

**BOURDIEU'S CRITICISM OF THE NEOLIBERAL PHILOSOPHY
OF DEVELOPMENT, THE MYTH OF *MONDIALIZATION*
AND THE NEW EUROPE ¹**
(An Appeal for the Renewal of Critical Sociology)

UDC 316.2.286.32

Ljubiša Mitrović

Faculty of Philosophy, Niš
ljubisa@filfak.ni.ac.yu

Abstract. *The author first discusses the basis of the neoliberal philosophy of development in the world, especially Bourdieu's criticism of the neoliberal ideology and strategy of development and their implications for the social relations in contemporary society. Bourdieu points to the connection between the neoliberal philosophy of development with mega capital interests, that is, those of transnational corporation at present, just as he stresses the attempts to justify, by the neoconservative revolution with its appeals to progress, reason and science (especially economic sciences) through the new market fetishization, the process of historical restoration and thus, to paraphrase P. Bourdieu, to classify as outdated any progressive thought and action.*

Bourdieu especially criticizes the myth of "mondialization" as an integral part of the neoliberal development strategy in the modern times by speaking about it as "exploitation sans rivages" and "the main weapon in the struggle against the achievements of the welfare state." By making a distinction between the social democratic model of the social development and the democratic processes of the world integration and the "asymmetrical globalization model," Bourdieu stresses that globalization is not homogenization; it is, instead, continuation of the power and influence of a small number of the dominant nations over the totality of the national stock exchanges. In the context of his main theses, Bourdieu points to classical and new forms of the structural inequalities in the world (social violence and symbolic repression).

In his works Bourdieu especially deals with the issue of the fate of the European welfare state under the conditions of the domination of the neoliberal ideology and globalization while exposing the myth about a harmonious and uncontroversial concept of European integration and the European Union. He points out that, under the influence of mega interests and the neoliberal development strategy, the welfare state in Europe is under

Received December 26, 2005

¹ Excerpt from the paper pertaining to the research project of the Institute for Sociology of the Faculty of Philosophy, Niš, entitled *The Culture of Peace, Identities and Inter-ethnic Relations in Serbia and at the Balkans in the Eurointegration Process* (149014), sponsored by the Ministry for Science of the Republic of Serbia.

attack, and that, in truth, the European Union is torn apart inside, split in two and differentiated as "the Europe of workers" and "the Europe of bankers," that is, into several development and cultural circles that overlap but are not always harmonious. Finally, the author stresses Bourdieu's appeal for the renewal of the critical sociology that has not given up its analytical as well as its humanist and emancipating role in society.

Key words: Pierre Bourdieu, Sociology, Neoliberalism, Globalization, Welfare State, European Union

I PIERRE BOURDIEU'S COMMITMENT TO THE RENEWAL OF CRITICAL SOCIOLOGY

Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) is a French sociologist considered by researchers as one of the most important sociologists of the second half of the 20th century. His thought was formed under the influence of four currents in postwar France that were of considerable influence upon the intellectual climate and the development of social sciences, Marxism, Durkheimism, structuralism and Weberism. Yet he created, upon the theoretical platform of structuralist constructivism (or constructivist structuralism,), his own open school of reflexive (Bourdieuian) sociology.

Pierre Bourdieu wrote over thirty studies of a wide scope and different value, from substantial scientific-theoretical significance to the papers speaking about his explicit public engagement.² Here we are mentioning only some of them: *Sociologie de l'Algérie* (1958), *Le métier de sociologue. Préalables épistémologiques* (with Jean-Claude Chamboredon and Jean-Claude Passeron), *La reproduction. Elements pour une théorie du système d'enseignement* (1970), *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique* (1972), *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste* (1979), *Questions de sociologie* (1984), *Homo Academicus* (1984), *Les règles de l'art* (1992), *La misère du monde* (1993), *On Television* (1996), *La domination masculine* (1998), *Acts of Resistance: Against the New Myths of Our Time* (1998), *Contre-Feux 2. Pour un mouvement social européen* (2000), *Language and Symbolic Power* (2001) and others.

Pierre Bourdieu got his first acknowledgment for his critical studies about culture and education. He introduced into contemporary sociology new concepts and categories such as the concept of cultural legacy, cultural capital, *habitus* and symbolic power. Bourdieu discusses the role of cultural legacy, the wealth based upon the social status and education while stressing that success in school and society primarily depends upon an individual's ability to absorb the cultural ethos or *habitus* of the ruling class. Bourdieu's concept of *habitus* as a permanent unconscious interiorization through a primary and secondary experience or as interiorization of the social structure and culture *inscribed* into our minds and bodies is dialectic. Namely, in his opinion, *habitus* is at the same time both a product and a maker structured and structuring depending on individual positions (in that sense, the *habitus* a nobleman's son is different from that of a peasant's son, that is, the *habitus*

² More about his work see a compilation of critical essays entitled *La Sociologie de Bourdieu - textes choisis et commentés* whose authors are Alain Accardo and Philippe Corcufe, Editions Le Mascaret, Bordeaux, 1986. See also George Ritzer, *Modern Sociological Theory*, New York, 1996, Jonathan Turner, *The Structure of Sociological Theory*, Belmont, California, 1991. As for authors from former Yugoslavia, those who wrote about Bourdieu include Rade Kalanj in Zagreb, Miloš Nemanjić and Ivana Spasić in Belgrade and Mileva Filipović in Podgorica. Likewise, this author has pointed out the theoretical importance of Pierre Bourdieu's work in his textbook *Sociology* (Institut za političke studije, Belgrade, 1997).

of a son from the large bourgeoisie family is different from that of a son from the worker's family).

Under the impact of structuralism as well as Marxism, Bourdieu analyzed numerous forms of structural inequalities in the present society (from social to symbolic forms of repression and violence). Yet, unlike Marx and Marxism (that foregrounded the importance of economic capital), Bourdieu speaks about a plurality of capitals (economic, social, political, cultural, symbolic). As estimated by Alain Touraine, Bourdieu's thesis about cultural capital is one of the most innovative and *most solid* contributions of Bourdieu's sociology.³

Bourdieu first analyzes the role of the school educational system in the class reproduction (self-reproduction) of the French society. This is, among other subjects, dealt with in his studies *La reproduction. Elements pour une théorie du système d'enseignement* (1970), *Homo Academicus* (1984) and *The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power* (1989); later on, he turned towards the issues with the widest possible formats, namely, neoliberal philosophy of development, globalization, forms of structural inequalities and violence in the world, resistance movements and alternatives.

In this research context comprising the key issues of the modern times, Bourdieu focused his analysis upon actors and types of historical actions in a really structured social world while trying to bridge the gap between the objective and the subjective sides of the social action, between structures and history, systems and actors, underlying that, in this context, sociology is, willy-nilly, an inseparable part of the struggles he describes. Hence his advocating for sociology as a socially engaged science is legitimate.

In Bourdieu's opinion, sociology is impossible without the unity of theory and practice, without their intertwining in sociological practice. Sociology must be shaped as an *empirical theory*, as a critical thought about social practice or, as Touraine would say, the activity of actors in the self-production of society and history. In this context, in addition to the research of the key problems of the present day, Bourdieu also advocated for the constitution of a sociology of sociologists that would explore the cognitive and social role of sociologies, their subculture in the context of power relations, that is, promotion of the emancipating and subcolonial culture of dependence at present.⁴

Pleading for the affirmation of a critical and engaged role of sociologists in the modern times, Bourdieu opposed both the tendencies to de-politization and de-mobilization of intellectuals and their instrumentalization as mere actors in the current social engineering in the function of the status quo forces. Not only does he criticize aggressiveness of the contemporary neoliberal right in France and the world but he also subjects to criticism the so-called culture of the left by criticizing the servile position of the right and the left social democrats in Europe who have become an extended fraction of the American Democratic Party and the forces of the capital relations in the world.

In the last years of his life Bourdieu engaged in the cultural and political public life of Europe. With his research and activities, Bourdieu seems to be re-promoting the role of the humanist intellectual. Like Emile Zola and Jean-Paul Sartre, he advocated for the re-

³ Alain Touraine in his study *Sociology of Masses* quoted from R. Kalanj *Globalization and Postmodernity*, Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2004, p. 176

⁴ P. Bourdieu, *Questions de Sociologie*, Editions de minuit, Paris, 1984, p. 79-86

newal of critical sociology that has not given up its analytical as well as humanist and emancipating role in the society. He is also engaged in forming a transnational European social movement as a counterweight to the world neoliberal hegemony of transnational corporations, that is, neoimperial dictatorship of capital at present.

All this is revealed in his numerous papers and public speeches in the last ten years of his life. They are given in a brilliant academic form of essays, criticism or public appeals. It is in them that Pierre Bourdieu is following the footsteps of the best representatives of Mills's workshop of *sociological imagination*; namely, he critically questioned and expressed, using the discourse of not only an analyst but also of an engaged social fighter and humanist intellectual, his views about unemployment, precarity, enormous exploitation, marginalization of numerous social groups and social misery generated by the realization of the neoliberal ideology in the modern world as well as the activities of union and other new social movements as movements of postcapitalist alternative.⁵

II BOURDIEU'S CRITICISM OF THE NEOLIBERAL IDEOLOGY AND STRATEGY OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

In his most recent study entitled *After Liberalism*, I. Wallerstein, among other things, while dealing with the historical sociology of liberalism, in the Braudelian spirit of the structural history of the second wave, stated that several ideologies stemmed from the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, most of all, *liberalism* as a centrist and reformist ideology and *communism*, that is, socialism as an ideology of the left while, as a reaction to the French Revolution, conservatism also came into being. The oncoming times, after this Revolution, writes Wallerstein, was under the sign of the modernity of deliverance and the domination of the ideology of liberalism.

Numerous forms of liberal reforms that their protagonists and actors introduced into the system were in the function of integrating the working class into the political system (its taming) *so that the domination based on power and wealth could be transformed into the domination of harmony*.⁶ This reform movement is expressed in two ways, firstly, through an agreement on the suffrage and expansion of political liberties and, secondly, through transmitting part of the *global surplus of value to the working class but in such a way that the greatest part should remain in the hands of the dominant layers and that the accumulation system should remain intact*.⁷

Analyzing the social, political and cultural history of the world in the last two centuries, Wallerstein concludes that the *ideological cement of the world capitalist economy from 1789 to 1989 was liberalism (together with its partner, scientism). The years are entirely precise. The French Revolution marks the emergence of liberalism on the world political scene*.⁸ Namely, Wallerstein thinks that the year 1989 marked not only the col-

⁵ Just as a reminder: unlike Anthony Giddens who has, in our opinion, without losing the respect for his theoretical work, reduced himself to the position of T. Blair's counselor, Pierre Bourdieu spoke out openly about the most important political and other developments in the last decade of his life. Among other things, he signed the appeal of French and European intellectuals against the NATO air-raids on Yugoslavia in 1999

⁶ I. Wallerstein, *After Liberalism*, Slu'beni list, Belgrade, 2005, p. 200

⁷ Ibid, p. 200

⁸ Ibid, p. 83

lapse of communism but also the collapse of classical liberalism adding to this the following statement: *the times of arrogant, self-assured liberal ideology is behind us. Conservatives reappeared, after 150 years of self-humiliation, with their own self-interest.*⁹

Such evaluation of the events happening at the end of the 20th century was also given by Pierre Bourdieu in his studies in which he speaks about *the emergence of neoliberalism as a conservative revolution and historical restoration*. Unlike the great ideologies (liberalism and socialism) that faced their decline, the time of conservatives came after 1989 regardless of the fact that they present themselves, following ideological and mass media fashions, as protagonists of *human rights and liberties and of global democracy (or democracy sans rivages)*. About this estimate of the character of the newly emerging social changes at the end of the 20th century, two greatest sociologists of the second half of the 20th century agree, namely, American sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein and French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu.

And while the classical liberalism, liberal-democratic project and order took care of human rights and liberties, neoliberalism is, according to Bourdieu, an ideology of the forces of historical restoration, a form of conservative revolution whose actors want to *sink and dissolve, in a cold water of calculation, all relationships and institutions of solidarity among people*. This ideology declaratively refers to human rights and liberties while, in truth, it foregrounds the interests of the mega capital forces, of transnational corporations; besides, it is in function of their domination and hegemony at present. The neoliberal ideology, with its monetary strategy of economic development, has led to the destruction of the institutions of solidarity in the world as well as to the destruction of not only socialist states but also of the social-democratic model of capitalism in the world. It has led to mass unemployment, enormous uncontrolled exploitation, the destruction of the standards in the domain of labor and welfare legislature and social-darwinization of the relationships at national and international levels.

The neoliberal philosophy of development is an expression of the interests of the neo-conservative restoration forces in the world, the forces of mega capital that promote *ultra-right utopia, the utopia (being realized) as exploitation sans rivages*¹⁰ that is, new social Darwinism in the national development and at the international level. *The neoliberal discourse and program* tend, at the global level, to induce a breach between *economic logic* (based upon competition and which brings efficiency) and *social logic* (subjected to the principle of justice) and then to instrumentalize the latter and subdue it to the former so that, through privatization, liberalization, deregulation, all collective institutions (of legal and welfare state and solidarity) will disintegrate; thus, there will be no active intermediary between individuals and social groups, owners and producers, the subordinated and the dominated, namely, there will be nothing except for the power of the market or a mere interest in profit and economic efficiency. The neoliberal philosophy of development is an expression of the *conservative revolution* that appeals to progress, reason, science, and the like in order to justify the restoration and thus it tries to classify as outdated every single progressivist thought and action.¹¹ It rests upon competition and the right of the

⁹ Ibid, p. 14

¹⁰ P. Bourdieu, *Acts of Resistance*, p. 107

¹¹ Ibid, p. 39

stronger. It introduces structural inequalities as genuine social violence, as a peculiar *infernal machine*,¹² as stressed by Pierre Bourdieu, that destroys and grinds everything thus setting up a Darwinist struggle of all against all and *cynicism* as a norm of all practices.¹³ The effects of such a logic of the social development in the modern world are: an enormous exploitation of the world of labor, considerable social-class stratification, job dismissals, unemployment, precarity, temporary jobs, privatization of public services, destruction of all collective institutions of the welfare state, destruction of the achieved standards in the domain of labor and welfare legislature (codified by the International Labor Organization), decline of the life quality for most of the population on the planet, suppression of the forms of participation democracy, marginalization of the role of unions and the left, submission of the national states to the requirements of economic freedom and interests of translational companies, that is, globalization processes. That is why this type of capitalism is referred to by some analysts as a *killer capitalism*.

Table 1. Poverty in the world

| Poverty in the world | |
|---|---|
| 2,5 billion people or 40% of the world population | Lives with less than 2 dollars per day |
| 10% of the richest people | Controls 54% of the world capital |
| 110 million children | Not going to school |
| | Half of them in Africa, south of Sahara |
| 1 billion people | No access to potable water |

Source: Pnud, according to the Social Watch report for 2005, *Politika*, Belgrade, 8 November 2005, p. 4

This social development which is in function of megacapital and transnational global corporations has been destroying the Euro-model of capitalism, institutions of the social welfare state; it has devastated the solidarity among social groups, classes and peoples. In addition to the severe disproportions in the development in the relation North-South, there is a more and more pronounced global controversy as a new type of relation between the center and the world system periphery, between the rich minority, the club of rich countries of G-7 capitalism and the rest of the world that some people call *a lumpen planet*.¹⁴ While the developing states of the world are moving towards the postindustrial civilization, the rest of the world is being de-industrialized and regressing, suffering in the forms of the technological and economic debt slavery. Unfortunately, though the beginning of the century was in the sign of the struggle against colonialism and people's emancipation, the end of the 20th century was characterized by new forms of enslavement and world re-colonization.¹⁵

¹² Ibid, p. 113

¹³ Ibid, p. 113

¹⁴ R.Heilbroner, «Growth and the Lumpen Planet,» *New Perspectives Quarterly*, Vol.10, N 2, p. 48

¹⁵ See the study by Ljubiša R. Mitrović, *Globalization and the Modern Left (Globalizacija i moderna levica)*, Institut za političke studije, Belgrade, 2000, pp. 47-49

Table 2. Depth of the World Social Polarization

| World Population | World Wealth |
|------------------|--------------|
| The richest 20 % | 82,7% |
| Second 20% | 11,7% |
| Third 20 % | 2,3% |
| Fourth 20 % | 1,9% |
| The poorest 20% | 1,4% |

Source: D. Held & A McGrew, *Globalisation/Anti-Globalisation*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2002, p. 82

The neoliberal ideology, as an ultra-right utopia as defined by Pierre Bourdieu in his book *Acts of Resistance: Against the New Myths of Our Time* (1998) does all in its power to legitimize the gap between the social and the economic factor in the historical development of the human society, to reduce again the human nature to *homo economicus* (or, as Marcuse would say, *a one-dimensional man*), and to subdue the social to the forces of structural violence of the so-called *free market*, that is, the interests of the mega capital forces and their uncontrolled hegemony in the contemporary world. Let us remind ourselves that such reductionism and illusions were once criticized by Karl Polanyi in his study *The Great Transformation* (1944) pointing out that *the source of catastrophe lies in the utopian effort of the economic liberalism to set up an automatic market system*. Concerning this, nowadays this issue is dealt with by the well-known English economist John Gray (former counselor of Margaret Thatcher for economic affairs) who, in his study *False Dawn: The Delusions of Global Capitalism* (1998) states that *a free market is not a natural state of things, it is not an iron law of the historical development but a political project* so that, in this sense, there is no harmony but a contradiction between social democracy and global free markets in the contemporary world, namely, that democracy and market are competitors rather than partners so that "*democratic capitalism*" is an empty slogan of all neoconservatives that denotes or hides a profoundly problematic relation.¹⁶

Pierre Bourdieu, in his works written in the last decade of the 20th century, *La misère du monde*, *Acts of Resistance: Against the New Myths of Our Time* and *Contre-Feux 2. Pour un mouvement social européen* takes into consideration the implication of the neoliberal ideology and strategy of development on the social relations in the modern world (on the hegemony of unshackled mega capital, enormous exploitation mass unemployment, precarity, impoverishment, marginalization and fragmentation of the society, further worsening of the relations between the North and the South, subversion of the social welfare state, etc.). Bourdieu, with his analysis and criticism, points to the connection between the neoliberal philosophy of development with mega capital interests, that is, those of transnational corporation at present as well as the attempts to justify, by the neoconservative revolution with its appeals to progress, reason and science (especially economic sciences) through the new market fetishization, the process of historical restoration (namely, *the return to some kind of radical capitalism that has no other law but that of maximal profit of capitalism with no restraint and no make-up*) thus, to classify as outdated any progressivist thought and action. The power of the neoliberal ideology, as underlined by Pierre Bourdieu, rests upon *peculiar social neo-Darwinism* (on the ideology

¹⁶ John Gray, *False Dawn: The Delusions of Global Capitalism*, Masmedija, Zagreb, 2002, p. 225

of competence, that is, the best and the most brilliant are those who triumph, as formulated by Gary S. Becker, Nobel-prize winner) while the poor are not only *immoral, alcoholic, corrupt, but also stupid, incapable, non-intelligent towards such a cruel technocratic, inhuman ideology and philosophy of development*. Of course, Pierre Bourdieu, as a critically engaged intellectual, could not reconcile with such simplifications and devastating projects of the neoliberal development in the contemporary world. He could not accept the attempts aiming at *radical break-up between the economic and the social*, with the efforts to impose upon the world an essentially neoliberal vision under the mask of economic rationalizations. Neither could he accept the fact that through new forms of symbolic *"inculcation" and repression* (through aggressive actions of mass media), neoliberal messages about *flexibility, elasticity and deregulation* are represented as *a universalistic message of deliverance*.¹⁷ Opposing such *doxia* or ideological rationalization, Bourdieu questioned both strategies and actors and mechanisms through which this new illusion is produced and imposed at present as the only one and indispensable alternative in the development.

III BOURDIEU'S CRITICISM OF THE MYTH OF MONDIALIZATION AND NEW EUROPE

Bourdieu's works written in the last decade of his life are especially devoted to the criticism of the *myth of mondialization* as an integral part of the strategy of the neoliberal development in the contemporary world. He referred to it as *"exploitation sans rivages"* and *"the main weapon in the struggles against the achievements of the welfare state."* Making distinction between the social democratic model of the social development and the democratic processes of the world integration, on one hand, and, on the other, "an *asymmetrical model of globalization*," Bourdieu stresses that *"globalization is not homogenization; it is, instead, continuation of the power and influence of a small number of the dominant nations over the totality of the national stock exchanges."*¹⁸ In his analyses, Bourdieu writes about globalization as a myth in the full sense of the word, a powerful discourse, a *powerful idea* having a social power that achieves the level of belief. Concerning this, he writes that *globalization is the process of uniting financial markets around a certain number of nations in the dominant position which carries along with it the reduction of autonomy of the national financial markets and concentrates power in the hands of a small number of countries.*¹⁹ At the same time, Bourdieu claims that globalization is, likewise, the main weapon in the struggle against the welfare state, that is, the welfare state in Europe and in the present world. In the context of such considerations, Bourdieu points out classical and new forms of structural inequalities in the world (namely, social violence and symbolic repression).

Bourdieu's criticism of the process of globalization as an asymmetrical process which, under the conditions of regional and class division of the modern world, further multiplies the differences and inequalities seems to have represented an introduction into the critical endeavors of other distinguished world authors, sociologists and economists, who wrote

¹⁷ Pierre Bourdieu, *Acts of Resistance*, p. 35

¹⁸ Pierre Bourdieu, p. 43

¹⁹ *Ibid*, p. 43

about the effects of globalization (most of all, sociologists Immanuel Wallerstein, Ulrich Beck and economists J. Stieglitz, John Gray).

Globalization as an objectively historical process is related to the development of new production forces of the scientific-technological revolution; yet, because of the antagonist system of the social power distribution, its consequences are having different implications for different parts of the world system (world center, semi periphery, periphery). The powerful mechanisms of the new production forces, through the process of globalization and world division of labor, have networked the contemporary world; hence Manuel Castells writes about *the network society*, M. Obrov about *global era*, David Held about *new world order*, George Ritzer about *the MacDonalidization of the society*, Marshall McLuhan about *global electronic village*, K. Axelos about *planetary society* while J. Habermas about *postnational constellations*.

Bourdieu's critical analysis of the process of globalization, especially of its negative consequences upon the social development and social inequalities in the contemporary world seem to have anticipated the kind of criticism implied in the research of J. Stieglitz (*Globalization and Its Discontents*) and John Gray (*False Dawn: The Delusions of Global Capitalism*). It is paradoxical and yet, true that these two high counselors for economic affairs in the American (Stieglitz) and English (John Gray) administration, who are also, at the same time, scientists, should dare to criticize the dominant asymmetrical model of globalization that is being realized at present. These and many other authors (such as, for instance, Noam Chomsky, Ulrich Beck, Naomi Klein) show that it is difficult to represent globalization as ideologically neutral so that the distinction should be made between globalization as a process and globalism as a project of new inequalities, between the neoliberal and the social democratic type of globalization. Andrew Heywood in his study entitled *Political Ideologies, An Introduction* (2003) argues that there are at least two alternative versions of globalism, namely, **neoliberal globalism** and **globalism in the version of state security**.²⁰

Table 3. Information Gap

| | Postindustrial Societies | Third World |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Number of Phone Connections | 74,4% | 1,5% |
| Internet Users | 93% | 0,2% |
| Share in Patents | 95% | 0,0% |

²⁰ Concerning the treatment of globalism, Andrew Heywood writes in his book *Political Ideologies. An Introduction* (2003) that, among other things, there is *neoliberal globalism* in which globalism is related to further expansion of economic market-oriented structures and values. From this perspective, the essence of globalism is in building global capitalist economy which is in the function of interests of the transnational corporations and which considerably reduces the power of the state, especially its ability to transform the social structure. Globalization is, then, a mechanism by which the *end of history* is carried out in the sense of the final victory of liberal capitalism. *The second version of globalism* is that of the state security. It is mostly a product of the coming of global terrorism and the response to it by Western powers in general, most of all, the USA. The so-called *war against terrorism* is a *war sans rivages* because its enemy is a set of sub-state actors who act through transnational organizations. Globalism of the state security is regarded as a defense of liberal-democratic values and humanist ideals that are ordered into military units in the same way as the attempt of the United States, as the only remaining world superpower, to set up global economy." (Andrew Heywood, *Political Ideologies. An Introduction*,, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Belgrade, 2005, p. 341)

Source: Miroslav Pečujlić, *Globalizacija - dva lica sveta* (*Globalization - Two Faces of the World*), Gutenbergova galaksija, Belgrade, 2002, p. 115

Pierre Bourdieu has paid special attention to the analysis and criticism of new forms of dependence and exploitation in the contemporary world. In his criticism of sociology he has subjected to fundamental demystification of the role of the symbolic power system in the contemporary world society linking it with the increasing structural inequalities in the world. Concerning the relationship between the social and the symbolic power Bourdieu, among other things, writes that the *symbolic power* which assumes the imposition of one view of the world and social divisions depends on the social authority achieved in the previous struggles.²¹ In that sense, at the core of his analysis there is a problem of inequality in the approach to the means of communication and an analysis of the discrimination factors in the relation between those who have an access to the "symbolic power" and those who are doomed to be subjected to the same symbolic power (see more about it in Bourdieu's works *On Television* and *Acts of Resistance*).

Considerable disproportions in the world wealth distribution between the North and the South are today concurrently followed by military-political expansion and the use of unrestrained force in the international relations by the new world order powers as well as cultural hegemony, that is, cultural neoimperialism.

In his works Bourdieu especially deals with the issue of the fate of the European welfare state under the conditions of the domination of the neoliberal ideology and globalization while exposing the myth about a harmonious and uncontroversial concept of European integration and European Union. He points out that, under the influence of mega interests and the neoliberal development strategy, the welfare state in Europe is under attack, and, that, in truth, the European Union is torn apart inside, split in two and differentiated as "the Europe of workers" and "the Europe of bankers," that is, into several development and cultural circles that overlap but are not always harmonious. Unlike the representatives of institutional sociology who have an idolizing approach to the new Europe (European Union) as an ideal (of a decent and model community), Pierre Bourdieu explores the European Union as a form of a controversial integration process (a form of economic and political macrointegration and world globalization), while especially analyzing and criticizing forms of the destruction of the Eurocapitalism model (social welfare state) at present. He analyzes the assumptions of the formation of the European system, the identity of the European Union which is related to the affirmation of the welfare state after the Second World War and the creation of social partnership of the forces of labor and capital. He writes about Europe *as a common home* but also about the attempts of Americanization and Brusselization of Europe under the influence of the neoliberal invasion, that is, the activities of the forces of unshackled mega capital, its political faction and hawks. In that sense, he points out internal contradictions that are being created in the functioning of the European Union (between the *old* and the *new* Europe); besides, he develops a radical criticism of those tendencies aiming at the destruction of the welfare model state in Europe. In that sense, he criticizes *Eurocracy* which is in function of a new plutocracy, a specific coalition of financial oligarchy, political bureaucracy and tycoons in military and media industries.

²¹ More about it in P. Bourdieu's "Symbolic Power," *Kultura*, Belgrade, 1999, Vol. 38, p. 25

Bourdieu's kind of criticism of the European Union that explicitly or implicitly destroys the social democratic model of the welfare state for the sake of interests of the uncontrolled mega capital and the new right has been joined, then or later, by the studies of other researchers.²² That is why sociologists find unacceptable the myth about mondialization and new Europe; instead, it is the task of critical sociology to problematize, following the Bourdieuan appeal for the engaged role of the sociologist, in the theoretical way and to explore in the empirical way Euro-integration processes (and the European Union) as a complex and controversial global social phenomenon in the contemporary world.

IV IN SEARCH OF AN ALTERNATIVE

Pierre Bourdieu did not belong to any party. He is an example of an engaged beyond-any-party intellectual who belonged to the modern intellectual Euro-left. His life and works make him, especially as a sociologist, belong to Europe and mankind.

Pierre Bourdieu was not just satisfied with analyzing controversial world and European realities; instead, in the spirit of his engaged humanist sociology he searched for pathways, possibilities and actors of the development of society and human emancipation.

Unlike the neoliberal philosophy of development, Bourdieu pleaded for the affirmation of the principle of the social democratic model of social development, *for the affirmation of a genuine economy of happiness* which is able to take into consideration all profits and all costs, material and symbolic, of human actions, most of all, of employment and unemployment.²³ In short, according to Bourdieu, "it is an imperative to oppose to the monetary Europe which destroys all previous social achievements a social Europe based on such an alliance of workers of many European countries that would be able to neutralize the dangers induced by workers of every country, especially through *social dumping*, to workers of other countries."²⁴ That is why Bourdieu thought it necessary to conceive of *a new internationalism* which is, most of all, a task of trade unions.²⁵ Concerning this, he advocated for *the formation of a European social movement* (the formation of the basis for a new internationalism on the union, intellectual and peoples' levels) as an alternative against negative effects of neoliberalism and neoliberal globalism and for the sake of preserving the social state and the social democratic model of social development.

Consequently, Bourdieu perceived, unlike neoliberalism as a *utopia of exploitation sans rivages*, in the movement of unemployed in Europe as well as in new unions and a critical humanist role of the intellectuals who are not integrated in the existing system, regarding the strategy of transnational and pan-European actions, *the possibility for creating an alternative movement* for the sake of defending public interests and the social democratic model of social development.

²² Concerning this, we should mention a critical study written by Alain Minc, *La grande illusion* (published by Studentski kulturni centar, Belgrade, 1989) or *L'Europe des Apatrides* by Gerard Baudson (Zavet, Belgrade, 1994) or *After the Empire* by Emanuel Todd (2004) or *Extension to the East. From the urge to the east for peripheral European Union Integration* by Hannes Hofbauer (Filip Višnjić, Belgrade, 2004)

²³ Pierre Bourdieu, *Acts of Resistance*, p. 68

²⁴ *Ibid*, p. 68-69

²⁵ *Ibid*, p. 69

Finally, it is Bourdieu we should be thankful to for his re-problematizing and *re-affirming the role of engaged intellectuals* in the function of human emancipation and the contemporary humanity. Concerning this attitude, it should be added that in his orientation he is not lonely today. Such a role of the intellectual in the contemporary social struggles and new social movements (such as, for instance, the alter-globalist one) is insisted upon by Noam Chomsky, Immanuel Wallerstein and Toni Negri. Regardless of their ideological and theoretical orientations, these engaged intellectuals are looking for new strategies of anti-system and alternative movements that would act on the translational level (that would promote a sort of *globalization assuming a from-the-base orientation, globalization with human face, globalization of non-acceptance*) with a flexible, elaborate and democratic organization structure.²⁶

Unlike the myth about value-neutral sociology and the instrumentalized role of the sociologist as an extended hand of the ruling forces of social engineering promoting *status quo*, Pierre Bourdieu has left us, in our times of "a universal history of infamy" (Borges) and conformism when so many, forsaking their scientific ethics/vocational ethics, are *gladly swimming along the tide*, a shining *example*, in his rich works and honorable intellectual engagement, of what the role of the intellectual should be like in the process of restoring humanist sciences and their emancipating function in the modern world.

REFERENCES

1. P. Burdije, Nacrt za jednu teoriju prakse, Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, Beograd, 1999, 10-11.
2. P. Bourdieu's "Symbolic Power," *Kultura*, Belgrade, 1999, Vol. 38
3. P. Bourdieu: *Le myte de la mondialisation et l'Etat social europeen*, Contre-feux, Liber-raisons D' Agir, Paris, 1998.
4. P. Bourdieu, *Questions de Sociologie*, Editions de minuit, Paris, 1984
5. R. Kalanj *Globalization and Postmodernity*, Politička kultura, Zagreb, 2004
6. I. Wallerstein, *After Liberalism*, Slu`beni list, Belgrade, 2005
7. R. Heilbroner, «Growth and the Lumpen Planet,» *New Perspectives Quarterly*, Vol.10, N 2
8. D. Held&A.McGrew, *Globalisation/Anti-Globalisation*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2002
9. Ljubiša R. Mitrović, *Globalization and the Modern Left*, Institut za političke studije, Belgrade, 2000
10. John Gray, *False Dawn: The Delusions of Global Capitalism*, Masmedija, Zagreb, 2002
11. Miroslav Pečujlić, *Globalization - Two Faces of the World*, Gutenbergova galaksija, Belgrade, 2002
12. Alain Minc, *La grande illusion* published by Studentski kulturni centar, Belgrade, 1989
13. Gerard Baudson, *L'Europe des Apatrides*, Zavet, Belgrade, 1994
14. Emanuel Todd, *After the Empire* by (2004)
15. From the urge to the east for peripheral European Union Integration by Hannes Hofbauer Filip Višnjić, Belgrade, 2004

²⁶ Concerning this, I. Wallerstein writes about the phenomena of *groupism* while Manuel Castells writes about *resistance identity*, Toni Negri about individual *autonomous strategies* of vertical action (from the local to the core of the Empire); Noam Chomsky writes about antiglobalist movements towards social actors.

BURDIJEOVA KRITIKA NEOLIBERALNE FILOZOFIJE RAZVOJA, MITA O "MONDIJALIZACIJI" I NOVOJ EVROPI (Pledoaje za obnovu kritičke sociologije)

Ljubiša Mitrović

Autor najpre razmatra osnove neoliberalne filozofije razvoja u savremenom svetu, a posebno Burdijeovu kritiku neoliberalne ideologije i strategije razvoja, njihovih implikacija na društvene odnose u savremenom društvu. Burdije ukazuje na povezanost neoliberalne filozofije razvoja sa interesima krupnog kapitala, tj. transnacionalnih korporacija u savremenosti, kao i na pokušaje da se neokonzervativna revolucija, pozivajući se na progres, razum i nauku (posebno ekonomsku nauku) kroz novu fetišizaciju tržišta, izvrši opravdanje procesa istorijske restauracije "i tako pokuša da svrsta pod zastarelost svaku progresističku misao i delanje" (P. Burdije).

Burdije posebno kritikuje mit o "mondijalizaciji", kao integralni deo strategije neoliberalnog razvoja u savremenosti, govoreći o njemu kao o "eksploataciji bez granica" i "glavnom oružju u borbama protiv tekovina welfare state-a. Praveći distinkciju između socijaldemokratskog modela društvenog razvoja i demokratskih procesa integracije sveta i "asimetričnog modela globalizacije", Burdije ističe da "globalizacija nije homogenizacija, već je ona, naprotiv, produžetak moći i uticaja malog broja dominantnih nacija nad celinom nacionalnih berzi". U ovom kontekstu svojih razmatranja Burdije ukazuje na klasične i nove oblike strukturalnih nejednakosti u svetu (na socijalno nasilje i simboličko ugnjetavanje).

Burdije se u svojim radovima posebno bavi pitanjem sudbine evropske socijalne države u uslovima dominacije neoliberalne ideologije i globalizacije, razobličavajući mit o harmonijskom i neprotivrečnom konceptu evropske integracije i Evropske unije. On ukazuje da se, pod uticajem interesa krupnog kapitala i neoliberalne strategije razvoja, socijalna država u Evropi našla na udaru; da se u realnosti Evropska unija iznutra cepa, udvaja i diferencira na "Evropu radnika" i "Evropu bankara", na nekoliko razvojnih i kulturoloških krugova koji se seku i nisu uvek harmonični.

Najzad, autor poentira Burdijeovo zalaganje za obnovom kritičke sociologije, koja se nije odrekla analitičke, ali i svoje humanističke i emancipatorske uloge u društvu.

Ključne reči: Pjer Burdije, sociologija, neoliberalizam, globalizacija, socijalna država, Evropska unija