Dusanka Slijepcevic[1]
University of Banja Luka
Faculty of Political Sciences
Banja Luka

Review article
UDC 316.334.2|.3(100):929 BAUMAN Z.
DOI 10.7251/SOCEN1713079S
Accepted: 10.9.2017.

Zygmunt Bauman's contribution to the discourse on a risk society

Abstract

The paper will seek to present the risks of the consumer society, with emphasis on Zygmunt Bauman's perspective on the affected areas of social life in the age of liquid modernity.The aim of this paper is theoretical analysis of the risks of the consumer society, in other words the synthesis of discourse standpoints concerning the risk society (Beck, Giddens, Touraine, Bauman) with the focus on specificities of Bauman's contribution to the discourse. Besides that, the aim is directed to the causal explanation of the risk state through the prism of theglobalization process impact and the dominant ideology of neoliberalism.

Theoretical analysis has resulted in perceiving Bauman's contribution to the discourse on risk society in terms of understanding the transformation of human relations, caused by socio - economic changes in the sphere of social security and freedom - the essential prerequisites of a dignified existence of individuals in society.

Concluding observations indicatethe type of risk of the contemporary society, which is most easily recognized by its dominant attribute – disintegration of social tissue that is a trademark of liquid modernity and life under the pressures of precarious existence marked by fear.

Keywords: *modernity, globalization, risks, Bauman*

[1] Teaching Assistant
Scientific area: Theoretical Sociology
Department of Sociology – Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Banja Luka
E-mail: dusanka.slijepcevic@fpn.unibl.org

INTRODUCTION

The transformation of the society that followed in the second half of the 20thcentury, with the end of the *classical industrial society*[2], affectedsignificantly all spheres of social life and thus established the question of the ending of the modern, i.e. the beginning of its *reflexivity*[3], in the context of the generated consequences (more radical and more universal in the comparison to the period of the early modernity).This showed thatduring its development themodernity negated and disintegrated the foundations based on traditionally settled institutional order on which it was originally constituted[4], in other words the industrial society impeller ("primary family", "classes", etc.)[5], thus leading to the creation of risksunder the influence of fragmentation of all spheres of social life enabled by the globalization – *"dissolving all borders"*[6]. Besides the globalization, the process of *individualization*, in parallel to the process of *de-traditionalization*[7], is ongoing in a risk society, and the remains of the previous institutional order (family, marriage, labor, gender relations etc.) are passing through even more radical changes under their influence.

Through this venture we found ourselves in an indeterminatetime position, which cannot be calleda transitional one (becausein this case it would entail a clear knowledge of the expected outcome). Rather, it is a period, *"which is impossible to sustain a long (...) in which the old ways by which host more things do not work or make ineffective, while not yet invented, much less experienced in practice, new instruments"*[8]. However, the lack of definition of the current situation does not mean a lack of perception of existing risks, arisen on the ruins of society deteriorated by globalization, and caused by conflict between *non-social forces*[9] - a sort of impersonal world (markets, wars, waves of violence, terrorism, global crisis, natural disasters, technology) and individuals, or in short terms the world of life of human beings. On the contrary,

[2] Look at: Ulrich Beck,*Risk Society: Towards a new modernity* (Belgrade: Filip Visnjic, 2001).

[3] Look at: Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Belgrade: Filip Visnjic, 1998); See also: Beck, *Risk Society.*

[4] Mileva Filipovic,"Sociology and post-positivist paradigms: Some cognitive difficulties of contemporary sociology"*SOCIOLOGY* Vol. L, N° 3 (2008): p. 260

[5] Look at: Ulrich Beck,*Risk Society: Towards a new modernity* (Belgrade: Filip Visnjic, 2001).

[6] Alain Touraine, *A New Paradigm: For understanding today's world (*Belgrade: Službeni glasnik, 2011).

[7] Beck, *Risk Society: Towards a new modernity*

[8] Bauman, Zygmunt. "Zygmunt Bauman about bugbear of rebellion and social inequality", 2014, https://radiogornjigrad.wordpress.com/2014/05/12/intervju-saintervju-sa-zygmuntom-baumanom-bauk-pobune-bauk-pobune/[20. 07. 2017.]

[9] Touraine*, A New Paradigm.*

it is evident "*... that the way it is organized modern society is more irrational: it is increasingly directed against a man, and not for him*"[10].

A certain fact is themore the modern society in the global coordinates develops the more problems, risks and dangers for a man and his communities and institutions multiply.[11] Also, although the preconditions for a man's free life (technics, technology, ...) are acquired, decent and dignified life is not ensured yet because of the omnipresent feeling of fear and helplessness against non-social forces.

This only means that the increasing application of expert rationality and knowledge only deepens the state of risk.

Although it leads to (un)expected risks and consequences, the confrontation in the fields mentioned is nevertheless facilitated by an increase in the degree of reflexivity of social knowledge which "*makes the actions more predictable*"[12].

GLOBALIZATION AND MODERN TIMES RISK RADICALIZATION

The emergence and development of modern technology is the cause of **globalization**[13] and its most prominent aspect. Namely, the spreading influ-

[10] George Ritzer, *Contemporary Sociological Theory and its Classical Roots* (Belgrade: Službeni glasnik, 2009), p. 19

[11] Risks have assumed a global character, so the potential dangers which follow it cannot be limited to certain places and groups. On the basis of the political and cultural strength which they have gained, and the globalization as their mediator for expansion, the risks have become a supranational and non-specific class phenomenon which affects everyone, regardless of the distinctions, and which, therefore, starts the question of responsibility (individual and collective one) when it comes to dealing with its wanted and unwanted consequences, i.e. self-produced insecurities.

[12] Alberto Martineli, *Modernism: The process of modernization* (Podgorica: CID, 2010), p. 147

[13] Because of the necessity to explain the increasing number of dynamic social changes, the term **globalization** is included in the dictionaries of social and humanistic sciences in the middle of the 80s of the 20thcentury and it is related to the period which followed after the real-socialism, The Cold War and the construction of the unipolar world. By deriving the concept of "globalization" from the Latin word *globus*(ball, later ball of the Earth) or French *global* - in the sense of totality, one can find a simple definition of it in terms of the social process, which streams towards the universality and uniqueness of the world.Aljosa Mimica & Marija Bogdanovic,*Sociological Dictionary* (Belgrade: Zavod za udžbenike, 2007), p. 163 Thus, globalization can be defined as *"the manifestation, the emergence of a global society ('world society')*where the *'term 'globally' can be referred only to (in order to be theoretically precise) those manifestations which appear on the level of 'globus' (as a symbol of the Earth, the totallity of our real life),*

ence of information and communication technology (ICT) has led to an increase in the speed and volume of interactions among people all around the world. This has created an overall impression "*... that we all live more and more in one world, so that individuals, groups and nations are becoming increasingly interdependent*".[14]It is all about deepening general, global interdependence in all aspects of social life, or about *"intensification of social relations on a world scale that connects distant places in such a way that local events shape events that have taken place miles away and vice versa*".[15] This results in the compression of time and space, which strengthens the feeling and *"consciousness of the world as a whole"*[16], and *"the spread of free capitalism to every country in the world is coming; market integration, nation-states and technologies in an unprecedented degree that allows individuals, corporations and nation-states to stretch around the world further, faster, deeply and cheaper than ever before"*[17]. That only confirms that the term globalization *denotes "a series of social processes that are thought to transform our present state into a state of globalization"*[18]. On the other hand, under the influence of globalism as the *"ideology of the world market rule"*[19], the world market eliminates or replaces political activity, and the multidimensionality of globalization is reduced only to the economic dimension, while all the other dimensions (cultural, political, ecological, ...) are subordinated to the dominance of the world market system. In its pretensions to become the dominant "value", neoliberalism (market globalism) tends to ruin the social structures that are opposing or resisting the process.[20] It is possible to reach this knowledge through reflexive insights of

or on the 'world map' level as a form of 'extended' globus, so, on the world level". Ivan Sijakovic & Dragana Vilic, *Sociology of Contemporary Society* (Banja Luka: Faculty of Economics, 2010), p. 64 – 65 Over time, the use of the term "globalization" has been intensified to such an extent, especially in the nineties, that it has become unthinkable to omit it in any analytical approach to the happenings of contemporary society.

[14] Ulrich Beck, *What is Globalization? (*Zagreb: Vizura, 2003), p. 56

[15] Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, p. 69

[16] Roland Robertson, *Globalization – Social Theory and Global Culture* (London: Sage PublicationsLtd, 1992), p. 8

[17] Thomas L. Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization* (New York: Farrar, Straus&Giroux, 1999), p. 7 – 8

[18] Manfred B. Steger, *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 8

[19] Beck, *What is globalisation*, p. 24

[20] Lisickin and Seljepin believe that globalization is based on the strategy of *"preserving and deepening financial and economic power over the world"* with the help of financial resources and transnational companies (TNKs) in the United States. To this end, the deregulation and liberalization of the financial markets are being carried out in order to cause losses of the economic independence of the states (abolition of the state regulatory economy and deprivation of the possibility of monetary control within the state), and therefore committed the subordination

the situation in society, in other words through the observation of risks which assumed a global character. Denoting the risk points to the impossibilities, negative deviations opposed to the expected ones which cause losses or damage and *"include uncertainties and dangers".*[21]The risk origins come from the modernization, in other words from science as a form of applied technology. This is the reason why the phrase 'risk society' presents a social construct, which refers to the totality of appearances, processes and the constructs of late modernity, regarding the society of risk distribution, not a society of distribution of goods (industrial society).

Namely, thanks to globalization, the"*extreme form of capitalism*"[22], the eradication of the economy from societyoccurred in a way that it can no longer be controlled(since it manifests itself as a destructive influence on all spheres of social life), and the risks are affecting the unexpected areas, and their presence is felt daily through the effects at local level and *vice versa*.[23]Thus, today we face the dominance of fabricated risks, which are a direct consequence of the impact of human knowledge and technology on the world of nature. Unlike the external risks, which come outside of the tradition or nature, the factory risks are created under the influence of our growing knowledge of the world, under the influence of the action of human practice, scientific knowledge, power and technology on the nature.[24]

Today's risk[25] has gone to a terrifying extent and the modern world turns into a risk society which cannot be controlled, it turns into a "*runaway world*"[26].Thus, the inconspicuous risk scales present the inherent conse-

of national economies to the interests of the TNC and their integration into the *"world empire"*. Vladimir Aleksandrovic Lisickin&Leonid Aleksandrovic Seljepin,*Global Empire of Evil: New geopolitical distribution of forces (*Banja Luka: Sociological association- Banja Luka, 2014), p. 357

[21] The American Heritage Dictionary, Fourth Edition copyright Houghton Mifflin Company, 2009

[22] Touraine, *A New Paradigm*, p. 205

[23] Anthony Giddens, *Runaway World: How globalization is reshaping our lives* (Belgrade: AMD System, 2005), p. 47 – 61

[24] Giddens is talking about these exact risks (produced and outer ones), *Runaway World, p. 52*

[25] Risks of a risk society differentiate significantly from the earlier risks, both because of the modern causes that provoke them, and because of their action in relation to space (they can also affect those living far from the risky territory, as it was seen in the case of the atomic accident in Chernobyl), and in relation to time (that same accident has shown that the consequences of atomic risk are borne by generations that have not even been born yet). Without making a difference based on nationality, wealth or social origin, the risks of the globalization age present a threat to all societies. Regarding this, it is possible to point out that the produced risks have some new characteristics (compared to the earlier risks) and new social, cultural and political consequences, as well as potentials that threaten people and the entire civilization.

[26] Anthony Giddens, *Runaway World: How globalization is reshaping our lives* (Belgrade: AMD System, 2005)

quence of the prevailing type of technological and economic development, by whose momentum risks are increasing.[27] The destructive-creative role of globalization becomes more and more prominent in the disintegration of the old and constructing the new *individualized*"*society*".[28] On the ruins of stable interaction caused by pleasing the contemporary requirements for permanent mobility and more efficient flexibility appear: the rise of chauvinism, fanaticism and terrorism as by-products of this destruction, which favor to the climate of the fascism development.[29]

The risk society discourse incorporates the views on turbulent changes, risk state diagnoses, as well as the projection of alternative future.

TOWARDS THE RISKS[30]

As a witness of the *"collapse within the modern, which liberates the contour of the classical industrial society and takes on a new form - here the so-called*

[27] Anthony Giddens, The Consequences of Modernity. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1990.

[28] For more information see: Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Times: Living in an age of uncertainty* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007); Touraine, *New paradigm.*

[29] For more see in: Zygmunt Bauman, *Postmodern Ethics* (Zagreb: AGM, 2009).

[30] The content of the headline refers to the discourse presentation on risk society and on the authors who contributed to its creation. The risk society discourse represents the multidimensional social construct about changes of the foundations of the society under the influence of modernization, and about risks and consequences of that process has on the flora and fauna, but also on human existence. The discourse incorporates the standpoints of numerous sociologists and other experts on social areas. The appearance of **Ulrich Beck's (Ulrich Beck)** book – *Risk Society: Towards a new modernity* (2001), which, for the object of interest, has the perceiving of historical mega-trends of both fascinating and frightening times, is one of theevents that, in the chronicle of events in our life and culture in general, stands out with its outstanding significance. This can be seen especially if we take into consideration the contribution of this book to the construction of discourses on a risk society. Credits for the same contribution belong to **Anthony Giddens (Anthony Giddens)**, who through his books*Consequences of Modernity* (1998) and *Runaway World: How is Globalization re-shaping our lives*(2005) attempted to present the uneven and major changes of the world, which, under the influence of modernization, globalization and unstoppable growth and development got out of control. Guided by Beck's idea of scientific rationality and knowledge as risk factors, Giddens also argues that the innovation process entails certain risks and dangers.
Alain Touraine (Alain Touraine), on the basis of the scientific findings collected in the *A New Paradigm: For understanding today's world* (2011), also enriched the fund of scientific knowledge on the transformations of social structures that generate risks at the global level. **Zygmunt Bauman (Zygmunt Bauman)**, through the entire trilogy *Liquid Times*(2009), *Liquid Love* (2009) and *Liquid Fear* (2009) and especially with the appropriate and symbolic use of Pandora's box metaphor, magnificently described the life chained by risk, that is, permanent insecurity, unexpected outcomes and multiple losses, where the search for shelter and hope of humanity remained as the only alternative.

(industrial) risk society"[31], **Ulrich Beck** establishes a "diagnosis"[32] of the modern world, with the intent of understanding and perceiving the unsteadiness and the horror of the civilization which endangers itself.

The emergence of modern global institutions has been made by the destruction of traditional ones, and following this trend, modernization at the transition to the 21st century is now affecting itself, as tradition has exhausted itself completely. This means that the basic components of traditionalism, which were immanent to industrial society and incorporated in the patterns of "primary family", "class", "democracy" etc., begin to disintegrate, thereby disintegrating the concepts through which these phenomena were thought about and explained, all of this to reach the aim ofindustrial society self-understanding.

Accordingly, the leading idea, with which Beck begins in his lectures, deals with the process of modernization, which then leads to the transition of class society into a risky society, due to "*... social transformation within the modern, in which people are liberated from the social forms of an industrial society - class, layers, families, gender statuses of men and women - much like people in the time of reformation from secular power of the church were 'released' into society"*[33]. In other words, Beck is trying to explain that from an old, classical industrial society we are moving to the stage of other modernity. Namely, "*as modernization abolished the agrarian society in the nineteenth century, and derived the image of the structure of the industrial society, modernism today erases the contours of industrial society, and the modern continues to live through another social form"*[34]. This, on the one hand, leads to a more intense release of

[31] Beck, *Risk Society*, p. 18

[32] The motive for establishing the diagnosis of a risky society was a Chernobyl disaster from April 1986, which pointed to the problem of the atomic age and its aggressiveness, but now on a global scale. This nuclear accident has drawn attention to the environmentally-conditioned, self-destructive potential of a modernized society, which only creates risky states around the world that are equally vulnerable to "East" and "West". Beck, therefore, offers an answer to the causes of the emergence of risks, with particular emphasis on the fact that risks are largely due to unimaginable absorption of world forces to take over the hegemony in the world. Such forward-looking statements, which become the target of conquering and colonizing goals, are precisely producing a state of risks and construct a society based on them. Therefore, any attempt to manage crises and establish control over risks is condemned to failure, since economic globalization under the aegis of the ideology of neoliberalism leads to the destruction of the environment, social stratification, unemployment and poverty, as well as globally organized crime and uncontrolled domination of the global elite of power. Therefore, under the influence of apocalyptic potentials of distorted modernity, at the same time a triumph and a crisis of one type of civilization takes place, which gradually loses the meaning of the overall progress towards a higher quality of life.

[33] Beck, *Risk Society*, p. 126

[34] *Ibid*., p. 19

a person from the definitions of a class industrial society, while on the other hand it causes more intense release of risks.

Under the concept of a risky society, Beck implies *"a society at a higher level of modernity"*, followed by social risk production. For Beck, a risky society is another name for a world beyond control[35],and risk *"means ambivalence; being at risk is the way of existence and governance in the world of modernity; to be exposed to global risk is the human condition at the beginning of the 21st century"*[36].

This world risk society ideahighlighting means that we live in a society in which we are facing the risks for our security. *"In contrast to all earlier epochs (including industrial society), a risk society is markedly characterized by one disadvantage: the impossibility of external attribution of danger"*[37]. In other words, today's society which is dealing with risks, in fact, is confronting itself, since due to the application of highly developed production forces it itself produces hazards and risks (e.g. environmental risks) that previous generations did not face, and which can no longer be excommunicated. These are the unwanted consequences of human activities that are causing global environmental threats, that is, the dangers of the *"atomic age"*, which *"become blind travelers of average consumption. ... they travel by wind and water, they are in everything and everything and come into contact with what is most necessary for life - with air, food, clothes, living space - all, otherwise, strictly controlled, protective zones of modernity"*[38].In that sense Beck performed a classification of risks, he made a distinction between: solvable and unavoidable risks which seek adaptation and habituation.[39]

The consequences of modernization and a galloping world. Representing the view that modern times, of which we are contemporaries, is not so much a period of postmodernity as the period in which the consequences of modernity become more radical and universal than they were before, **Anthony Giddens**[40]develops views on transformations, brought by modernity, which with their intensity cause changes of even the most intimate spheres of our existence. Institutions of late, *"reflexive modernity"* are emerging, as a result of the transformation of the previous, traditional order.[41]

[35] Joshua Yates, "An Interview with Ulrich Beck on Fear and Risk Society" *Hedgehog Review* Vol. 5, Issue 3 (2003): 96 – 107. http://www.iasc-culture.org/THR/archives/Fear/5.3HBeck.pdf [01. 09. 2017.]

[36] Ulrich Beck, "Living in the world risk society: A Hobhouse Memorial Public Lecture"*Economy and Society* Volume 35, Number 3 (2006): p. 330

[37] Beck, *Risk Society*, p. 317

[38] *Ibid*., p. 14

[39] See in: *Ibid*.

[40] See in: Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*. and Giddens, *The Runaway World*.

[41] Social relations such as that are established, and they are no longer determined strictly by local contexts, in which they often took place, but which now involve the whole planet. Their

Giddens names the ballast, under which the world is abolished by controls, using an adequate metaphor of *"dragon's chariots"*[42]which, despite the anticipation of the Enlightenment, is not possible to submit to prediction and control due to: *errors in the design*, *in management*, as well as *unintended consequences* and the *circularity of social knowledge*[43]. However, even though the social world a produce of human factor, it cannot be completely controlled, which does not mean that it is necessary to give up the attempts to control dragon's chariots.On the contrary, any attempt of anticipation, of alternative future creation is more than welcome, because our dedication to it can contribute tothe realization of that projection. That is why Giddens pledges for models of a good society, which would be based on *"emancipatory policies"* (policies of equality) and *"life policies"* (politics of self-actualization).[44] While emancipatory policies are based on the ideas of justice and equality, and directed towards the liberation from subordination, so far life policies[45] are based on the *"ethics of personal"*[46] and aim at achieving self-realization.

Therefore, the subject can best perform its social activities by joining forces with other subjects within the forms of radical engagement (social movements), as *"practical opposition to the perceived sources of danger"*[47]. Giddens sees them as the means of achieving a safer and more humane world in the future, that is, the postmodern world, as he envisioned (*post-scarce system*, *multilayered democratic participation, demilitarization and humanization of technology*)[48]. Giddens lays the greatest hope in the peace and ecological movements that are gaining in importancein recent times[49], due to the rise

development and expansion at the global level provided the opportunity for a richer existence than the one the pre-modern system was able to offer, but modernity did not spare us from its reverse, which as ballast threatens from all sides.

[42] Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, p. 134

[43] *Ibid.*,p. 145 – 148

[44] *Ibid*., p. 149 – 151

[45] It is precisely in life policies that it is possible to recognize the opportunity to improve the position of society. It is known that self-actualization is a tendency towards the realization of human potentials and self-awareness of the individual. Therefore it is not surprising that it has become fundamental to self-identity, which will also be said about the subject. Namely, it contributes to the construction of subject, conceived in Touraine's definition, as the bearer of sense and meaning, the actor driven by desire (the constituent of the postmodern).

[46] Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, p. 151

[47] *Ibid*., p. 133

[48] *Ibid*., p. 156

[49] In that sense, of crucial importance for a subject and movements would be working on: strengthening awareness of the need of monitoring technology and creating the conditions for its humanization, in order to avoid catastrophic consequences. It is important that people care about controversial phenomena, such as 3D printing, genetically modified food, cloning, organ transplantation, and so on, and that they seek to reconstruct social institutions and

in risk with severe consequences.The possibility of self-actualization or else the exclusion of the subject in fact appear with the formation of "knowledge society" or to say it even more precisely the appearance of economy based on the information and knowledge.

The possibility of self-actualization or exclusion of the subject just occurs with the emerging 'knowledge society', or better to say on information and knowledge based economy.[50]

Dealing with the institutional analysis of modernity, Giddens gave a precise schematic presentation of the risks[51]with severe consequences in the pe-

put technology in service for human needs.This concern with new challenges will help them to handle the determinants of life better, in the information age of informatics capitalism in which computer technology has become the main productive force, and social life is increasingly controlled by computer machines. The organization of the most modern era, therefore, implies that the establishment of control over information, as the main capital in the 21st century, and knowledge as well, becomes the main source of power in the "knowledge society".

[50] As Manuel Castells points out, the dynamics of capitalism restructured into a new information form, also relies on polarization and inequality, creating a differences already in the division of labor at the *„self-programmable*", which is easily reprogrammed to perform many different tasks, and which, thanks to education as their main quality, produce knowledge and processes information, and as such represents the manufacturers and "*generic*", easily replaceable with machinery or other members of the generic labor force, due to a lack of knowledge, information and competences. Manuel Castells, *End of Millennium* (Zagreb: Golden marketing, 2003), p. 365 Potential conflict is possible precisely on this route, because the generic labor force needs information manufacturers to negotiate about employment, while the reverse is not the case, so in that situation there is "*an arise of a major gap in information capitalism that leads the gradual disappearance of the remains of solidarity of industrial society*".*Ibid*., p. 369 The individualization of labor force, globalization of the economy and the weakening of the legitimacy of the state led to the disappearance of the safety membrane (health and welfare) for socially-incapacitated people who are unable to gain some sources of income, which often causes their multiple life crisis and the state of social exclusion that this category of the population predetermines the main factor for potential hotspot of confrontation with the dominant social groups.

[51] Thus he argues about one of those risks – "*the breakdown of mechanisms of economic growth*" which is possible to expect concerning the inner limitations of the available resources which unable the infinite accumulation. Accordingly to that if one takes into consideration the external factors which are irreversibly affected by the market (deepening of the world inequalities), it is likely to expect their harsh implications. The economic crisis 2008-2009 confirmed that. When we talk about *"the risk of totalitarian rule growth",* Giddens states that the rise of totalitarian regimes is very likely to happen if we observe the resilience of the growing democratic participation, which can easily turn into a dictatorship. Namely, the rise of democratic participation implies the supervising democratic participation mechanism strengthening and the control in the hands of political government whom possesses the monopoly over the means of the coercion, as the instruments of terror.

Giddens has identified also *"the nuclear conflict of major extents"* as a type of risk, also with fatal consequences, because the massive army conflicts, in which only conventional weapons would be used, would lead towards destruction, and let alone one (even if it was limited) nuclear war.

riod of reflexive, late modernity *("the breakdown of economic growth mechanism"; "totalitarian rule risk"; "nuclear confrontation and large scale war"; "the decay of natural environment or ecological disaster").*

The "end" ofthe society and *anopportunity for reconstruction.*Alain Tourainewill be remembered for the insightful identification of retrograde forces which are representing the "*anti-subject*" and the main protagonists of anti-society. On the trail of his deconstruction of social transformation, occurring at the transition from the second half of 20th to 21st century, Touraine speaks about the main risk - ***the risk of neoliberalism***, as an ideology that propagates market fundamentalism, which is best manifested in the aspirations that *"the market have to be the master of everything"*[52]. At the same time, it emphasizes the problem of individualization of society, which gradually leads to the crisis of representation, and thus to the crisis of identity and the end of society. The triumph of the market, that is, of liberalism is, therefore, a key force that threatens the destruction of institutions and norms.[53]

This heightened pressure of the imperative of individualism[54]involves an individual into the labyrinths of searching for partial identities, which are inconsistent because they depend on market conditions and man's (un)success in positioning in the global market. This is to conclude from the following quotation: *"The breakdown of society in the most modern countries has reached its extreme forms when the connection between the system and the actors has broken, when the meaning of a norm for the system no longer coincides with its meaning for the actors. Then everything gets double meaning and the individual wants to be affirmed by opposing the language of society"*[55].

The last risk Giddens is arguing about is *"the decay of the natural environment or ecological disaster"*. Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity*, p. 163 – 164

[52] Touraine, *A New Paradigm*, p. 120

[53] Touraine thus underlined the importance of Durkheim's diagnosis of social anomie, whose second name is postmodern. Namely, the key ideology of globalization - neoliberalism as market globalism - has proclaimed the principles of egoism and utilitarianism that come to the most explicit expression through consumption practices, contributing to the momentum of consumerism and its negative impact on the human beings.

[54] If the society in the epoch of modern times is meant as the totality of social relationships that establishes the structure of the ranks of the spheres of activity, it is at the ruins of its own postmodern times that it has become atomized, which is why Touraine diagnoses his "end". Touraine sees the main culprit for such a situation in instrumental rationality, which has become the dominant factor of human life so much that he mastered it, in the way that a man of the modern age focused his action on searching for profit and efficiency. This resulted in a reduced degree of interaction, that is, the loss of relationships and interpersonal relationships, creating alienation of man even from himself, since the root of man is (the other) man itself.

[55] *Ibid*., p. 69

Leading by the proclamation of the 'end of history' (F. Fukuyama), Touraine anticipated that the "end" of society is, indeed, the end of "*a social conception of a society in which every actor, individual or group is defined by a social situation*"[56]. However, Touraine sees the chance to move out of the labyrinth in reconstructing the rationality and subjectivity of modernity through the striving to the most important goal of multiplying and defending the creative potentials of the subject against existing inconsistencies, uncertainties and unpredictability, as well as potential violent acts that, in combination with the aforementioned characteristics of the fluid life, threaten to flood the flows of everyday life.[57]

The most important Touraine's contribution to the discourse on a risky society rests on his understanding of the anti-subject as the negation of the subject, that is, sense, consciousness and conscience. ***The risk of an anti-subject*** invites the necessity of constituting the subject, because the subject is the only capable of resisting the *"impersonal forces of market and war"*[58].So, conscientious and aware of own position in society, the subject is a seeker of meaning, hope, holder of the claim, which is characterized by the desire to be *"an actor of his existence"*[59].On the other hand, the protagonist of destruction, and the most important name of the anti-subject is, as Touraine points out, "*evi"*. His cruelty "*wild to dehumanize human being, ran over his face and turned it into a bloody heap of flesh and bones in which there is nothing more human*"[60]. Continuing with an explication of subject, Touraine emphasizes its essential properties – *"killing the subject in himself and in the others"* (doing evil) and the *"desire to humiliation and degradation that exceeds the desire to*

[56] *Ibid*., p. 58

[57] The technocratic, information society was programmed on accumulation of knowledge and information, and on the use of techniques and technologies, as the main capital in the 21st-century, to which the bureaucratic - technocratic elite is being entrusted with the monopoly and comes in a *"position to decide and thus (she) occupies the position of the bourgeois class in classical capitalism",* thus opposing the entire society. Ivan Sijakovic & Dragana Vilic,*Sociology of Contemporary Society* (Banja Luka: Faculty of Economics, 2010), p. 60Confronting the victorious, technocratic class of the postindustrial society, that is, the negative effects it creates (alienation, manipulation, coercion, aggression), they concentrate on the strength of social movements and their actions beyond the production sphere and in terms of the new themes which they start (knowledge, education, peace ...) Ivan Sijakovic & Dragana Vilic,*Sociology of Contemporary Society*, p. 60

[58] Not coincidentally, Touraine retrograde forces called "faceless", leaving the possibility of extending the classification of anti-subjects (market, social exclusion, xenophobia, fascism, war, violence, 3D print, etc.)According to his, previously mentioned, qualitative characteristics, the subject is a human being, a holder of the personality which is constituted on a principle rather than on authority.Touraine, *A New Paradigm*, p. 143

[59] *Ibid*., p. 205

[60] *Ibid*., p. 139

kill".[61] In accordance with its previously indicated characteristics, anti-subject of upcoming seasons can be identified among the more actual projects dehumanization of *trans-humanism movement*, which aims at the destruction of the structure of human society.[62]

[61] Which means, by thinking in binary categories, Touraine clearly specifies that the anti-subject is evil, and despite the previously given thesis that – thinking in binary oppositions (*"dangerous couples"*) *"always presupposes that the meaning is on the one hand, while the other one represents nonsense"*(*Ibid*., p. 138). The conclusion is drawn that the problem is of a semiotic, discursive nature, that is, subject to manipulation of meaning, and Touraine itself confirms this by specifying a concrete example that indicates that the bearer of power possesses a monopoly on the construction of reality or classification into predetermined categories (subject - object): *"Than West in expansion, towards the conquest of the world, saw in colonies the opposition to what enabled the West triumph. The colonized world, especially the Arab world, has become a place of evil, one that threatens the kingdom of good, as President Bush states*" (*Ibid*., p. 137 – 138). Bearing in mind Touraine's, Beck's and Giddens's views on the subjects of the information society, there is no doubt that they are social movements, collectivist, communal forces that are opposed to the forces of globalization, that is, to radical individualism. In view of the dominant logic of IT capitalism, Castells recalls the need for a decentralized form of organization and intervention of social movements, that is, through networking (see more in: Manuel Castells,*The Power of Identity* (Zagreb: Golden marketing, 2002), p. 368).

[62] This is confirmed by the attitudes of analysts who are skeptical about the 'blessings' promised by trans-humanism: "*The new species, or 'posthuman' will likely view the old 'normal' humans as inferior, even savages, and fit for slavery or slaughter. The normals, on the other hand, may see the posthumans as a threat and if they can, may engage in a preemptive strike by killing the posthumans before they themselves are killed or enslaved by them. It is ultimately this predictable potential for genocide that makes species-altering experiments potential weapons of mass destruction, and makes the unaccountable genetic engineer a potential bioterrorist.*" According to Annas, Andrews, and Isasi 2002 in: Nick Bostrom, "A History of Trans-humanist Thought" *Journal of Evolution and Technology* Vol. 14, Issue 1 (2005): 24 – 25If we take into account that the revitalization of humanity, according to the opinion of the risk society theorists (especially Bauman), the only remaining chance for deliverance from multiple crises, caused by the disintegration of society, then it becomes quite clear aspirations of trans-humanism 'movement' to the erosion of human empathy. Removing the remaining solidarity, as a component of humanity that formed the connective tissue of human relations, thus representing a pillar of social cohesion, unblocks the road to social engineering in the creation of a technocratic corporatism and other manipulative strategies technocratic era. Everything will be performed only under the mask of human augmentation and "better" life, but in fact with the aim of exploitation of the human body, as new colonies of parasitic mode of existence of capitalism, to the complete overcoming of the human form of existence on earth (trans-humanism; post-humans).This would be in line with emergence of informationalism as a"material basis" (Castells, *End of Millennium*, p. 360) of a new society, that is, of social order, which increasingly, how Castells warns, *"looks like a meta-social mess... automated, random sequence of events, carried out from the unreasonable logic of the market, technology, geopolitical order or biological determination*" (Castells, *The Rise of the Network Society*, p. 500). Regarding the aforementioned challenges that entails 21st century, Castells states: *"If they are reasonably exploited, the genetic revolution could bring healing and thus give us the opportunity to explore a rather unknown area of spirituality. But if we make the same mistakes that we committed in the twentieth century, by using technology and industrialization to kill each other in wartime fears, with our new technological*

ZYGMUNT BAUMAN'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE DISCOURSE ON A RISK SOCIETY

The changes, which took place in the second half of the 20th century, when the society in which fordistic economy dominated was transformed into a consumerist society, encouraged Bauman's research attention. Bauman, particularly in the term of the risks of consumer society, was putting emphasis on those risks that affect the sphere of social relations, but also on psycho-social situation of the individual in a deeply individualized society. So he asked the answers to the questions: *How does a consumer society influence an individual, his relationship to others and the environment? By which methods this effect is realized? What challenges does an individual face in a consumer society? How is it to live under the burden of freedom and the imperative of individualism? Why is 'seeking shelter in Pandora's Box' one of the most elemental human needs?* and similarly.

Motivated by the search for detailed responses, Bauman's analysis contributed to the enrichment of the scientific results of the discourse on risk society and enabled the wider understanding of the transformation of interpersonal relationships, encouraged by radical changes in the socio-economic life, particularly in terms of sphere of the social security and freedom, as essential prerequisites of decent the existence of individuals in society.

The need to avoid confusion over the use of the term postmodernity, Bauman disclaims by applying terms or metaphors "*liquid modernity*"[63], in order to specifymore clearly the difference between the solid structures of the classical modernity and the inconsistent characteristics of late modernity. The very meaning of liquid modernity automatically associate with the vagueness, uncertainty, changeability, unexpectedness of outcomes, losses that are constituent elements of the concept of risk. In this regard, Bauman was reflected the risks of the liquid times in late modernity, with which the individual, wrenched from the previous state of safety and security, is facing with full freedom of personal choice, which implies a fear of the decision, as well.

force, we can easily end life on the planet. The stoppage of the nuclear Holocaust proved to be relatively simple because control of nuclear energy and weapons is centralized. But the new genetic technology is pervasive, its mutational influences are not subject to complete control, and its institutional control is much more decentralized. In order to prevent the evil consequences of the biological revolution, not only responsible governments are sufficient but a responsible, educated society is needed" (Castells, *End of Millennium*, p. 377).

[63] Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Modernity* (Zagreb: Pelago edition, 2011c).

This "*liquid times*"[64] take place in the society of liquid modernity, which was created by the liberation from the ossified structures of solid modernity, which was synonymous with social security and safety. Life in a liquid society represents life at the moment and for a moment or life from today to tomorrow, unpredictable in its dependence on changes and turbulent circumstances on a global scale, which are increasingly determining events at the local level too, by preventing the consolidation of behavior in routines that guarantee stability.Liquid life, in consequence, never happens under the same conditions, because the changeability of the events at the daily level exceeds the possibility of its control and foresight. Consequently, it is characterized by the absence of rules, norms and behavior patterns that would suggest commonly accepted principles of behavior, as well as a mess in the lives of individuals, whose everyday life was reduced to the mechanical conquest of desires and false needs. Therefore, it is indicative anomaly of the condition in which such a life takes place, which only implies the potential consequences for the mental health of the individual and the quality of his relationship with other people. In this regard, Bauman emphasized that the main risk of today's society stems from the lack of security that has been sacrificed on the altar of freedom, despite the fact that freedom and security are interdependent. Therefore, Bauman was emphasizing that the social state of freedom without security represents a classical anomie, ultimately anarchy or that "*the suffering of a modern man comes from achieving a huge, unprecedented personal freedom in exchange for giving a huge part of security (...) security in the sense of social position, self-confidence, faith in their decisions, trust in authority*"[65]. While on the other hand, security would have ended in tyranny without freedom, in the last case - slavery.

Life in the age of liquid modernity is following social streams which seem to erode the identity of the individual, without offering some predictable frameworks for complete identification, personal sovereignty in the present and the future. Bauman was describing such a situation as a mere siege, or as a situation in which an individual is *"under siege"* on a daily basis, thus trapped in a cage without wires by expressing obedience to the marketing imperatives of the consumer society to be an individual, distinguished in his distinction from others, but only under the condition of consumption only those goods which with their specification promise so much dreamlike individuality. That's why you buy Pepsi and become your "own", just like anyone else

[64] Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Times: Living in an age of uncertainty* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007).

[65] Zygmunt Bauman,"Freedom is a paradox", 2015, http://akuzativ.com/teme/841-sloboda-je-paradoks [19. 07. 2017.]

who does the same, or you come out of the race with globalization, fashion trends and dictates of prevailing tastes, ending up like the "out" of the season and at the dump of the *de mode* collection! The choice is allegedly a matter of freedom, although the matter of choice is far from free decision making when choosing between pre-selected, offered options. Under the siege of the consumer and transitory syndrome, or the expiry of the expiration date, man is reduced to one, the materialistic dimension of his existence. His world of life is colonized in a way that he himself is becomingconsumed, that is, he becomes a consuming object, just as other (living and inanimate) fragments of the consumer society.

To catch up with time, it is the greatest challenge and the condition of impeccable functioning in liquid times. To be in a constant movement, with a run in the future so that would not be ended on the ruins of the past! This imperative is also determining the dominant type of personality, which corresponds to the forces of modern times: *"Today are ruling people who move faster and act, which approaches the momentum of movement. And they rule people who cannot move equally fast, and even more strikingly, over the category of people who cannot even leave their place when they are satisfied*"[66].To choose identity in accordance with the prevailing social circumstances and the requirements of the global market! In a word, to be a tireless performer, an acrobat on the trapezoid of a traveling circus, because *"The Show Must Go On!*". To follow the celebrities and become such, because the time of the heroes who have sacrificed transient pleasures for eternal glory has passed! To renounce and thus be the martyr only on the condition that the satisfaction gained by renunciation provides an irreplaceable sense of even greater pleasure!

Each of these imperatives of the consumer society carries with itself the appropriate risks (deregulation, liquidity of life, individualization, consumption, apparent happiness, freedom, waste, etc.) that threaten multiple dangers in the relation between the individual - others - the environment. Namely, the deregulation leads to anomie, the anomie weakens the collective consciousness and the responsibility of the individual for others, what leads to its atomization, individualization and alienation from others, and from itself, as well. This feeling of mental uncertainty, the social void, which arises in the absence of the presence of human essence, turns man to satisfying material needs through the consumption of consumer goods that cannot replace the sense of psychological failure. Thus, an individual easily becomes manipulated by mass media and consumption imperatives that promise him a sense of

[66] Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, p. 118 – 119

happiness, which never comes to him or is at hand, but short of breath, and passes into Tantalus troubles.

The risk of freedom is a question that moves to think about how much we really are "*blessed*" by liberty, and how much "*cursed*"[67]. To be free means to be blessed with dignified life to the limits of others freedom, and damn free - deprived of human essence, that is, interpersonal interactions and communion with others, to be *with* but not *for* others, morally blinded by the passaging of the limits of the freedom of others, to be beast, to be non-human. In that sense, Bauman remarks: "*Freedom is always linked to the necessity of compromise. Absolute freedom, which at the same time reconciles both sides, is impossible. Freedom is a paradox. If I need to be completely free - which means I can realize my intentions - other people have to accept it, even if my intentions do not match their desires. So the freedom to realize my wishes always reflects on the situation of other people*"[68].

Freedom has become a risk, a burden that a person is burdening. Therefore, the escape from freedom or escape is often encountered in frames in which the boundary between the 'I' and the world disappears, because within these frames a culturally prescribed form is adopting and which, from one point of view, creates a uniformity. An illusion of freedom, which arises in the process of extortion making choices, choosing everything from the global market, leads to saturation and withdrawal before the flurry of life guidance in liquid times. This leaves the consequences for the identity. "*Various identities give us the feeling of an absolute flight into space, we can choose between them. Some have more identities at the same time, depending on whom they send SMS. But there is nothing to rely on. We're walking through the lively sand, we're precarity ... we're kneeling. We do not know how much the situation we find in our life, the position we occupy, will last*"[69].

On the other hand, the risk of freedom is the risk of rude behavior and irresponsibility. As a consequence of irresponsibility misuse and neglect of others, as well as oneself, and the environment of the natural habitat and atmosphere surrounding us (the production of waste, air pollution, etc.) are most often caused, and it further underlines the following Bauman attitude to the risks of late modernity: *"Great current postmodernity, in which we live - individualization, the breakdown of ethical contexts, the weakening of authority, their large number and the lack of a spiritual power that would annul other*

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 25

[68] Zygmunt Bauman, „I am not a preacher, I am a diagnostic", 2013, http://www.tacno.net/novosti/zygmunt-bauman-nisam-propovjednik-ja-sam-dijagnosticar/ [19. 07. 2017.]

[69] Zygmunt Bauman, "Freedom is a paradox", 2015, http://akuzativ.com/teme/841-sloboda-je-paradoks [19. 07. 2017.]

voices - this is a great danger on the one hand. It's enough to look around: we live in a corrupt world, where neither word nor commitment is true"[70].

Before the encroachment of liberty, security and safety were sacrificed, and that created ***arisky state of chronic fear***due to ubiquitous uncertainty and hopelessness. The risk of leaving under fear and it's controlling the mental state of the individual, is paralyzing of his analytical ability and his taking concrete actions to combat the disturbing state. On this symbiosis, the market is best profited by "*blooming under conditions of insecurity: it earns on human fear and feeling of an accident*"[71]. As a consequence of human fear, there is a decline in sociability and a lack of interpersonal interactions, or a decline in the importance of community, because solidarity among people is endangered in the long term[72].

Speaking of ***the risks in the social sphere***, Bauman made observations of the key problems in this field in his work *Liquid Love* (2009) in order to devote them more extensively in his work *Postmodern Ethics*(2009).Neither intimate, and in general, human relations do not resist the liquidity of life and the changeable nature of capitalism, which is the result of the struggles of ever-increasing qualities. Thus, what once used to be a pillar of society overnight is replaced by 'more perfect' technological foundations, in accordance with the dictates of the dynamics of social flows. Due to the penetration of technology into social trends, human communication increasingly shifts from the sphere of direct, face-to-face interactions into the sphere of technology-mediated communication, which contributes to the removal of human beings from each other due to the lack of real proximity, which is a presumption of morality. Human relationships are also consuming, by becoming a consuming object from which a passing pleasure is expected, without any particular engagement and pre-invested time, an effort or sacrifice, which only speaks of their (non)stability. In that way, first of all the human solidarity is suffering, which is only a consequence of hyper-consumerism and externality of egoist movements. That is why hope also lies in the strengthening of solidarity, which Bauman confirms with the following words: *"Mankind and humanity are in crisis - the only way out of the crisis is solidarity among people. The first major obstacle on the way out of the process of mutual alienation is the absence of dialogue: silence, self-denial, distance, neglect, indifference"*[73].

The best indicators of social relations crisis are social networks, which, despite the positive evaluations of some theoreticians, according to Bauman's

[70] *Ibid.*

[71] Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Fear* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006), p. 158

[72] *Ibid*., p. 93 – 94

[73] Zygmunt Bauman, "Use of panic", 2016, http://pescanik.net/upotreba-panike/ [20. 07. 2017.]

opinion, deepen the gap between already eradicated and marginalized individuals. Those who do not have or do not want to have the access to social networks, seem tobe condemned to isolationism, marginalization, neglect due to their inaccessibility and closeness to contemporary forms of communication. On this occasion, Bauman notes: *"If you compare life online with offline lives, this one is significantly lighter than the other. In order to get in touch with another person offline, great effort, attempts, self-awareness, and giving up of their interests need to be done. And it's equally hard to break it: you need to invent excuses, to explain, sometimes to lie. And it is never known whether this acquaintance will return"*[74]. Thus social exclusion from the network simultaneously becomes exclusion from the virtual life of simulated sociability, which is best maintained by a number of daily, through a link and one mouse click, a "friendship" encountered, subjected to the daily dis/connection test and the influence of new users. Social relationships built for years often, as a matter of ignorance on social networks, collapses like a tower of cards. *"Online all of it is terribly easy. Equally easy is to connect to the network, as well as to turn off. No one will notice that I stopped answering SMS and posting posts. You do not see what we lost? One of the thousands of friends on the network is not one of the few friends that a man has acquired in his life. The Poles say that a real friend is known in poverty. I would not guarantee these friends on Facebook, if something happens, that will help. I even think they will be the first to run away"*[75].

Bauman does not omit ***therisk of discontinuity***. On this occasion, the following points out: *"The leap from traditional communities to modern online communities has been seen by many as a historical advance for the freedom of choice of every individual, but the fact is that what is most attractive in new networks has a high price. The currency that we pay for this price is the security that traditional communities have secured, and in 'networks' we can forget about it. (...) The disintegration of old communities may contribute to greater freedom of the individual, but people as individuals have no possibility or means to become free de facto with such freedom, and not just de iure. Many who would purposefully replace this supposedly fair substitute, see it as something which makes them even more impotent and desperate, and therefore even more insecure"*[76]. The risk of discontinuity was slaughtered with the rise of globalization and its

[74] Zygmunt Bauman, "I am not a preacher, I am a diagnostic", 2013, http://www.tacno.net/novosti/zygmunt-bauman-nisam-propovjednik-ja-sam-dijagnosticar/ [19. 07. 2017.]
[75] *Ibid.*
[76] Zygmunt Bauman, "The state keeps us in fear", 2011b, http://www.e-novine.com/intervju/intervju-drustvo/44714-drava-nas-dri-strahu.html [19. 07. 2017.]

"eradication mechanisms"[77] and strives for cultural homogenization and the exaggeration of culture - the former reference framework of existence.

Bauman does not overlook either the analysis of the main ***risk in the economic sphere***, more precisely the sphere of labor. Short-term planning, unlike planning from a period of solid modernity, is now based on the process of work flexibility. Such a lifetime becomes *"permeated with insecurity"*[78], which deprives the possibility of permanent employment and the creation of opportunities for a career in one workplace. Hence, human labor, as a key purpose of man's activity, is now slaughtered to uncertainty due to the general process of neoliberal deregulation and liberalization.

Bauman was particularly warning on ***therisk of rationality*** of contemporary civilization, which threatens a new strain of the Holocaust, this time over the many disenfranchised, losers of the race with globalization, which due to their inability to contribute to the production and reproduction of the social order and to meet the ever-increasing standards of productivity and profitability, are declared to be human "*'waste', different from the 'useful' products because it is a dedicated product"*[79]. This problem Bauman notes in an escalating wave of migration around the world, highlighting the following: *"Mass migration is not a new phenomenon; it followed the modern era from the beginning (shifted and sometimes changing direction) - because 'the modern way of life' is the creation of 'superfluous men' (local 'useless' - because of economic progress for them no longer work, or local 'undesirable' - rejected due to conflicts, unrest and disturbances caused by social/political transformations and related power struggles). So today we suffer the consequences of the deep and seemingly unsolvable destabilization of the Middle East caused by erroneous, irresponsible short-sighted and inconsistent policies and military adventures of the Western powers"*[80].

The essence of this and other problems of the modern era in fact stems from the key problem of modernity, which consisted in the unreserved trust in human reason and rationality, which instead of faith should have served as the so-called ultimate, last truth of sobriety, but which, in the end, failed in the task of attempting to impose universal ethical codes, which each individual had to bear with absolute certainty. Just what the *Postmodern Ethics* (2009) reminds us of, that is, of Bauman's critique of ethical universality by which he points to the mistakes and deficiencies of modernistic approaches

[77] Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity.*

[78] Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, p.144

[79] Zygmunt Bauman, "Human waste production", 2010, http://www.e-novine.com/feljton/40934-Proizvodnja-ljudskog-otpada.html [20. 07. 2017.]

[80] Zygmunt Bauman, "Use of panic", 2016, http://pescanik.net/upotreba-panike/ [20. 07. 2017.]

to morality, which is not conceived as a constituent of the human personality. In that sense, the key distinction Bauman makes between rules, which prescribe duties, and as such can be universal, and responsibility, which is purely an individual matter. More precisely: "*Duties are trying to make us similar; responsibility is what makes us individuals*"[81]. The other man is the source of self and morality, and as such a worthy the sacrifice. The aggravating circumstance is that morality is unconditional and is not subject to calculations, so it must be practiced without the expectation of reciprocity, which at the same time is, above all, a disenchanting alternative to life in the postmodern era. Its practical application would imply re-establishment of close relations, i.e. fostering "proximity"[82], which was lost due to the rapid development of modernization, primarily by moving from community to society.

This risk is also associated with ***the risk of social exclusion***, which is most often followed by fear of lagging, becoming tackling, deprivation and similar forms of social violence. About this, Bauman in the interview "The state keeps us in fear" (2011) points out the following: *"Most of us, from the bottom to the top, today are afraid of threats, although unspecified and insecure, to be excluded, recognized as incapable of coping with challenges, that they will take away our respect and humiliate us"*. This fear is justified in view of the unprecedented experiences from the past, which modernity itself has blossomed, in the middle of the 20th century, at its economic, cultural and social peak. At that time, the social exclusion strategy found the most radical implementation in the practice of the Holocaust, based on the Nazi, "gardener" policy of redefining the political, ethnic and social map of Europe[83] and since thenhas been a constructive element of the foundation of modernity, but also a warning of the consequences of humanity atrophy and planned production of "human waste". Therefore, the risk of social exclusion is marked by a state of constant fear of reducing a personality to a mere object of instrumentally-rationally-based operations, to a category deprived of all rights, worthless and as such a legitimate target of exclusion due to its category of disinclination. In this sense, Bauman has characterized the postmodern era as a state of life under the disapproved expectations of the promised harmonious order in a garden called "society", because the destructive potential of modernity, and despite the material progress that enabled it, forever threw the shadow on technological knowledge and efficiency, and the enlightening forecast that the world, by reason, willingness, and capabilities, can be put under the control and thus realize the idea of civilization progress and order creation through the prohibition or elimination of all disruptive factors.

[81] Zygmunt Bauman,*Postmodern Ethics* (Zagreb: AGM, 2009), p. 72
[82] *Ibid.*, p. 110
[83] Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989)

The *risk* also rests ***in the idolatry of technology***, especially in a problematic approach to solving every problem by technology It is impossible to achieve this for two reasons: a) because of the specialization of technique in action in strictly defined areas, not in totality, for which the very person as totality could not be included as a whole, and b) because most of the problems of the modern man are of moral nature, so that they cannot be solved through instrumental-rational action, which follows the calculations and interests. Bauman is also skeptical about the second question which refers to the technology. Namely, he states that, in spite of the dominant discourse on global technological progress, technology brings prosperity and order only to the richest countries of the world – to some of the main protagonists, at the local level[84]. The problem of fetishizing technology lies in the fact that our immense confidence in its progress passives us. *"Technological fetish is 'political' for us. It allows us to spend the rest of our lives free from the feeling of guilt that we may not do what we should, safe in the belief that we are, after all, informed and engaged citizens. The paradox of the technological fetish is that the technology that works in our name actually allows us to remain politically passive. We do not have to take political responsibility because that technology works for us ... This 'arrangement' allows us to think that it is only necessary to universalize a certain technology, and then we will have a democratic and arranged social order"*[85].

In this regard, Bauman also discussed ***the risk of crisis in the democratic system***. This crisis arises as a result of the national states de-sovereignty and the strengthening of global power, which leads to the de-legitimization of politics. For this, the best indicator is the migration crisis, as a global phenomenon, which can no longer be matched by *"parochial methods"*[86]. Due to such circumstances, there is a lack of confidence among citizens in political leaders and elites, because they are no longer able to independently decide, and therefore do not fulfill given promises. The collapse of trust in the democratic system, therefore, is becoming more and more present. On this occasion, Bauman claims the following: *"Power and politics are alive and there are separated from one another and their divorce is waiting around the corner. On the one hand the power is skipped like a vagabond in the global space, in no man's land, without any political control and with full freedom to select its own target; on the other hand politics is solved and resolved from all or almost*

[84] Zygmunt Bauman,*Postmodern Ethics* (Zagreb: AGM, 2009)

[85] Zygmunt Bauman, "Hotheaded Civilization", 2011a, http://www.e-novine.com/feljton/49671-Civilizacija-usijanih-glava.html [20. 07. 2017.]

[86] According to Bauman in: Ricardo de Querol, "Zygmunt Bauman: Social media are a trap: The Polish-born sociologist is skeptical about the possibilities for political change", 2016, https://elpais.com/elpais/2016/01/19/inenglish/1453208692_424660.html [21. 07. 2017.]

all of its powers, its muscles and its teeth"[87]. This forced individuals to take on responsibilities in dealing with given and upcoming challenges and tasks, this time without reliance on the hinterland, which were once the usual and effective patterns of action. For the newly emerging difficulty of the situation the intense sense of loneliness and tolerance for a wicked fate is indicative. Therefore, *"since we have lost hope of salvation 'from above' (in parliaments and other government institutions) in searching for alternative instruments to act in a way to do the right things, people have come down on the roads as a way of discovering and/or on the path of experimentation"*[88]. Bauman recognized the culprits for the caused democracy crisis and the destabilization of the lives of its followers in the spokespersons of this form of state organization. Namely, as he points out: "*... the long and sad history of discrediting democracy is in no case limited to the vicious circle of Islam. The forces of 'the North' have a long history of overcoming democracy and freedom – a history that has never come to an end by the end of the colonial era*"[89]. In addition, the promises that have led democracy to the world's ship have either failed or in the end did not even receive their epilogue. *"To the countries that were liberated from communist tyranny, western-style democracy promised prosperity, growth and peace, but in all these areas it brought much less than it promised*"[90]. All this has contributed to the overall impression of democracy, as an idea and as practice, that is, to the discredit of its reputation, which made democracy a feverish word for *"an idea without shine"*, the reason is that: *"bloodshed caused by the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in the name of democracy"*.

The risk that should also not be neglected is also ***the risk of xenophobia***, which manifests itself through hatred and mistrust towards strangers, because the stranger by definition is *"physically close but socially far"*[91],which means unworthy of attention, and as such a legitimate object of the passing tactics. In favor of determining a foreigner, Bauman offers a precise description: *"People who have fled from war atrocities, despotism, the gluttony of hunger and the absence of perspectives knocked on the other's door since the beginning of the modern era. For people on the other side of the door, the natives always were foreigners first of all. It's so today. Strangers cause panic just because they are 'foreign' - scary unpredictable, different from the people we*

[87] Zygmunt Bauman, "Zygmunt Bauman about bugbear of rebellion and social inequality", 2014, https://radiogornjigrad.wordpress.com/2014/05/12/intervju-saintervju-sa-zygmuntom-baumanom-bauk-pobune-bauk-pobune/[20. 07. 2017.]

[88] *Ibid.*

[89] Srecko Horvat, "An interview: Zygmunt Bauman. The future of democracy: Or it will change or there will be no democracy!", 2011. https://www.tportal.hr/kultura/clanak/buducnost-demokracije-ili-ce-se-promijeniti-ili-demokracije-nece-biti-20110506 [25. 07. 2017.]

[90] *Ibid.*

[91] Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Modernity* (Zagreb: Pelago edition, 2011c), p. 191

communicate everyday with and we believe we know what we can expect them to do; the influx of foreigners could ruin everything that we keep and end a well-known and comfortable lifestyle. (...) We do not know about strangers enough to properly interpret their moves and react appropriately. Situations in which we do not know what to do, situations that we did not produce and which are beyond our control are the main sources of anxiety and fear"[92]. Thus, an unpleasant atmosphere is created, which pervades all the flows of society and counteracts the fire of the old, under the carpet pushed resentments. *"A phantom flies above the planet: xenophobia's phantom. Old and new, never quenched and freshly deflated and warmed tribal suspicions and animosities have blended and entered with a completely new fear of security, condensed by the insecurity and uncertainty of liquid modern existence"*[93].

This logic threatens to create *"human waste"*, as confirmed by Bauman's allegation: *"People-exhausted and dead tired of never completed tests of adequacy, frightened to death by the mysterious, unexplained uncertainties of their destinies and the global fog that hides their prospects from the sight - desperately they seek the culprits for their troubles and temptations. They find it, which is not surprising, under the nearby lamps – in the only place that is necessarily illuminated by the forces of law and order: 'The criminals are those who make us insecure, and the strangers are those who cause crime'; And so 'the collecting, closuring and deportation of strangers is what will restore our lost or stolen security'"*[94] "Passing by" tactics and other methods of attitudes towards foreigners are also transmitted to behavior in other spheres, thus creating the effect of alienation.[95] Hence, Bauman rightly says that there has been a *"tragedy of cruel indifference and moral blindness. There is an increasing number of signs that public opinion and the media that are guided solely by viewing are approaching the point of 'overwhelming the refugee tragedy'. Dead children, fast-paced walls, barbed fences, crowded refugee camps ('reception centers'), governments that are pouring on the refugee's wounds and risky trips by treating refugees as hot potatoes – all these scandalous events are no longer news and they are being less reporting. Shocking news by repetition becomes a boring routine of everyday life – the moral panic is retreating and the knitted by veil of forgetfulness disappears from sight and conscience"*[96].

[92] Zygmunt Bauman, "Use of panic", 2016, http://pescanik.net/upotreba-panike/ [20. 07. 2017.]

[93] Zygmunt Bauman, "Human waste production", 2010, http://www.e-novine.com/feljton/40934-Proizvodnja-ljudskog-otpada.html [20. 07. 2017.]

[94] *Ibid.*

[95] Cold disinterest for anything that comes up on the road to the goal, in combination with the skill of overcoming and reserved treatment with others, risks the emptying of social relationships and every place from the content and meaning, or the creation of an atmosphere of the phantasmagoric.

[96] Zygmunt Bauman, "Use of panic", 2016, http://pescanik.net/upotreba-panike/ [20. 07. 2017.]

CONCLUDING CONSIDERATIONS

Life in a world risk society, in which every scientific and technical progress carries certain dangers, in large part, involves dealing with everyday risks. Thus, in a situation of objective affliction and endangerment of fate in contours developed modern(where the diagnosis of hazards coincides with the insight into the inevitable permissiveness to the danger) it poses existentially important issues in the domain of risk protection. Such questions can only testify to an increase in social reflexivity, which requires us to constantly reconsider the circumstances we are facing with, i.e. to predict the possible consequences of our behavior, which also is the theory advocated by the authors of the risk society discourse.

Based on a reflexive perception of the more and more present risks of the late modernity, it is possible to make a conclusion that the risks of the contemporary agein most cases are denoted by disintegration, and decomposition of social tissue. Hence, the dominant types of risks are the risks in the society's social sphere that are gaining their strength under the predefined life denoted with fear and uncertainties.Zygmunt Bauman himself can be credited for targeting those risks as the most dangerous ones, and for noticing the alternatives to the state such as that. Bauman's most significant contribution consists of noticing the origins of contemporary age risks, and that presents the predominance of hyper-liberalization i.e. the freedom achieved by sacrificing the social security of human existence, which caused the de-humanization of human relations i.e. the erosion of solidarity. The eradication of social interaction leads to the ingraining of fear in the streams of everyday human life and deterioration of interpersonal relations (social exclusion, xenophobia, the production of "human waste", chronic fear, idolatries of technology, rationality crisis, etc.)

However, according to Bauman's opinion, a new chance to get out of the state of risk is re-finding proximity and building a globally responsible society, both for events and consequences in the near future and in the future, which would also be a response to the risky situation. An alternative to risks would also be based on empowering the development of consciousness directed against fear. It would also be necessary to revitalize the idea of humanity, which rests on the valorization of moral principles, which will determine the direction of further civilization development and prosperity of society in moving towards the improvement of human dignity and the reconstruction of disunited communion.

Such a practice would enable more adequate management of the process of globalization through the achievement of ethical responsibility, both towards itself and others, as well as at the global level, that is towards the planet and humanity as a whole. This could ultimately contribute to reducing the global risks that threaten the modern world, since everything that human beings create can also undergo control.

REFERENCES

Bauman, Zygmunt. "Freedom is a paradox", 2015, http://akuzativ.com/teme/841-sloboda-je-paradoks [19. 07. 2017.]

Bauman, Zygmunt. "Hotheaded Civilization", 2011c, http://www.e-novine.com/feljton/49671-Civilizacija-usijanih-glava.html [20. 07. 2017.]

Bauman, Zygmunt. "Human waste production", 2010, http://www.e-novine.com/feljton/40934-Proizvodnja-ljudskog-otpada.html [20. 07. 2017.]

Bauman, Zygmunt. "I am not a preacher, I am a diagnostic", 2013, http://www.tacno.net/novosti/zygmunt-bauman-nisam-propovjednik-ja-sam-dijagnosticar/ [19. 07. 2017.]

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

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Liquid Love: On the frailty of human bonds*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Liquid Modernity*. Zagreb: Pelago edition, 2011c.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Liquid Times: Living in an age of uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Postmodern Ethics*. Zagreb: AGM, 2009.

Bauman, Zygmunt. "The state keeps us in fear", 2011b, http://www.e-novine.com/intervju/intervju-drustvo/44714-drava-nas-dri-strahu.html [19. 07. 2017.]

Bauman, Zygmunt. "Use of panic", 2016, http://pescanik.net/upotreba-panike/ [20. 07. 2017.]

Bauman, Zygmunt. "Zygmunt Bauman about bugbear of rebellion and social inequality", 2014, https://radiogornjigrad.wordpress.com/2014/05/12/intervju-saintervju-sa-zygmuntom-baumanom-bauk-pobune-bauk-pobune/ [20. 07. 2017.]

Beck, Ulrich. "Living in the world risk society: A Hobhouse Memorial Public Lecture". *Economy and Society* Volume 35, Number 3 (2006): 329 – 345.

Beck, Ulrich. *What is Globalization?*. Zagreb: Vizura, 2003.

Beck. Ulrich. *Risk Society: Towards a new modernity*. Belgrade: Filip Visnjic, 2001.

Bostrom, Nick. "A History of Transhumanist Thought". *Journal of Evolution and Technology* Vol. 14, Issue 1 (2005): 1 – 30.

Castells, Manuel. *End of Millennium*. Zagreb: Golden marketing, 2003.

Castells, Manuel. *The Power of Identity*. Zagreb: Golden marketing, 2002.

Castells, Manuel. *The Rise of the Network Society*. Zagreb: Golden marketing, 2000.

Filipovic, Mileva. "Sociology and post-positivist paradigms: Some cognitive difficulties of contemporary sociology". *SOCIOLOGY* Vol. L, N° 3 (2008): 251 – 266.

Friedman, Thomas L. *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1999.

Giddens, Anthony. *Runaway World: How globalization is reshaping our lives.* Belgrade: AMD System, 2005.

Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Belgrade: Filip Visnjic, 1998.

Horvat, Srecko. "An interview: Zygmunt Bauman. The future of democracy: Or it will change or there will be no democracy!", 2011. https://www.tportal.hr/kultura/clanak/buducnost-demokracije-ili-ce-se-promijeniti-ili-demokracije-nece-biti-20110506 [25. 07. 2017.]

Lisickin, Vladimir Aleksandrovic & Leonid Aleksandrovic Seljepin. *Global Empire of Evil: New geopolitical distribution of forces.* Banja Luka: Sociological association, 2014.

Martineli, Alberto. *Modernism: The process of modernisation*. Podgorica: CID, 2010.

Mimica, Aljosa &Marija Bogdanovic. *Sociological Dictionary.* Belgrade: Zavod za udžbenike, 2007.

Querol, Ricardo de. "Zygmunt Bauman: Social media are a trap: The Polish-born sociologist is skeptical about the possibilities for political change", 2016, https://elpais.com/elpais/2016/01/19/inenglish/1453208692_424660.html [21. 07. 2017.]

Ritzer, George. *Contemporary Sociological Theory and its Classical Roots.* Belgrade: Službeni glasnik*, 2009.*

Robertson, Roland. *Globalization – Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage Publications Ltd, 1992.

Sijakovic, Ivan & Dragana Vilic. *Sociology of Contemporary Society*. Banja Luka: Faculty of Economics, 2010.

Steger, Manfred B. *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Touraine, Alain. *A New Paradigm: For understanding today's world.* Belgrade: Službeni glasnik, 2011.

Yates, Joshua. "An Interview with Ulrich Beck on Fear and Risk Society". *Hedgehog Review* Vol. 5, Issue 3 (2003): 96 – 107. http://www.iasc-culture.org/THR/archives/Fear/5.3HBeck.pdf [01. 09. 2017.]