



UDK 321.01:329.12
Manuscript received: 03.09.2010.
Accepted for publishing: 09.11.2010.
Review article

Serbian Political Thought
No. 1-2/2010, Year II, Vol. 2
pp. 75-97

Ljubiša Despotović
Faculty of Culture and Media, Megatrend University, Belgrade

Political Myths of Liberalism: Freedom, Power And Inequality

Abstract

Power and inequality have been established as dominant postulates of liberal political and economic constitution, as the highest values around which its political-economic essence is being constituted. Nevertheless, there are numerous myths which surround this hidden core of liberal political practice. This essay will provide an analysis of various liberal myths: from liberal state, through the connection between liberalism and democracy, to globalization. In the second part of this essay, the focus will be on Serbia and its modern history regarding “implementation” of liberal ideology and its practices.

Key words: political myths, liberalism, power, inequality.

All big political ideologies of Modernism have been created on the basis of the need to rationalize and organize the world in a triangle of three important political values: freedom, brotherhood and unity. After French Bourgeoisie Revolution, the modern world started to be constituted and configured through actions of three political ideologies (Liberalism, Conservatism, Socialism), but also through their conflicts and struggles. Besides different interests, one of the more significant reasons of their conflicts, amongst others, was different understanding and valuation of these political values. Conflicts and political struggles contributed to stronger mythologization and mystification of political and ideological field. Everything was mystified and mythified, both own ideological postulates (self-mystification) and political struggle as well, dogmas of competitors' ideologies, their leaders, parties and political practice itself. Processes of creating myths, as usual, are part of overall political and ideological activities, and are not as such a privilege only of one political ideology. Liberalism is not less inclined to myth creation, and not less immune to a need of political coexistence of its own ideological habitus and political practice. Political and social reality is never enough beautiful and desirable and can always be retouched for the needs of an ideological optics. Even when euphorically presenting

to the world own ideological triumph and announcing a new phase of the end of political history as we have known it being so far, even then, and even more than we are capable to comprehend, does not stop to exist the need to adjust that reality to the criteria of own ideological vision.

If we could draw some kind of circle from which originated the liberal social thought and the idea originated even in the time of its political and ideological infancy, all the way up to the moment when it started experiencing its neo-liberal phase of political existence in last several decades, within that circle we could quit clearly mark a destiny of these political values: freedom has experienced different metamorphoses in order to end up systematically as a part of set of human rights and freedoms in the context of democratic constitution of the rule of law, but also emptied of essentially valuable content and transformed into purely legal-political standard. Brotherhood has disappeared and perverted into solidarity of confessional belonging in its actual Christianity context. Brotherhood, as an important political value, on which one social community of liberal type would be constituted, today looks like a complete political utopia. Instead of brotherhood, these societies have identified some kind of form of mechanical solidarity which functions only if corresponding to functional frames of state and political institutions. Equality however, has never had any other form and meaning in liberal doctrine than of an ordinary mould of political and legal equality, until the end of complete emptying of any other content of social or economic equality. Power and inequality have been established as dominant postulates of liberal political and economic constitution, as the highest values around which its political-economic essence is being constituted.

Knocking down the Berlin Wall and the end of Cold War in political literature on the West in its major part in last two decades was interpreted as the period of definite triumph of liberalism as political ideology and often also as the end of political history, because with alleged general triumph of liberalism ended the phase of historic struggles of big political ideologies. With that started the new phase of definite ending of epochal domination of liberal ideology in the context of increasingly faster globalization and setting so called liberal values and standards in the foundations and structure of the new world order. This ideological intoxication and mystification of own political ideology as a final triumph, and serious intention to create and build up out of it a real ideological domination, has contributed to the awakening of a critical resistance to such demonstration of current phase of political history, and to the establishment of a need for a true theoretical and also a political ideological valorisation of everything brought by liberalism to teater mundi in last two centuries, and especially in decades after the end of the World War Two when within so called Western societies experienced its full ideological expansion, and later in one of its phases of true domination establishing socio-economic structure of so called state of wellbeing.

Not long after that, some kind of ideological reaction occurred within the liberal political circle of thinking/doing which established the political and economic

hegemony of neo-liberal model of democracy. That model significantly questioned both the basic ideological values of liberalism and their overall democratic capacity. This radical turning point towards an extreme vision of political order and distribution of social goods and rights represented an important focus not only towards the best democratic achievements of liberalism but also towards true violent practice of behaviour (a kind of theology of violence) when it comes to the domain of practicing foreign-policy of the key representatives of neo-liberal hegemonism. It is understandable therefore to have some of the most important critics of these processes on the West severely criticizing these processes, especially their myth-mystifying character, and to the large extent questioning and problematizing not only phenomenological but also the essential aspect of this specific ideological blindness and triumphalism. „Undoubted, and rightfully these processes have also been celebrated as a final triumph of liberalism as an ideology. However, it has been absolutely wrong understanding of the reality. Absolutely contrary, these processes more describe a collapse of liberalism and our definite entrance into the post-liberalism world.“ (Valerštajn 2005: 9)

One of important segments of mythological and mystifying layers of liberalism as political ideology is also a wrong perception of its own ideological position, which has frequently been placed in the area, which according to its self-understanding has been located between another two political ideologies (socialism and conservatism), and it has been in political-locus sense determined as centristic position, and in axiomatic sense understood as moderate, wise and rightful order. „Liberalism has never been a doctrine of the left, it has always been essentially a centristic doctrine. Its representatives have been assured in their moderation, wisdom and humanity. (...) The remaining political scene liberals have always tried to determine as two extremes where they have been in the middle“ (Ibidem: 9). Although within the liberalism itself also there has been a similar division on classical, modern and neo-liberal model, which have comprised a political spectrum in which a modern liberalism could be placed in the middle, classical on the left, and neo-liberal model on the right ideological position. Such division is of course of a conditioned character, but has a kind of explicative potential, and therefore we mention it here.

Part of the total of political myths of liberalism was also a myth about liberal state which according to ideological perception and assertion was the only one guarantying freedom in its full capacity of that political value. Behind this political myth of liberalism has been hidden the truth that the freedom has been available only to a minority, and by the rule to that minority which has been in ownership and social sense on the top of the social hierarchy. „Ideology is fragmented, because there are divided interests in a society. (...) For Marxists and other liberal oriented post-structuralists, this fragmentation has been necessary exactly in order to consider a possibility for some social group to take over control. (...) However, below a general ideology there are others which promote interests of more important social sub-divisions. The biggest and the most important amongst them usually are class, race (or ethnicity), religion and gender.“ (Čapo 2008: 342) Introducing into analyses

the term sub-ideology enables us to easier explain the existence of political interests of particular dominating social groups and arrangements which within the same ideological circle differ their positions as controlling one, and their interests as primary. Sub-ideology does not go out of the frame of a big ideology to which it belongs, it just specifies and derives it as an apology of governing establishment which in that way performs political rationalization and justification of its interests and position making it acceptable to a large part of remaining society.

It has been proven that freedom has not been equally available to everybody, although within the framework of ideological perception of a society, has been placed in the main social focus - legitimizing political order as order of freedom in its universal characteristic. „Liberals have always claimed that liberal state - reforming, legalistic, has been the only state guarantying freedom. That has been maybe characteristic for a minority group whose freedom has not been questioned. Unfortunately, that group has always been remaining a minority on its way to become majority. Liberals have been always emphasizing that only liberal state can guarantee non-repressive order.“ (Valerštajn 2005: 9). Overlooking, most probably on ideological basis, that non-repressive and free are never the same neither in its sense nor in its essence, especially if taking into consideration the level of dispersion on a wider civil population. What applies for a part or a group has never applied for all, disregard any efforts invested by ideological propagators in trying to hide this fact and present it as universal. One particular political order becomes really free when the degree of universal human rights and freedoms reaches the level after which it is impossible to reverse it on a position of political monopoly of any social group or class. It happens in practice very rarely, and therefore this liberal myth is being considered as a doctrinary projection of wishful social relations and not more than that.

In transitional phase of former socialist societies, both of post-soviet and post-Tito type, newly formed political pseudo-elites, almost as a ritual have been repeating the ideological slogan of their ideological patrons from the West, about the need to establish civil society as the key element for development and transformation towards political order of freedom and democracy. If development of democratic political institutions being mentioned as the first condition of their democratization, then the establishment of civil society and its social values presented as the key second phase, towards their real transformation into a society of Western type. This process, disregard being presented as necessary, at the same time has been mythologized. Therefore, it has become manipulative to the extent to make its basic function and purpose senseless.

The subject of all sorts of manipulation and misuse, it has demonstrated not only the scale of small democratic capacities of these societies but also the degree of misuse of the concept by the countries from the West who have been propagating it and installing it in the above-mentioned geopolitical circle of transitional countries. „Here comes another misguiding slogan: call for development, expansion and reconstruction of civil society. It is equally helpless. Civil society can exist as long as exist countries

strong enough to support something what is called „civil society“, which is essentially organization of the citizens within the state and who implement activities legalized by the state and engage in indirect (i.e. hostile) politics vis-à-vis state. Development of civil society has been essentially an instrument in uprising of liberal countries, pillars of inner and world order. Civil society has also been used as the symbol of gathering for the purpose of establishing structures of liberal state there where it has not existed before. But above all, civil society, historically speaking, has been the way how to limit potentially destructive violence of the state as well as the way to domesticate dangerous classes.“ (Ibidem: 10) Although it sounds a bit paradoxically, well developed civil society is the best product and also the best partner of a successful and strong state. If there is something wrong with it, then we surely know that there is something fundamentally wrong with the state as well. Only healthy citizenry can support and strengthen a serious state, and vice versa, a serious state can produce healthy citizenry (and healthy nation).

In so called transitional phase of the development of post-socialist societies, including certainly societies on the territory of former Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY), political-economic concept of civil society has been used by Western countries not only to establish a political control over them, but also to organize robbery of their economic assets. The scale of the robbery even nowadays is not yet possible to comprehend, but new coming generations in decades will be affected with its aftermaths. „USA in 1989/90 officially offered socialist countries a model of social transformation through the process of „transition“ with „shock“ therapy. Civil society in that context becomes a leverage of macro-economic reorganization. Groups of experts „transitologists“ were prepared, and they flooded Eastern-European countries. Transition process was established as apolitical, more or less as technical process. Term „open society“ covered conditions under which a transitional country can be integrated into a global economic process. (...) „Shock therapy“, as claimed by Jeffrey Sachs, chief architect of transition, represents a mechanism for the fastest bridging of the gap between „underdeveloped socialist economies“ and developed capitalistic economy, and for involving former socialist countries in „normal capitalist processes“. However, what happened was quite contrary; „shock therapy“ in practice was proven to be an ideal mechanism for devastation and servitude of former socialist countries, with more difficult consequences than those resulting from wars, because these are long-lasting consequences.“ (Avramov 2006: 72) In the form of civil society political structures were formed which have monopolized social changes and modernization, and which were at the same time awarded by their foreign mentors with possibilities to swimmingly rob their citizens during wild processes of privatization.

One of the common liberal myths is the myth about liberalism and democracy as twins, as unbreakable pair of modern political order which inevitably go together. There where is liberalism, necessarily there is democracy as well, and there where democracy is active, it is necessarily of liberal origin and inspiration. This widely prevailing myth has become dominant in the consciousness of political masses to such extent that it has become almost undoubted. It could be even said that it has become so undoubted

that any attempt of its questioning and criticism faces an outrageous reactions and counterattacks of liberal ideologists and politicians which are aiming with all their passion to make senseless any further attempt of demystification and criticism. In fact, the situation is absolutely contrary. „We have to remember that democracy and liberalism are not twins but mainly oppositions. Liberalism was thought as the opposite of the democracy. The problem which lead to creation of liberalism was how to hold dangerous classes, first within the core, and then within the world system as the whole. Liberal solution guaranteed a limited access to political power and limited share in the economic surplus which would not endanger continuous accumulation of capital or the system which supported it.“ (Valerštajn 2005: 39) Although a bit simplified consideration of the complex of democracy, Wallerstein surely well recognizes that between liberal and democratic cannot be the sign of equality what has been and still is the case very frequently amongst us.

The extent of democratization of Western societies has always been proportional to the need of preserving political and economic control by minority over remaining society. So called dangerous classes have been pacified, amongst other, by corrupting the middle class in the extent needed for preservation of economic stability within the society. Such stability has been based in a large extent on a pure economic robbery outside the borders of Western world (core countries), on the territory of semi-periphery or complete periphery. „Simultaneously, the pressure requiring democratization has been permanently increasing. Democracy in its essence is authoritarian. It is the requirement for similar thinking in the political process on all levels and similar participation in the system of socio-economic benefits. The biggest limitation to that tendency has been liberalism with its promise of inevitable permanent improvement by applying rational reforms. Responding to democratic request for equality now, liberalism has offered the postponed hope.“ (Ibidem: 40) Although a bit conservative, this ideological visioning by Wallerstein, emphasized the liberal component as the corrective one in regard to authoritarian and collective visioning of democracy itself.

It has to the large extent demystified and demythologized another liberal myth, - myth about creation of the state of wellbeing. It was possible as an ideological project achievable in one period and in one part of the core countries, thanks mainly to economic exploitation of the rest of the world, either by unequal conditions of trade, or war robberies or other ways of domination and tyranny. „The stumbling-stone was inability to create the state of wellbeing on the world level (what was, for example, advocated by Brandt Commission). Because it was not possible without violating basic process of capitalistic accumulation of capital. The reason was very simple: the success of the formula applied within the central states depended on hidden variable - economic exploitation of the South, joint with anti-South racism.“ (Ibidem: 39). Both once and nowadays, mechanisms and technology of economic robbery have not changed its essence, but only the forms and ways, adjusted to time and needs. „Parallel with nowadays situation is scary clear. Deindustrialized countries are being attracted with a possibility to export agricultural goods to EU and USA,

and in that way they are forgetting requirements for industrialization. However, none of the countries has ever grown rich with food production if not having at the same time the industry sector. (Reinert 2006: 112.)

The wealth has had to remain protected, and privileges based on it intact. Liberal ideology in economic and political part (doctrine) is essentially nothing else but ideology and program of rich who their privileged position should preserve from „dangerous classes and states“, including the series of mechanisms of manipulation by which the poor will be convinced that the existing political and economic order is rightful and free. The order is based on the rights of strong and capable to confiscate limitlessly. That right allegedly is not a privilege, but the consequence of their capability and knowledge and the richness is only its logical equivalent.” Neo-liberalism represents the politics and processes in the modern world which are in function of relatively small number of the most powerful entrepreneurs, skilfully covered with the robe of „democratic“ state, who control entire life on the planet with the aim of maximizing the increase of their profit.“ (Mačak and Drobac 2010: 194)

Group sub-ideology of corporate elites here acquires its doctrinary and also its political justification. „For privileged position, by its nature, political justification is being identified, and frequently the most appropriate economic and social doctrine as well. Nobody wants to believe that its personal benefit is contrary to general public needs. Therefore, it is quite natural to invent an acceptable or, if necessary, moderately unacceptable ideology in order to protect own interest. There is the whole army of hard-working and gifted experts available for that task. Such ideology is gaining increased strength as the number of privileges is increasing.“ (Galbraith 2007: 12) Logic of rich has shown also here an essential particularism. The problem is in fact that state institutions support and feed that particular interest and ideology and by default using tax payers' means without requesting their approval for that.

Liberalism, equally as any other ideology (especially used by nazism and socialism), has propagated and applied Darwin's principles, incorporating them in apology of own political domination and economic benefit. Such approach has been used both in the area of internal affairs and in the area of foreign affairs. „Weak industrial states in the Second and Third World have been exposed to shock therapy, sometimes becoming open for free trade over night. Nations like Mongolia for example, lost about 90% of their industry during the period of 2-3 years, in countries like Peru, and Russia, half of industrial jobs disappeared in only few years time, while, at the same time, real salaries decreased by half. (...) Globalization has become neo-colonialism which is being developed through de facto Morgenthau plan: a colony is essentially a state which has the licence to produce only raw materials. (Reinert 2006: 123.) Actual wave of colonization acquires by that only a new form and cover without changing its basic exploitation essence.

Political myth about liberalism as permanent change which leads towards progress also is an integral part of the inventory of liberal political myths which fade in time

and become an obvious example of delusion technology of liberal propagators. Delusion impact is often amplified with ideological optics in which liberalism is seen as freedom oriented order which seemingly offers equal opportunities for success, skilfully hiding mechanisms used for preserving privileges and control function of the richest. „There are visionaries of renewed hierarchy and privileges, guardians of eternal flame of aristocracy. These are individually powerful persons who lack collective structure and who act during systematic crisis, because they see that everything is out of control. Here they refer to Lampedusa Principle: „everything must change in order that nothing change“. (Valerštajn 2005: 43) Cycles of changes are permanent and continuous (as outside visible frame), but their inner driver the most frequently remains protected from hazardous consequences.

For liberal ideology another political myth is also characteristic, - myth about so called minimum state (weak state). Taking the side of an individual and its inviolable rights, especially the right for enrichment, liberalism as ideology (represented by its most radical founders), doctrinally rejects a strong state as an important political factor of liberal order, considering it only as so called night guard which shall guarantee human rights and which may not disturb political autonomy of a society imagined as mechanical community of free individuals. „We live in a society in which social values emphasize freedom and individuality; dominant system of our economic beliefs underlines the market economy based on laissez-faire principle (French: „leave things as they are“; „do not interfere“) and economic competition amongst individuals; our social beliefs emphasize slogans „mind your business“, „be yourself“, „keep up with your beliefs“ and „resist the pressure“. Many of our political beliefs include disbelief in a „big government“ and belief that any government is inefficient“. (Tarner 2009: 189) However, it has not been like that from the very beginning, none of relevantly important development politics has not been possible without acting of strong state and its institutions. It has been experienced that doctrinary denial of a state and favorizing individualism and autonomy of civil society has been an ideological fog behind which there have been standing strong processes of using a state both in developmental and even more in control function of preserving the order of economic inequality. „From the very beginning liberals have been in a basic contradiction. As representatives of an individual and its rights vis-à-vis state, they were advocating the universal voting right, the only guarantee of democratic state. Immediately after that, state became the main actor of all reforms whose goal was to liberate an individual of the idea of engaging positive law to serve utilitarian goals. (...) For liberals, state has created conditions for rise of individual rights. But in all of these cases, essential issue was strengthening state in regard to society, while rhetoric was quite contrary to that.“ (Valerštajn 2005: 74-75.)

Both on doctrinary and on practical political plan, this kind of anti-etat rhetoric of liberals has never stopped. „We have been reading and listening for many years how our (and European) humanitarian intelligence scornfully speaks about the state. It started long time ago: liberals in 19th century, Marxists during 20th century, neo-liberals nowadays - they all have been repeating the same story against the state,

and in favour of democracy. (...) The last story against the state is included in the actual narration about perspectives of globalization. As many times before, it is here again about a myth which will for a certain period of time attract people skilful in writing. It is about the myth which speaks about divergent processes: on one side about the transfer of functions of the state to supranational organizations: and on the other side about the transfer on lower instances of local communities and non-governmental organizations. These two processes circle into two respective myths. The first is the myth about dying of the national state (or better said, sovereignty) in the general trend of global integration. Important aspect in that sense is the loss *de iure* of sovereignty of the state. Another myth, in accordance with the transfer of state functions on lower or local instances, speaks about deetatization of political system. This should be proven in shifting from central government towards variety of centres of governing on different territorial levels to full decentralization.“ (Brdar 2007: 243-244) Although national state nowadays is the main target of globalization processes, within the core countries it is stronger than ever. Without its developed institutional mechanisms, and especially without its significant budget capacities, heading of corporate echelons towards the rest of the world would not be even nearly strong as it is nowadays. Politics and rhetoric of globalists, about the need to eliminate national states, is correctly understood only when it applies on the rest of the world. National state, according to the opinion of these structures, is the main obstacle to the expansion of corporate power on these societies and regions, and to globalistic ideology as such.

Liberalism, therefore, can be defined as the ideology which includes modernism as an important segment which is open towards social change and reform. But these changes have technical-technological component as a dominant one, which, in dimension of political reforms, acts in a way that in any a bit important part does not disturb a privileged position of its governing elite. Therefore, there is no wonder having Wallerstein's observation which being placed in the area of international relations concludes quite opposite to Fukuyama's triumphalism, that in the world exists resistance and rejection of liberalism as political ideology because it has fully unmasked its political and economic essence as antidemocratic. „It is not a craving for realization of liberalism, but for its rejection. It is cognition that nowadays world system is antidemocratic because economic wellbeing and political power are not equally distributed. Now, disintegration is being experienced as something normal, and not as progressive change.“ (Valerštajn 2005: 94) „Nowadays, fig's leaf has fallen and the Czar is naked. All yells about a triumph of democracy in 1989 throughout the world, will not hide for long the lack of any serious chances for economic transformation of the periphery within the frame of world capitalistic economy.“ (Ibidem: 105)

Despite the noise by liberal demagogues and numerous attempts of masking their projects and politics, the masks have fallen, and nowadays there is no need to explain that many of mentioned political myths as well as those we have not mentioned, are part of liberal ruling technology with which they defend their own

privileged positions and interests. "In fact, „idea of the state“, like many other ideas, like „freedom“, „democracy“, „market“ (I am mentioning some of them in which I believe myself), etc., its meaning, first of all, they owe to the fact that people believe in them - and not necessarily to any impartial proofs.“ (Bošković 2010: 157)

In liberal circles, another problematic mythological armband has been constituted, although skilfully hidden, indicates the relationship of liberals towards the state, when it is about the process of forming national identities of modern European nations. It is especially interesting in the example of the Great Britain. The state in this case is not only a mere instrument used by liberal elites to direct and stimulate processes of technical and economic modernization, controlling at the same time so called dangerous classes in their surrounding. They have been using the state very skilfully in the process of creating and defining national identity, modelling its content both in cultural and linguistic terms, and also in terms of its political and legal content. Newly created national identity had a very clear and direct connection with the force which had shaped it - and it had been the liberal state. It has been proven in many cases that it was not the nation creating the state, but contrary, it was the state creating the nation and its identity, according to its needs and interests.

„If the Great Britain (and France and all countries) was the country of „two nations“, rich and poor, Disraeli's solution to create one nation of two is understandable - one feeling, loyalty and renunciation. Such „equality“ we call national identity. Big program of liberalism was not to create states from nations, but nations from states. It means, the strategy was to take those settled within the borders of a state, previously subordinated to the King-sovereign, now being sovereign nation - and to make them citizens who identify themselves with the state.“ (Valerštajn 2005: 115) The process of forming and designing (amalgamation of class-social differences and differences on the level of regional and ethnical identities) of the new national identity had not been done smoothly and without force (obligation). State institutions were put in full motion. Their national mission was more than clearly defined and determined as well as the profile, content, and characteristics of new identity which had been created. „Big uniting institutions of nations were education system and armed forces. In all core countries, elementary education became compulsory: in many of them the military service as well. In the school and in the army, language was taught as well as civil duties and national loyalty. During the century, states which were two „nations“ - rich and poor, Normans and Saxons - became one nation, in this particular case „Englishmen“. (Ibidem: 116)

Natural continuation of the process of creation (production) of a nation was the occurrence of racism as the ideological basis for upcoming phase of colonial conquest. Based on the image of the arena in which only the strongest dominate and win, was easily transposed and fitted in ideologically appropriate mould - field of economic inequality. This standpoint, through racist theories and practice, from domain of internal usage, was transposed to the field of foreign relations and scenario for new phase of conquest was prepared. About that, I. Wallerstein says: „The final element

in the task of creating a national identity - racism, shall not be overlooked. Racism unites a race which considers itself superior. It unites it within the state disregard minorities who are excluded from full or partial participation in carrying out civil rights. But it unites the „nation“ of a national state vis-à-vis the rest of the world, not only vis-à-vis neighbours, but even vis-à-vis peripheral zones. In nineteenth century, core countries became national countries becoming at the same time imperial countries too that were „in the name of the mission of civilizing“ established their colonies.“ (Ibidem: 116) Nobody is such political hypocrite and ignoramus like hither imitators of liberal paradigm. Their yells on nationalism, (and not even mentioning racism), is the proof of a complete political loyalty and dementia as well. Nationalism and racism, as we can see, are the basic constituents of liberal ideology, and represent operating fuel of development of these countries. Yell on domestic nationalists therefore is nothing else but an attempt to eliminate “dangerous class“ for their foreign mentors in the phase of aggressive attack towards our country.

As a typical example of imperial power, haughtiness and „civilization“ of liberal masters, we are citing here a small quote from the guidelines about how to deal with „lower races“ and how to provide economic and political superiority over them. „All black people will be forbidden to weave flax and wool, to purr or strum wool and to produce anything from iron apart from casting, also they are forbidden to produce hats, socks and leather of any kind.“ (Joshua Gee, Trade and navigation of Great Britain Considered, London, 1729, quote according to E. S. Reinert 2006: 111)

This rude and brutal order in time has experienced its political- legal transformation and reached the phase of full efficiency but now transposed in forms of trade agreements, or better in forms and regulations of trade exchange - rich and poor countries and nations.“ State and corporate planners were aware of their absolute power they intended to use it for constituting a global order to serve to their interests. The biggest priority had the plan to ensure that the heart of the industry, Europe based on Germany, and Japan, to be within auspices of the world order which is under firm domination of the America, controlled by domestic financial-industrial sectors which are connected with American state-corporative forces.“ (Čomski 1998: 51)

And in that situation of absolute domination of rich, former American president R. Nixon advised his associates how to act in cases if the existing regulations in international relationships turn against their creators: „when you start to loose, change the rules of the game“. Whatever course of action you take, act as your position of absolute power and domination must be preserved and improved. Those who do not accept offered rules of international exchange between rich and poor will face military reprisal and economic sanctions until they accept it. „It looks like the September 11 gave the green light to Washington to stop asking countries whether they want or not the American version of „free trade and democracy“ and to start imposing it by military force and politics of shock and threatening.“ (Klajn 2009: 16)

Modern national and liberal state of the West occurs in this way as the key instrument of a march of corporate elites, and it represents a certain symbiosis of

corporativism and the state. The state opens new areas for undisturbed enrichment of corporative sector, and in return, through economic servitude of weak countries conquers new territories for its home country. „The best defined as „complex of capitalism of catastrophe“, has more far-reaching tentacles than military-industrial complex on which at the end of his presidential term warned Dwight Eisenhower: it is about the global war on all levels lead by private companies whose participation is paid with the state money, with unlimited mandate to expand the territory of USA forever, at the same time eliminating every „evil“ outside its borders. (...) the ultimate goal of corporations in the seat of this complex is the introduction of the model of the government which will be providing profit, which in exceptional circumstances with extreme speed transposes into a usual and daily functioning of the state - in fact, privatization of the government.“ (Ibidem: 19) „Since he understands the importance of the state for the free market and democracy, liberal will hardly support globalistic weakening of the state-nation. Because, globalistic forces are against the state-nation exactly because of the fact it limits their monopoly. (...) Transnational companies are so strong that they can swallow the whole markets and to become their masters. The only dam to their tyranny monopoly is the national state. That is wherefrom interest groups of globalistic capitalism systematically working on weakening the national state. These interest groups from the area of capital are getting connected with the groups from the area of global politics. They are joined by ideologists of „cosmopolitan democracy“ and „international state“ from the circles of global academic and media elite. Together, they create the force which smashes states of small and insufficiently developed societies.“ (Antonić; 2006: 32) „Such political problems become even more serious when rich nations organize export of resources of poor countries with the help of local elites, which makes a profit from all of that, what additionally increases inequality within a poor country.“ (Tarnier 2009: 458)

Above mentioned standpoints cruelly confirm additional myth in the rich series of political myths of liberalism, even the whole group of myths dedicated to so called free trade. Graham Dunkley in a brilliant way defines this big field of liberal mythology. „I am asserting that there exist five myths about free trade which are in relation with three myths of globalization: 1. trade has always been an integral part of human nature, 2. free trade, free market and private initiative are the best for most of exchange, 3. „comparative advantage“ is the best basis for any exchange of goods and services, 4. trade and free trade, when everything is taken into consideration, have extraordinary positive consequences for all involved, 5. volume of trade has been increasing in time, pointing out inevitable globalism. Myths by nature include a bits of truth and I do not fully reject these five assertions (...) Essentially, I base my standpoint against free trade on four basic reasons: 1. it is too simplified, overly based on suspicious myths and assumptions, 2. too narrow and overlooking the series of non-economic facts, 3. represents only means and does not manage to consider goals in a proper manner, 4. includes changes which are, together with many technological and developmental pressures, non-democratic or such that majority is not agreed with.“ (Dankli 2005: 20-22).

In the modern phase of liberal ideology which in last couple of decades has been announced in the form of neo-liberal model of democracy, tendency of maximizing profit has continued and which with that model has been lead to its definitive practically doable barriers. Incarnated in the politics of Reaganism and Thatcherism, this politic inspired with „Chicago school“, brings radical turn from Keynesian vision of Social state and its participation in mechanisms of social regulation and development. It includes, very briefly, in the idea of hypostasing free-market self-regulation, without state interference in economic flows and its laws. Therefore, there is no wonder to see such loud yell on the state and its regulatory function in the economy, by biggest ideologists of neo-liberalism. „Economic control, which has spread in the United states in last decades, has not only limited our freedom to use our own economic sources - it has affected our freedom of voice, press and religion.“ (Friedman 1996: 57)

Recent experience in solving so called world crisis, which, what a wonder, originated exactly in the USA, is showing to which extent has gone hypocrisy of neo-liberal demagogues. Although doctrinary deeply opponing to any interference of the state into economic flows of the society, in the name of its freedom, that same group has not made any protest against measures of American state in regard to solving actual crisis, in which into the private sector (big corporations and banks) huge amounts of financial means have been injected (it is about thousands of billions) while at the same time millions of labour workers have been left without the basic incomes for living and without housing. Rich owners of corporations and banks were given thousands of billions of dollars of USA tax payers, and their jobless workers and clients were sent to the streets into uncertainty for elementary survival.

Encouraged political elite, inclined to such standpoints of Friedman and Hayek, started processes of a strong de-democratization of society, and connivance to big capital. That, although seemingly contradictory to doctrine, has lead to strengthening the role of political elite which has become the master of the most important state institutions and put them in the function of corporate interests. In the literature, this doctrine is often called „doctrine of shock“, because it is connected to that type of political action which is related to the usage of natural crisis and catastrophes for imposing neo-liberal model of governing. The same applies also for those actions which are the product of planned activities of the elite, either caused by actions of economic or political factors (environmental crisis and accidents, wars, economic sanctions etc.). „During more than three decades, Friedman and his powerful followers have improved exactly this strategy: waiting for a big crisis, then selling parts of the state to private players while the citizens still stager of shock and then urgently proclaiming „reforms“ for permanent. (...) Three characteristic and mandatory requests - privatization, reduction of legislation, and radical decrease of social consumption - mainly have been extremely unpopular amongst the citizens...“ (Klajn 2009: 12-15) Despite its unpopularity, this method has worked. It has provided, in a very efficient way, social allocation of economic values and capital

into the hands of private owners and by the rule to the biggest of them.

The essence of this doctrine of „Chicago school“ is to enable, by all means, maximization of profit and prior to that privatization of everything what can be subject of this process, then to carry out de-regulation of provisions and decreasing the costs. „The cult of profit by all means is based on crude simplicity and clarity, and even bigger advantage is that it shines as the only one and reliable sign-post in that fog of insecurity and state of being lost in which because of collapse of traditional moral rarities, our epoch is getting lost.“ (Albert 1995: 252) This scenario is being equally well implemented at home and abroad. It is especially favoured by so called transitional elites where it is maniacally implemented, and where it has caused catastrophic consequences: poverty of the majority of population, deindustrialization of the country, huge unemployment, maniacal robbery of social and state property, criminalization of the society, corruption of institutions and individuals in them, strengthening the power of party-oligarchy and tycoons' structures etc.

In the queen bee country - USA, the course of action according to this model has been as follows: „First, governments have to remove all provisions and regulations which stand on the way of accumulating profit. Second, they shall sell all property they have in order to enable corporations to do the business with profit. Third, they shall dramatically reduce financing social programs. Within this three-part formula about deregulation, privatization and reduction of costs, Friedman has presented plenty of details. Taxes, where they need to exist, shall be small, and rich and poor shall be taxed on the basis of the same flat rate. Corporations shall have the freedom to sell everywhere in the world, and governments shall not invest efforts in protecting local industry or local ownership. All prices including labour cost shall be determined by the market. Minimum salary shall not exist at all. Friedman with privatization included health protection, post, education, pensions, and even national parks.“ (Klajn 2009: 68) „Having in mind a large number of poor members of society, the gap between rich and less rich is getting wider, what causes creation of a high percentage of American population who has to work for lower wages without fringe benefits like health and pension insurance. This segment of labour force will represent an increasing problem in the future because the workers will be requesting an income and health care when becoming elderly.“ (Tarner 2009: 347) And what is a respective situation in the rest of the world. Cruelty and brutality of implementation of this scenario has been proportional to the extent of corporative greed, power of globalistic political elites and the extent of corruption and cajoling manner of local elites towards international masters and their interests.

“More precise term for system which erases borders between Big Government and Big Business is not liberal, conservative, or capitalistic, but corporate. Its main characteristics are huge transfers of public wealth into the hands of private persons, often followed by rapidly increased debts, increasing gap between shiny rich and

proportionally poor, as well as aggressive nationalism which justifies enormous security related costs. For those inside the bubble of extreme wealth, created by such arrangement, there cannot be more profitable way of society organization. However, due to obvious deficiencies for huge majority of population who remained outside the bubble, remaining characteristics of corporative state incline to include an aggressive control (again with an exchange of services and contracts between a government and big corporations), mass arrests, narrowing of civil freedoms and rarely, although not always, torture. From Chile, through China, up to Iraq, torture has been a silent partner in a global crusade of free market. However, torture is more than just a tool used for imposing unwished politics to rebellious nation; it is a metaphor of the logic which makes the basis of shock doctrine.“ (Klajn 2009: 23)

In brilliant book of Naomi Klein was done a complete demystification and demythologization of what we by inertia perceive as the world of liberal and democratic ideas, as well as the core essence of capitalistic economic way of gaining social assets, and political order which is being built on that already for more than two centuries, and especially its actual corporate phase. But let us have once again the author herself to prove it being the essential point of her book: „This book contradict the central and the most appreciated assertion in the official history - which the triumph of capitalism released of discipline of state regulations has been born from freedom, and that unhampered free markets go hand in hand with democracy. Instead of that, I will show you that this fundamentalistic way of capitalism is being born with the help of the most brutal ways of enforcement, imposed by force on collective political entity and also to countless individual entities. History of modern free market - better known as flourishing corporativism - has been paved with shocks. (...) (Ibidem: 26)

In its foreign-policy dimension, this essential point would according to Naomi Klein look like this: „I am writing the book about shock. About that how the countries are being brought into the state of shock - wars, terrorist attacks, putsch and natural catastrophes. And how they are being afterwards shocked - by corporations and politicians who exploit fear and disorientation created as a consequence of original shock to impose economic shock therapy. And how people who dare to resist to such policy of shock, if necessary, are being for the third time submitted to shock - by police, army and investigators in prisons. (Ibidem: 33) It is being demonstrated that such a big fuss about the freedom, democracy, civil society, prosperity etc., is being nothing else but the mass production of mere ideological phrases fogging perspectives to those who shall step on the assembly line of further exploitation. Wellbeing and freedom as promised but unreachable goals for small and poor countries, it seems are being spiced with necessary dose of beating and repression as a reliable method of political control and domination of rich, disregard it is about individuals, groups, stratum, classes, communities, nations or states.

Liberalism and Serbs - Two Centuries of Wanderings and Byways: Reforms yes, changes no !

In the middle of nineteenth century, to Serbia, through the first liberally educated generation, started coming ideas and values which had a liberal loading and inspiration. Young Serbs who were educated in European metropolis of that time, were bringing liberal ideas wishing to modernize underdeveloped country according to their European exemplars. That reforming and modernizing loading and effort faced in Serbia of that time an outrageous resistance and denials. Both by that time political leaders who had grown up under oriental discipline and occupation, (used to political torture and violence), and by ordinary people who was about to suffer outrageous measures of social changes by changing both inherited habits and character and their burdensome existential setting and basis.

Liberal generation of that time Serbia, was intoxicated with nationalism of Mazzini type, all prepared to liberate their own country of many centuries of occupation, to win its independence, and gradually to make it a modern, developed and democratic country. The problem was in a specific adjustment of liberal ideas and values to own national habitus. Their huge love and intoxication with values of collective character of Serbian nation has often been a big obstacle for realistic evaluation of modernization capacity of the country. According to their self-understanding so called genuine democratic character of Serbian man has been an excellent foundation for development of democratic system in Serbia. They wanted to carry out political modernization of Serbia according to exemplars of ideals and inheritance of French revolution and British parliamentarism. „Holy-Andrew's liberals had another important characteristic of their ideological and programmatic acting. They were confident Serbian nationalists. Belief in genuine inclination of Serbian spirit towards democracy and self-governance ethos based in tradition, was more than dominant determinant of their comprehension. Liberalism under the auspices of nationalism, would be a short but precise determinant of their ideological profilization. (...) They were and have remained primarily Serbian nationalists. Liberal ideas have come only as additional building blocks of nationalistic commitment. Liberalism has just adjusted to nationalism, emphasizes Jovanović, and has become its logical continuation.“ (Despotović 2008: 75)

One of additional interesting forms of myths and mystifications of Serbian liberals of that time was belief - myth that political tradition and mentality of Serbian nation gives the right to Serbian man to cherish a great dose of optimism in regard to Serbian approaching European community of nations of that time. Freedom-seeking political tradition and democratic ethos of Serbian nation have been experienced as inevitable factors of Serbian modernization, which will bring Serbia to wishing political future in an accelerated way. „This too confident and not very well explained idea has been one of the attempts to bridge civilization gap separating Serbia from desirable European environment. Aware of realistic need for modernization, and

also of certain Serbian handicap (Turkish occupation), liberals were trying to bridge many-centuries abysses, searching for roots of Serbian European civilization character, in time of Nemanjić's tradition on one side, and in certain national institutions which had been a product of a need for pure existential survival during the time of occupation as it was a cooperative for example. In these patriotic endeavours, their romantic enthusiasm has often overbalanced a need for rational argumentation. That weakness in regard to own political and cultural tradition, as well as strong belief in good-nature frankness of Serbian man, has made their liberalism populist, half-done and contradictory." (Ibidem: 78.)

Following the essential relationship of their exemplars on the West, serious Serbian politicians and statesmen of nineteenth century, as undoubtedly was also Jovan Ristić, were applying a political practice, which towards the citizens was creating a semblance of permanent political and social reforms, which seemingly, necessarily lead to political freedom and democracy. The same standpoint was taken by this Serbian liberal leader of the second half of the nineteenth century, in regard to the needs for political reforms in Serbia. He also considered political changes and reforms as necessary evil which should be moderately and carefully introduced into political life in Serbia, in the manner, not to endanger existing political authority and its political privileges." Also, by taking as example the Constitution from 1869 (whose undoubted creator was exactly J. Ristić), it is possible to illustrate his standpoint in regard to political reforms and political changes. He was experiencing and comprehending political reforms as a necessary tool for preserving authority, which should be used only as a last resort, moderately and superficially, without entering into fundamental changes. He was experiencing them, as emphasized by Jovanović, also as „necessary needed measure of authority security“ (...) If we could formulate this political logic in a very brief manner, we think that it should be read as follows: reforms yes, changes no. Seductive because provides a semblance of reformatic standpoint, and again reliable because it was preserving the existing order". (Ibidem: 95-96.)

Contrary to Serbian state discontinuity which occurred in the previous century (Kingdom of Yugoslavia, Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia, Federative Republic of Yugoslavia, Serbia and Montenegro), ideological and political confusion of its political elite has achieved remarkable time continuity. Both in nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Serbian society and its social elite in its major part, have demonstrated a permanent tendency in ideological wandering, incomprehension of own political orientation, as well as geopolitical position of Serbia itself. Such political-ideological wandering has been producing conflicts and mistakes which were extremely costly for Serbian nation in 20th century. Its historic and geopolitical wandering has continued, and existential Calvary nowadays seems to have no end. Let us try at least in brief to indicate its causes and origin.

In synchronous plane, considering last two decades, neo-liberalism is in power on the West, and neo-communism (neo-bolshevism) in transitional countries.

With necessary remark that such transitional neo-communism in most of the countries has been skilfully hidden with liberal robes. In fact, it is about two types of bolshevism, if we take as an example Serbia's experience. First echelon of bolshevism (national-bolshevism) was comprised of those political circles who grabbed a primitive form of utilizing nationalism (it was an efficient way to preserve authority at that time) by preserving at the same time intact own bolshevist order and political perception of reality based on old myths and images. Second echelon of bolshevism (liberal-bolshevism) was conscripted from so called second and third generation of party leaders of socialism, disguised in liberal-democratic form of political organization and at the beginning of transitional processes located primarily in opposition. Both versions of bolshevism (neo-communism) will be fighting on the ruins of the old order, unwilling to truly reform it - democratize (by introducing economic and political reforms), although both have their origins and legitimacy for its political mission in an old communist myth about them as the only chosen by history to carry out political and social reforms and create a new social order. „Last but not the least important, was the myth (myths) according to which only the communist were capable to get Yugoslav society out of relative underdevelopment and to solve the national relationships.“ (Šljukić et al. 2010: 6)

Neither this second form of bolshevism (neo-communism), despite declarative efforts for democratic changes, will not persist temptation to rob own citizens through the processes of wild privatization and by doing that to constitute itself in an accelerated way as the new political class which besides political authority and monopoly has access to respectable economic forms of capital and power. Declarative expression to swear in loyalty to citizens and commitment to democratic reforms represents ritually repeated political tirade by which, together with strong media manipulation, underage citizens of Serbia are being held in a permanent state of ideological semi-hypnotic (anaesthesia). „Courageous and deliberate citizen was needed during the fighting for the authority. Now, there is a need for a citizen transformed into a political sheep in order to submissively accept everything what is presented by the authority. Instead of pedagogy of civil society on the level of „desirable“ political culture, there is an ongoing pacification through media propaganda including giving title of being noble like „deliberate and emancipated citizens“ to all of those who are close to the authority and who do not controvert its politics.“ (Brdar 2007: 146)

That what is common to political parties of neo-communistic block, despite illusive images of political self-legitimacy (which created an illusion of political differences), is the method of governing (authoritarian and arbitrary political will) which has remained intact as well as party consciousness in which political opponents are perceived as blood enemies for who it is not enough to defeat them at the elections but who shall be exterminated and eliminated from the political life (there have been examples of brutal physical elimination) if possible forever. „In the name of democracy and rule of law, there is publicly performed pedagogy of

intolerance and arrogant ignoring, with occasional requests for arresting opponents. All of that is being carried out with great-hearted assistance of all sorts of experts for national, international and humanitarian law - what leads towards a conjecture that there will be no widely spread worries because of the lack of „desired“ reforms.“ (Ibidem: 144)

They also have common antidemocratic relationships within each party and Fuhrer Principle in managing party and also overall political life in the country. It has been proven that it has been easier to formally reform and democratize political system of the country than to essentially change own political habitus and method of governing. „What remains is the conclusion that democracy is not needed to „the second Serbia“, equally as it was not needed to “the first”. The only what is necessary is to create illusion that they extraordinary care about it: and according to Michels’ rule, these today are telling us that we have it “more than ever”, in the same manner like we were told by those from yesterday (and by those from the day before yesterday). Manipulation of the people is even more compact, and the innovation is that „the story about“ democracy has validity of democracy in practice. Therefore, accepting such government’s story provides an individual with legitimacy of „being enlightened“, and by that also the ticket of admission to „society of democrats“. In contrast to that, anybody who looks for democracy on the level of „transparent political pragmatics“, disturbs long time ago routine rules, and therefore has to be expelled from the game.“ (Ibidem: 150)

Let us recall here the philosopher Milan Kovačević who in his brilliant book „Ontological triptych“ lucidly demonstrated on the example of nineteenth century Serbia, that it was easier to expel Turks out from the country than from oneself. It has been proven again, that Serbs as the nation and Serbia as their home-country, permanently spin in a kind of political spinning-wheel. Communist ideology and its bolshevist practice have caused this political disorientation to last much longer than its political order lasted in its temporal sense. Neo-liberal phase of the development of Serbian society has been the continuation of such political and ideological confusion, which has characterized Serbian political history in last two centuries, and all in all will remain for long its imposing political characteristic.

Actual political coalition is a good example for illustrating the previous standpoint. It has been constituted of ideologically incompatible political options, of the remains of the old regime and DOS’s coalition, mixed both in terms of politics and generations of old communist’s establishment, it represents confused political creature, which proves that carrying out political power and control is above any political principle, taste and need for authentic transformation of Serbia. „New/old left/right, in fact is younger and modernized comm-party and state-party nomenclature. From survived and adjusted part of post-Tito’s party bureaucracy, has been created new renamed left. Evolving from former „pluralism of self-governing interests“ to „partyless pluralism“, nomenclature has then generated proto-pluralism by its own procedures, often from their own class. (...) Parties exist, leadership and leaders as well; both are loudly

advertising in media, and therefore the situation looks like pluralism, and again it is not pluralism in all, at least it is not as it should be.“ (Knežević 2006: 15)

But, if we take Montenegro, as another interesting example of transitional processes, we will easily recognize the existence of complete ideological and political continuity of the power of former party structures. Such kind of neo-bolshevist (neo-communist) political class, has preserved direct continuity of governing, adjusting itself more rhetorically and to a certain extent also symbolically to newly aroused need for liberal-democratic recomposition of political environment in the country. Skilfully creating an illusion of political changes and social reforms.

Contrary from Serbia, any kind of democratic capacity for changes has failed to constitute, one which would create an opportunity for democratization of the country and possibility for, although in political sense very modest, opposition alternative to be in position to make a break up with the old constitution of power - government and in this way to make its discontinuity possible. Reasons for such situation have been both on the side of unorganized and powerless opposition and even more in the area of inviolable and rigid structure of political regime.

Together with a strong support of globalistic structures, local regimes have imposed themselves as reliable political partner, which thanks to its servility and loyalty gained in return a wide area to constitute itself as the governing class both in political and economic sense, utilizing all possible means for achieving these goals, including those which are in deep contradictions not only with elementary regulations of local legislation but also with serious violation of international norms of law and legislation of European Union, more precisely with legislations of some of its member states (e.g. Italy). Counting on support of foreign mentors, actual authority in undisguised manner demonstrates political haughtiness and authoritarianism. „In Montenegro, any extremist from the class of Duklja ideology, either being in politics, or in culture, or in economy, is gaining the legitimacy of a democrat and support on the Radio „Free Europe“ or at some other pro-American or pro-British media.“ (Petrović 2007: 205) While, at the same time, members of opposition or pro-Serbian political block, are being satanized in media and absolutely marginalized.

Although covered with liberal cover, and sworn to loyalty to globalistic elites, local elite (political, economic, academic, media etc.) has not abandoned its favourite and proven governing method, and it is the political method of bolshevism by its inner essence and logic. Despite all propagandistic efforts to paint actual political changes and social reforms as democratic and in liberal sense, they have remained within the framework of the old regime, striving to take over all more important centres of its political authority and power. „Instead of reform of the state and its institutions towards modernization and bigger rationalization, a nonfunctional amalgam has been created, with a capillary penetration of informal and non-governmental bodies aiming to occupy the state from inside. At the same time, instead of one party, several

non-governmental organizations are taking the lead, which act against the law and not transparently towards the public, and still under protection of living, phantom authority of the state.“ (Brdar, 278.)

This can be especially well seen on the example of Serbia. „Political revolution“ carried out on October 5, 2000, brutally „wiped out“ from the authority so called forces of the old regime, headed by their ultimate political authority Slobodan Milošević. But that kind of political upheaval which was done by political opposition which declared itself democratic, despite propaganda announcements about fundamental changes of the state and society, in first five years of governing has managed only to take over centres of power of the old regime. Extent, pace and broadness of social changes have been so modest that during that process the political constitution of Slobodan Milošević (incarnated in the Constitution from 1990) has remained almost intact.

„What have been the bases of such Đinđić’s success in expanding the power? His base was not the electoral body. Equally as Milošević at the end of his governing, he and his party also could not count on more than 20% of voters. But, equally as Milošević, with 20% of voters Đinđić had 100% of power. Equally as Milošević, he found a good „political formula“. In Milošević’s case, that formula was consisted of nationalism and anti-globalism. In Đinđić’s case, that formula was consisted of reforms and modernization. Đinđić in fact established a kind of ideological monopoly on reforms and reformism. (...) these strong structures of an authoritarian system were simply too strong for Đinđić and his ambivalent character. Instead to reform the system, he domesticated in it. All the changes were reduced to changing the sticker “national government“, which was placed on democratic facade of the structure, with the brand „reformation government“. (Antonić 2006: 102-104)

In the country, after the tragic death of the prime minister Z. Đinđić, although it sounds paradoxically, the process of constituting so called anti-liberal cartel became even faster. Gathered around the ideology of weak state, especially when it has a clear national prefix, this newly established political centre of power has taken over key leverages of power and directing all more important political, economic and social processes. According to the researcher S. AntoniĆ, it is a kind of conglomerate of foreign and domestic structures which with their acting are striving to accomplish a full control over political and economic processes in the country. It has been formed of four interest groups.

First interest group is made of international bureaucrats. These are politicians and officials from Washington, Bruxelles, London, Berlin, Paris etc. They are a part of global political class. For sure, this group is also made of the ambassadors of more important Western countries, EU representatives, officials of various international agencies, financial institutions, non-governmental sector, intergovernmental organizations etc. „They are finding their „partners“ in the state apparatus, they provide them with the money for reforms and adjustments with the standards and at the end they evaluate „accomplishments“ and „scope of reforms“. (...) Therefore, shorten name for this group will be - evaluators.“ (Ibidem: 36)

Second group is made of dependent domestic political elite. It is, according to their own legitimating, the euroatlantic and reformation-modernization class. Their task is to strictly implement the guidelines of evaluators and to control the processes of transition in Serbia. „They are for that, in return, awarded with a possibility of undisturbed transformation of their own political capital into economic (during the process of privatization). That is to say - awarded with a possibility for endless robbery (of course, only of their own country and their own nation). (...) Shorten name for this fraction will be - reformers.“ (Ibidem: 36)

Third interest group is made of local branch of transnational proprietary class in Serbia. These are, foremost, domestic tycoons coupled with business ties with international capital. (...) Their task is to form a cartel which will ensure „open“ and „stable“ market. (...) However, the most important task of this fraction is to ensure financial awards for reformers (and very often to evaluators as well) through a systematic corruption. Shorten name for this fraction will be - businessmen.“ (Ibidem: 37)

Fourth interest group is made of transnational serving class. It is domestic academic, media, and cultural elite which preaches and preserves the ideology of „reform“, „modernization“ and „euroatlantic integration“. Its main task is to justify the guardianship of reformers and evaluators over their own nation and country. Its name could be missionaries.

„When I read in may 2001 in „Helsinki charter“ the term „Euro-Serbs“, it made me laugh. In the introduction of that issue, namely, stated that in Serbia, besides Serbs, also live certain „Euro-Serbs“. They are settled, was written there, mainly in Vojvodina and Belgrade and play the „key role“ in Europeanization of Serbia. Perhaps, if there are more of these Euro-Serbs in Serbia, and less of those „ordinary“ Serbs, then Serbia will faster enter into the Europe“. (Antonić 2007: 147) Such and similar bizarre examples demonstrate not only a high degree of „being enlightened“ of missionary „elite“ in carrying out its malignant mission, but also a pathological lack of elementary national dignity and common sense.

„The potential of civil society has been reduced to intellectual groups and NGO, maintained by foreign donations, of which the living civil society cannot get a chance to speak up, and in addition to that is losing the will for any engagement because of not seeing any sense in doing it. It is about subordinating the country to a simulacrum of civil society, i.e. to groups of „experts“, whose expertise has never been verified, who have never been chosen by anybody for anything, and who take care not to check their legitimacy before the citizens at the elections. Therefore, although they do not want to be political parties, they behave as they are.“ (Brdar 2007: 278)

As the consequence of overall former acting of anti-liberal cartel, civil society has remained underdeveloped in Serbia, and national state has remained in ruins. It is the status of the state without sovereignty, territory without the people and clear borders, nation without national state, free media without freedom and

responsibility, citizens without civil society, economy without wellbeing, workers without employment, farms without farmers, education without knowledge, youth without a prospect, belief without spirituality, identity without national insignia, society without morality, constitution without relevant values, liberalism without democracy, politics without betterment, reforms without changes, government without state wisdom, elite without nobility, rich without soul, and poor without hope. It is a tragic situation of re-paganized demos which is grabbing at the beginning of the new millennium desperately searching for the best inheritance of the national heritage, in an attempt to use it as a foundation for rationalizing own directions of new democratic development.

Bibliography

- Albert, M. (1995) *Kapitalizam protiv kapitalizma*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Antonić, S. (2006) *Elita, građanstvo i slaba država*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Antonić, S. (2007) *Srbi i Evro-Srbi*. Beograd: Čigoja.
- Antonić, S. and Pavlović D. (2007) *Konsolidacija demokratskih ustanova u Srbiji posle 2000. godine*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Avramov, S. (2006) *Alternativni model svetske zajednice. Civilno društvo i nevladin sektor*. Beograd: Nova Evropa-Evro.
- Bošković, A. (2010) "Liberalizam, pragmatizam i zdrav razum." *Kultura polisa*, 13-14: 145-165.
- Brdar, M. (2007) *Srpska tranziciona Ilijada*. Novi Sad: Stylos.
- Brdar, M. (2002) *Filozofija u Dišanovom pisoaru*. Novi Sad: IK Zorana Stojanovića.
- Čapo, E. (2008) *Teorija mitologije*. Beograd: Klio.
- Čomski, N. (1998) *Godina 501*. Novi Sad: Svetovi.
- Dankli, G. (2005) *Slobodna trgovina*. Novi Sad: Svetovi.
- Despotović, Lj. (2006) *Srpska politička moderna*. Novi Sad: Stylos.
- Fukujama, F. (2002) *Kraj istorije i poslednji čovek*. Podgorica: CID.
- Friedman, (1997) *Kapitalizam i sloboda*. Novi Sad: Global Book.
- Friedman, M. (1996) *Sloboda izbora*. Novi Sad: Global Book.
- Gavrilović, D. (2006) *Udari sudbine*. Novi Sad: Stylos.
- Grej, Dž. (1999) *Liberalizam*. Podgorica: CID.
- Galbraith, J. K. (2007) *Dobro društvo*. Zagreb: Algoritam.
- Hantington, S. (1998) *Sukob civilizacija*. Podgorica: CID.
- Klajn, N. (2009) *Doktrina šoka*. Beograd: Samizdat B92.
- Knežević, M. (2006) *Podeljena moć*. Beograd: IIC NSPM.
- Laš, K. (1996) *Pobuna elita*. Novi Sad: Svetovi.
- Mačak, Z. and Drobac, M. (2010) "Etičke aporije neoliberalizma." *Kultura polisa* 13-14: 193-221.
- Petrović, D. (2007) *Novi ustav i savremena Srbija*. Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Reinert, E. S. (2006) *Globalna ekonomija*. Beograd: Čigoja.
- Tarner, Dž. H. (2009) *Sociologija*. Novi Sad: Mediterran publishing
- Šljukić, S., Despotović, Lj., Gavrilović, D., Perica, V. and Velikonja, M. (2010) *Mitovi epohe socijalizma*. Novi Sad: CHDR (CIDP).
- Valerštajn, I. (2005) *Posle liberalizma*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
- Vujačić, I., Stojanović, B. and Lakićević, D. (2007) *Teoretičari liberalizma*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.