands out: our own being-software engineers themselves need lifelong learning regarding the change of their profession and they should promote an ethical approach to the change of their profession". (Götterbarn 1994, 4).

7 VI. Social Changes and Social Actors

The change is obviously necessary. To which actors we can rely on for the necessary change? The most important thing is a realistic assessment, i.e. the assumption of directing the changes in the desired direction. Sustainable development is a compact social process that constantly promotes progress of man and his community, and that means the dynamics of econeeds. For each particular society it is important to know that economics, especially social development, cannot be based on a single area or single factor, no matter how significant it is, but we must take into account the interdependence of a number of important factors and fields of social development and its directing towards the realization of fundamental human values, among which ecological needs have a central place. A central question is to what extent the society promotes interest that is not reduced to an anthropocentric vision of economic importance. The economic significance of interest has become dominant rather late in the history of the term: 'He rather included the whole of human aspirations, but signified an element of calculation

and deliberation in relation to the way it was supposed to follow these tendencies' (Hirsman 1995, 5). Here the unity of passions-human desires and reason is lucidly stated through the element of deliberation and calculation in relation to the method or principle by means of which these aspirations should be satisfied. It's not just a simple unity, but a process of sublimation in which all elements obtain the sublime and as such they receive a specific valence (passion is no longer 'naked' passion) in creating an interest sphere that has a full human meaning (Vukicevic, 2003). This is the moment that modern anthropocentric man is missing. The modern anthropocentric man who has not internalised the principles of sustainable development (eco-needs) cannot be an active participant of a responsible sustainable development.

8 VII. Social Circumstances and Human Nature

Obviously, we have to ask ourselves where are the causes of modern man's rejection of the principles of sustainable development i.e. the eco-needs, as his way of life and work. Is it a product of human nature itself, or is crucial the social situation 'which could hardly be reduced to the motives and the general laws of human nature' (Popper, 1993, 120). Sociological research convincingly shows that our behaviour, our actions, our methods can be rather explained by the social circumstances that produce the social system of a specific character and the values it promotes than by our human nature and its social-psychological characteristics.

Today, these circumstances are substantially determined by globalization as a total social change, which affects the whole of the contemporary social reality. However, human values get a 'meaningful adequacy' and 'subject rationality' in the way of thinking and feeling, which is the initiator of human behaviour and of the relationship between people and man's relationship with nature, i.e. in the totality of production of the social life of a specific society. The framework of our knowledge inevitably relies on a constant connection between the global and the local. According to this, a survey of the fundamental human values must be carried out not only based on the sense of something, but more importantly based on the sense, significance and meaning for someone. From this point the question arises: what is the subject (with all the motivational and cognitive limitations) which gives meaning to globalization or achieves a certain meaning in globalization? Are those all people or only certain people, certain groups of wealthy, powerful states, political elites, local communities, etc. Who are those subjects that in the name of history are spreading division between the rich and the poor, commit violence and terrorism, destroy nature, threaten democracy and freedom. In the name of what sense of globalization do people agree to this, because the consent of people is inevitable, regardless of whether the modern man accepts it as his anthropocentric nature or the consent is involuntary. 'And in the use of the human rights of refusal lies all the pathos of moral judgment and moral beings in terms of closure for all other options' (Knjazceva, 2008, 143). Those are the moments without which we cannot understand the full meaning that we give to history, and therefore the meaning of globalization as a historical process. Determinists can interpret the sense of history as a future state toward which history necessarily leads, and human consent or non-consent as a causally produced epiphenomenon. However, it is obviously a reduction of human nature to necessity and its purely causal explanation without the inevitable non deterministic component without which the essence of human nature is lost. It is human nature to overcome the limitations of the necessity of future 'good', because something cannot be good for people if it is only necessary. Human good must have a moment of indeterminism, that is, a full meaning, a meaning and significance for a particular individual and his community. This essence can be achieved only on the basis of a qualitative mediation of the global and the local, a mediation affirming the quality of both, which thus directs the progress of a society towards a constant achievement of fundamental human needs and gives meaning to existence as a realization of the essence based on the principle of sublimation (constant sublimity of both).

The affirmation of the specific man and his possibilities does not mean the postmodern denial of the need for the established standards that monitor and direct the nature of man and his community, and the nature of man is not only positive but also destructive. In fact, if no measures, if no values inherited from the past are valid as well as constituted political systems based on the principles of freedom, then the question is whether any individual can just feel free to express his/her wishes and constructive potentials as well as their destructive potential. Without that we cannot look for answers to the question of why people strayed into the consumer culture, why do they give up the welfare state, why do they risk their stability and security, why do they turn back the values of solidarity and joint effort, neglecting family, work ethic, humility and honesty, local values and culture, destroy nature and the like.

Without this differentiation it would mean that everything is permitted, while the principle of power replaces the principle of force. The power is reduced to force. So the logic of 'forced growth' becomes the main feature of earning, with the inevitable economic consequences of violence against nature, violence in family, in social life of people. In this sense, great Weber warns that a competitive social system does not exclude power, but it excludes force. (Weber, 1976, 26) The development of the society at any level, global or local, cannot have human sense and therefore cannot have a progressive meaning without a solution of the indicated problems. The dynamics of existence of man and his community requires a conception of society based on freedom, on the different kinds of freedom and their interference. You must have freedom as a foundation of development, as the goal and the means. (Sen, 2002, 113).

However, the essential question of fundamental social change is: How to identify the structure of the need for freedom as a positive (creative) mode of life?

The topicality of this issue is reflected at two levels: global trends of modern society, characterized by two opposing tendencies: universalizing tendency on the one hand, and the tendency of affirmation of their own identity on the other. This occurs in each state as a historical community, in which in a specific way Logos and History come together. In the historical process of sublimation all the 'objective' factors (institutional constitution, territory, language, culture) get their particular, indigenous meaning, importance and sense for a particular community. Of course, this does not mean that the external dominants (global social movements) have their influence, but liberal globalization produces social crisis neglecting the dialectic of specific-universal and making the universal absolute.

The negative consequences of this absoluteness are obvious. The development plans of the World Bank over the last few decades deliberately expelled the entire groups of relatively successful people from their land, including small, independent farmers, as to make space for giant dams and other developmental 'mega-plans.' 'The consequence of such a 'development' is the conversion of millions of small farmers into refugees, the landless, who are looking for work that they cannot find, in the cities' ??Goldsmith 2003, 13). This is only one aspect of the economic and social crisis that is caused by the global-world, but no less by the local factors. It also must be noted that the crisis has its causes, but that does not mean that it necessarily had to happen in this drastic and inevitable form and intensity, especially not so catastrophic consequences for the nature and not such an inhuman division between the rich and the poor. We cannot accept that the process of post-socialist transformation of socialist societies had necessarily to have: the continual robbing of public property and public goods in the process of socialist transformation of ownership, a model of unproductive, parasitic, corrupt capitalism, with the affirmation of the competitiveness which is allegedly contrary to the unproductive social model; a destruction of domestic production, privatization of banks under the monopoly of new political and economic elites with encouragement to consumerist indebtedness of citizens and to business activities, rather than producing the small and medium enterprises, reduction of working contingent, borrowing and pandering to foreign capital and import lobby, rather than producing the small and medium enterprises, a reduction of working age, borrowing and pandering to foreign capital and import lobby, an increased useless consumption on the one hand and on the other hand encouraging savings for the protection of nature, a stimulation of scientific and educational activities and creative forces of society and so on. But theorists and ideologists of liberal globalization do not want to accept these 'natural experiments' as tests of their project, because they show a deep human dysfunction and absurdity.

Today it is clear that all of this is neo-liberal ideological deceit and hypocrisy of those who caused the crisis, now they lecture and punish citizens, explaining them in their own ethics of pure will (all failures are caused by someone else-'global crisis'), without a trace of the ethics of responsibility (politico-economic elite has no responsibility) for obvious ideological utopianism of their project. Reversal can only be done on the principles of Social Economy. The social economy is a true human, long-term basis, a humanistic and progressive development of human society in terms of the constitution of social relations and institutions and socio-anthropogenesis with a comprehensive display of human nature and responsible attitude towards nature. This means that anthropocentrism as the main product of neo-liberal economies prevails.

It is undeniable that in this sense, more egalitarian societies based on a competitive social system and superior by all key social parameters, with the combination of legitimacy and efficiency, are more successful than the societies which are based on the social economy, but where a more pronounced inequality rules.

'Extensive research also shows that the 'Anglo-Saxon' economies are significantly ahead of relatively egalitarian Scandinavian countries and Japan, with a prevalence of health problems among the lower classes, the rate of premature deaths amongst the working class men, length of working time, the level of child mortality, the level of children's illiteracy, the level of violence amongst children, the degree of mental illness and disorders, the level of addiction, the level of distrust of other people, the number of prisoners, the length of sentence for the same crimes, the number of murders, etc.' (Jakopovic, 2011, 3).

'Also, the countries in which the pronounced inequality rules (such as the USA and the UK) have a lower rate of overall child welfare according to the UNICEF index, less equal opportunity and lower rates of social mobility, a lower rate of innovation i.e. fewer patents per capita, and so on.' (ibid 4).

All serious studies show that the rate of inequality is directly correlated with the above stated social phenomena. Unilateral, bureaucratized and politicized calculations do not show a huge social and economic damage which is produced by inequality in the form of medical expenses, mental disorders, repressive structures, police, and not to mention the enormous neglect of personal human and other potentials which are impossible to be expressed. For the neo-liberal ideologist, the human suffering, the violence to others and ourselves are the collateral 'trifle' that should not be paid a lot of attention to.

'The rich comparative experience and scientific research confirms that in addition to providing greater employment, stimulating economic demand and improving workers' motivation, innovativeness and productivity, social economy provides greater investment in education, valuable services and hightech manufacturing. Peripheral, neo-colonial economy, which the Balkan elites (in cooperation with foreign 'partners') have chosen stands in sharp contrast to this model,' (ibid.4).

The social economy is not welfare, social welfare benefit or social assistance to the poor, the unemployed, the sick, the homeless, etc. The social economy is a holistic concept of human economy that is not reduced to market and profit, but it is in the function of the creativity of all the potentials of a society, directing economic

investment in people's skills and their ability to demonstrate their abilities, meet the needs and interests of their own engagement. The social economy assumes that the economic, commercial, technological, spatial, investment ventures and development in all areas of social life and work include the social needs of people and their communities.

Thus, the social economy necessarily includes social planning and social development followed by the social needs of the people and the Exploitation of the Environment on the principle of responsible sustainable development, taking into account that the nature is human property, and not just the property of individuals or particular generations. All elements of the social economy stimulate the quality, competitiveness and entrepreneurial spirit and achievement motivation, solidarity within the democratic institutional and legal system of the society. In this sense, social economy is a real and permanent basis for the progressive development of the society. It makes a rational and meaningful relationship of individual, family and social economy. It connects the macro-economic stability of the society and micro-economic stability of family based on the principle of sustainable development. It takes into account the internal logic of a particular society without which social development cannot have a realistic basis.

By analysing the thirty years of centralized planning in India since it gained independence Sol finds: 'Everyone knows that it was not successful. But ... what Western critics forget.... this period gave the Indians time to think about their wider aspirations rather than undergo reformulated aspirations projected by the West, so they had developed a certain internal logic (noted by S.V.) that they are still developing, ? while those parts of the former colonies that had immediately left themselves to the western planning techniques which include Soviet techniques -nowadays had mostly collapsed' ??Sol 2011, 73-4). We can say that this is a kind of experimental verification of a specific universalism theory, not in the form of resistance to globalization, but in the form of accepting globalization on the principles of internal logic, i.e. specific compound of Logos and History. 'The prophets of globalization who were saying: 'Privatize, privatize, privatize' today say they were wrong, because a national rule of the law is more important' ??Sol 2011, 9-10). In this context we can accept Kissinger's statement that 'the cumulative development of one generation completely changed our world' (according to ??ol 2011, 74), but only as one part of the truth. A much larger and more important truth for the mankind, development trends of man and society and their perspective, is that the cumulative development of a generation has not produced a unified world. None of the directions of liberal globalization, not even its cumulative side, have a unified result nor unified consequences for all people and historic communities. It is an indisputable necessity of overall historical development that emerges from the generic essence of man and his community and it constantly follows it, not only in the age of globalization.

Detection of valid paths in this field assumes detailed scientific research and without these results social planning and social development of the society on the principles of social economy cannot be undertaken, nor the changes in the value system could be managed and thus influence the formation of personality types with the view of the world in which the ethics of responsibility is 'Chief Justice' of man's relationship to nature. Social Economy, in this sense, is a realistic assumption of true community of man with nature. ^{1 2}

¹© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)

²© 2013 Global Journals Inc. (US)



Figure 1:

- [Globalizacija] , Globalizacija . Beograd, CLIO.
- [Dobrenjkov and Delhi] , / Dobrenjkov , Nju Delhi . (the international institute of sociology, the 40th iis world congress)
- [Weber ()] , Maks Weber . 1976. Beograd. (Privreda i društvo)
- [Johnston et al. ()] , S Johnston , H McGregor , E Taylor . 2000.
- [Engineering et al. ()] , J Engineering , Ed. John Marciniak , Wiley . 2003. New York 10. Mander Džefri, Edvard Goldsmid.
- [Vukićević ()] ?????????? ?????????? ?????????????? ???????, ?????????????????????? ?????????????, ?????????????? ?????????????????? ?????????????????? ?????? ??. ?????????????? (??????? ?????, Slobodan Vukićević . 2011. (?????????? ?????))
- [E????????? ()] ‘?????????? ?????????? ?????????????? ?????????? ?????????????? ?????????? ? O E????????? . ?????????????? ?????????????????? ?????????????????? ?????? ??. ??????????????, ?????????????????????, (?????) 2011.
- [????????????? ()] ???oe ?e?e????? ? ??????????, M??????, V I ??????????? . 1994. (?????)
- [Petri? ()] *Biće skoro propast sveta, Beograd, Politika-kultura, umetnost nauka*, Vlada Petri? . 2011. 24.
- [Vukićević ()] ‘Elita i klasa-?ilasova teorija i praksa Novi Sad, Filozofski fakultet’. Slobodan Vukićević . *Tematski zbornik:PROMENE U DRUŠTVENJOJ STRUKTURI I POKRETLJIVOSTI*, 2012.
- [Vukićević ()] *Globaliyation, human nature and the nature of societiz/ An ispring reflectiveness of sociological analiyisis of profesor*, Slobodan Vukićević . 2012.
- [Gottterbarn ()] D Gottterbarn . *Encyklopedia of Software Engineering*, J Marciniak (ed.) (New York) 1994. Johan Wiley, Sons.
- [Habermas and Joyef ()] Jirgen Habermas , Racinger Joyef . *Dijalektika sekularizacije*, (Beograd, Dosije) 2006.
- [Vukićević ()] ‘Ideal i stvarnost ekomenadmentna, Nikići?, SO slu?ba za?tite prirode 19. Vukićević, Slobodan (2003) Crna Gora na prelazu milenijuma, Cetinje, Centralna narodna biblioteka Republike Crne Gore’. Slobodan Vukićević . *?ur?e Crnojevi?* 1995.
- [Sekuli? ()] *Intervju iz 1958*, Isidora Sekuli? . 2009. Beograd, Politika.
- [Koi?io ()] *Može li ?ovje?anstvo da se sa?uva*, Matsura Koi?io . 2008. Beograd, Politika.
- [Poper ()] *Otvoreno društvo i*, Karl Popper . 1993. Beograd, BIGZ.
- [Jakupovi? ()] *Plamen socijalne ekonomije*, Mladen Jakupovi? . 2011. Zagreb, Novi plamen, godinaV. p. 15.
- [Knjazeva-Adamovi? ()] *Polemike-politi?ke i filozofske*, S Knjazeva-Adamovi? . 2008. Beograd, Slu?beni glasnik.
- [Sekuli? (2002)] *Postmodernizam i kraj antropologije*, Nada Sekuli? . 2002. Sociologija 4.
- [Practike-focused ethics in Australian engineering education] *Practike-focused ethics in Australian engineering education*,
- [Sol and Ralston ()] *Propast globalizacije i preoblikovanje sveta*, Džon Sol , Ralston . 2011. Beograd, Athipelag.
- [Sen ()] *Razvoj kao sloboda*, Amartja Sen . 2002. Beograd , Filip Višnjji?.
- [Vukićević ()] *Sociological, theoretical and methodological approach to studing idetrity (Cveji?, Lazi?, Dobrenjkov) IIS Wordl Congress*, Slobodan Vukićević . 2013. Uppsala, Sweden.
- [Hiršman ()] *Strasti i interesi*, Albert Hiršman . 1999. Beograd, Filip Višnjji?.
- [Vukićević and ?????????????? ()] Slobodan ; ??????????????-????????????????? ?????? ? ?????????? ?????????????? Vukićević , ?????????????????? . ??????-????-Đ?”?????????) ??????, ?????????????????? ?????????? Đ?”? ? . ?????????????? 2013.