

BRACO KOVAČEVIĆ

IRINA KOVAČEVIĆ

SOCIOLOGY OF GLOBAL RISK SOCIETY

(ANTHONY GIDDENS AND ULRICH BECK)



Banja Luka 2017.

BRACO KOVAČEVIĆ IRINA KOVAČEVIĆ
SOCIOLOGY OF GLOBAL RISK SOCIETY
(ANTHONY GIDDENS AND ULRICH
BECK)

**Evropski defendologija centar za naučna, politička,
ekonomska, socijalna, bezbjednosna, sociološka i
kriminološka istraživanja**



Publisher:

European defendology center for scientific,
political, economic, social, safety, sociological
and criminological research, Banja Luka

For publisher:

Dr Duško Vejnović

Reviewers:

Academician PhD Slavo Kukić
PhD Vukašin Pavlović

BRACO KOVAČEVIĆ IRINA KOVAČEVIĆ

**SOCIOLOGY OF
GLOBAL RISK
SOCIETY
(ANTHONY GIDDENS
AND ULRICH BECK)**

Banja Luka
2017.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD.....7

- 1. GLOBALIZATION,
GLOBALISM
AND NEOLIBERALISM**.....13
 - Globalism, globalization,
globality.....15
 - Globalization and neoliberalism....20
 - Relationship against
globalization.....26
- 2. GLOBAL RISK SOCIETY**.....35
 - Risk society37
 - Risks of a risk society.....46
 - Population growth.....54
 - Food and genetically
modified organisms.....56
 - Water.....60
 - Air.....62
 - The destruction and
devastation of the soil.....63
 - Forests.....65
 - Endangering survival
and disappearance of plant
and animal species.....66

Waste.....	67
Climate changes.....	70
Social inequalities and poverty.....	76
Crime.....	81
Terrorism.....	85
Environmental problems and the boomerang effect	86
Global management	91
1. SOCIAL REF LEXTIVITY AND REFLEXIVE MODERNIZATION.....	107
<i>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</i>	115

FOREWORD

Under the influence of different factors, there has been a globalization of all areas of our lives and the world. With the fall of *the Berlin Wall*, and under the influence of information and communication resources, trade and transport, and neoliberal institutions of global power, the world was caught by a strong process of globalization whose influence, of course, reflected on all areas of social life, country, ethnic groups and individuals, leading to major changes to the local and the mondial area.

Globalization is a phenomenon that affects all areas of our lives. Founded on *neoliberal economic doctrine and practice*, it brings a whole range of problems, risks and dangers to society, states and peoples, as well as man's natural environment.

Neoliberalism disintegrated the policy of *the welfare state*, and countries and their economies pushed to the market that brought the profit and greater wealth to the rich, and the poor are impoverished. What neoliberals hypocritically and perfidiously recommend to the world brings only damage and poverty.

In this way, *neo-liberal globalization* has led not only to the impoverishment of the poor, but also to the devastation and degradation of their natural environment. That has created serious environmental problems and ecological

crisis manifested in the depletion of natural resources and pollution of the environment. Intense industrial activity to the environment causes many negative changes that threaten human and natural environment

A man's impact on nature produces a range of *risks* and *dangers* that have created a *risk society* to which many sociologists warn, and Ulrich Beck and Anthony Giddens in particular. Risks of risk society, the risks of global risk society, cause strong criticism of many theorists developing resistance to many individuals, groups, movements and associations. Giddens and Beck develop the concept of *social reflexivity* and *reflexive modernization* stressing the importance of reflection and review of our activities whose primary objective is to build different modern styles from this with the risks of the risk society.

In this sense, it is necessary to build qualitatively a new *global management* in order to achieve the concept of *sustainable development*, social and natural sustainable development. But this concept must not be used for manipulative purpose - to achieve domination of some powerful state, multinational and transnational corporation, or any of the global centers of power. If this is a concept that could be used to control, abuse and exploitation of

resources of the countries and peoples, it means that it would be used in order to generate profit for the rich and powerful, and would not serve its purpose - achieving environmental justice, preservation and restoration of resources and taking care of the present and future generations.

1.

**GLOBALIZATION,
GLOBALISM AND
NEOLIBERALISM**

Globalism, globalization, globality

Terms such as *globalization* and *globalism* are not identical, which is also discussed by Ulrich Beck.

Under *globalization* should be implied „the processes which have a consequence that transnational actors, their chances for power, orientations, identities and networks undermine national states and their sovereignty and are mutually connected“, while the term *globalism* implies an attitude that „world market pushes or replaces political action, ie. ideology of the world market rule, the ideology of neo-liberalism“. In addition to these terms, Beck uses the term *globality*, noting that it refers to:

1. geographical expansion and increase of interaction density of international action, global networking of financial markets, as well as the growth of power of transnational corporations;
2. permanent information and communication-technological revolution;
 1. universal and global requests for human rights –

- democratic principle;
2. global cultural industry;
3. postinternational, polycentrical world politics, where, except governments, there are growing transnational actors (concerns, non-governmental organizations, UN);
4. issues of global poverty;
5. global destruction of the environment, and
6. transcultural conflicts in one place (Beck, 2003, pages 24, 28, 29).

Globalization, globality and globalism therefore, relate to complex contemporary *processes*, to the *space* comprised by globalization processes, as well as to understanding and *ideology* that justifies expansion of these processes at global level.

For Giddens, globalization can be defined "as the intensification of social relations on the world plan, linking the remote places in such a way that local events are shaped by the events that took place miles away and *vice versa*". Globalization is a consequence of the development of modernity, as well as its entry

into the phase of social reflexivity of modernity, phase of critical questioning and self-questioning of modernity. In this sense, such a critical theory must start from recognition of emancipatory policies that must be linked to "life policies" or "self-actualization policies", where the emancipatory politics implies a radical commitment that is "focused on the release from inequality and subordination" (Giddens, 1998, pages 69, 149-150).

The thing that is relevant for Ulrich Beck when it comes to globalization, refers to the question - what is the specialty and paradox of contemporary globalization?

He replies that this specialty and paradox are in "prevalence, density and stability of mutual regional-global networks of relations" and "social spaces and flows" at economical, cultural, political and military level. World society "is not a mega-national society that "abolishes all national societies", but it is "a world horizon that is opened when it is created and which is kept in communication and action." The thing that is new in globalization is "not only daily life and action across national and state borders", but also a new "image of itself ... in the mass media, in the consumption, in tourism"; also, "new is `placelessness` of community, labor and capital, new is „global environmental

awareness of the dangers and appropriate sites of action.“ In addition, "new is inevitable observation of transcultural *others* in their lives," as well as the new "global cultural industry," undoubted growth of the European community of states, "transnational actors, institutions and treaties", as well as the level of "economic concentration" in the field of "borderless world – market competition" (Beck, 2003, page 31-33).

Globalization is, what we see it today, a new, different and revolutionary. Its processes are affecting the economy, technology, politics, culture, way of life.

When in the mid-nineteenth century Samuel Morse sent the first electric telegraph message, it marked a whole new stage of world history. Until then, it was not possible to send a message without travelling and delivery. The invention of satellite communications marks no less dramatic break with tradition and history; the first commercial satellite was launched in 1969, and today there are so many satellites in orbit and we do not know how many of them, but it is known that each of them carries a vast amount of information. For the first time in history, it is possible instantaneous communication from one side to the other side of the world. Also, other forms of electronic communication are increasingly more integrated

with satellite transmission and are growing rapidly. Approximately until the end of the fifties of the last century, there were no transatlantic or transpacific undersea cables for special purposes, and the first ones that were laid transmitted less than 100 voice lines; today they transmit more than one million. A century and a half after Morse's invention system of dots and dashes system (1999), it disappeared from the world scene and was abolished as a means of maritime communication; it was replaced by a system that relies on satellite technology that enables to locate precisely any ship in distress. Electronic communication presents not only a way to transmit the news or information in the faster way - its existence changes lives of both the rich and the poor. Globalization „regards not only to something that is `there somewhere`, far away from an individual. It also addresses of that what is `here`, affects the intimate and personal aspects of our lives. For example, the discussion of family values that is taking place in many countries apparently is outside the influence of globalization. But it is not. Traditional family systems are being transformed, or are in crisis in many parts of the world, especially due to the demands of women for greater equality. As we know from written history, there has never been a society in which women were approximately

equal to men. It represents a truly global revolution in everyday life, the consequences of which are felt everywhere in the world, in all fields, from politics to work ". Contemporary processes of globalization are influenced by many factors and driving forces, and one of them is the " fall of communism of Soviet type." Other relates to an increase in international and regional mechanisms of government (United Nations, European Union). The third one refers to the increase of international trade and production, intergovernmental and international non-governmental organizations (Giddens, 2005a, pp. 38-39; Giddens, 2005b, pp. 59-60).

Globalization and neoliberalism

Today are *globalization and neoliberalism* mutually interconnected phenomena. Contemporary globalization is neoliberally determined, as neoliberalism is globalizationally orinetated.

Neoliberalism seeks to strengthen institutionally the current profits of mobile capital. It even advocates the value principle according to which "what is good for capital is the welfare of all." It offers the promise:

"Everyone will become richer and, ultimately, the poor will also benefit." Advocating absolute market fundamentalism as a criterion for organizing society, neoliberalism is explicitly opposed to *the national state*, which, however, still resist its aggressive swoop. In this sense, Beck points out well that, "if the God of the national state is dead," this still does not mean "that the country is dying." By changing its shape, the state remains existing, and one of its forms is *a neo-liberal state*, ie. "the state of competition, the state of the market, form of the state where policy follows the logic of capital", ie. form of the state, which bears the mark „approved by MMF`." At the beginning of the third millennium, the International Monetary Fund controls economic policy of „every third `sovereign` state" so that the national states are transformed into neoliberal states, owing to the process of "disciplining the countries" by repressive "whip-policy" of carrot and stick, that is the ultimate method of assigning credit by IMF. By accepting the *Washington Consensus* and its "holy trinity" - *deregulation, liberalization and privatization* - the country is reformed in a way that *national states are becoming neoliberal states* in the world market (Beck, 2004, p. 25, 331-332).

Institutions that expand neoliberal economic doctrine and practice at the world market are International Monetary Fund, World Bank and World Trade Organization, but also powerful neoliberal western states, as well as multinational and transnational corporations.

Contemporary economy at local, but also at global level, is permeated by *transnational corporations* that really have immense power.

After World War II, transnational corporations "have become a global phenomenon." Their "expansion in the early postwar years came from companies having their headquarters in the US, but by 1970 also European and Japanese companies have begun to invest abroad. At the end of the eighties and nineties, TNK dramatically expanded by establishing three powerful regional markets: Europe (Single European Market), Asia and Pacific (Osasco Declaration guaranteed free and open trade until 2010) and North America (NAFTA - North American free trade agreement). Since the beginning of the nineties, the countries in other parts of the world as well have liberalized restrictions to foreign investment. Until the beginning of the twenty-first century, there were a few economies in the world that have remained out of reach of TNK. In the last decade, transnational corporations

based in industrialized economies are particularly active in expanding their business to developing countries and societies of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe" (Giddens, 2005b, p. 62).

Since by their actions globally, multinational and transnational corporations gained very large economic, financial, political, media, cultural, and even military power, they are, therefore, the subject of strong criticism by anti-globalization movements and associations.

Giddens quite accurately pointed out that the largest multinational and transnational corporations "have an annual turnover in excess of the gross national product of almost all countries. They usurped a part of the power that should belong to a sovereign democratic states. They are able to visit the entire world in search of the cheapest sources of raw materials and labor, and have the power to cause the overrun interests of poorer countries" (Giddens, 2005a, p. 16).

Considering that the power of corporations is immense, it is understandable that they rule also above the level of states.

Beck notes that multinational and transnational corporations can easily perform an "attack" to the foundations "of modern national-state societies." This creates a power of

corporations based on: possibilities of *export of work places* to the areas where costs and obligations associated with the employment of the labor force are low; possibility that, owing to advanced technologies and division of labor, *divide the process of manufacturing and dislocate it* to different places of the world; possibility to *manipulate with states and bargain* with them about the cheapest taxes and the most favorable tax incentives; possibility to *decide themselves* on investment and tax locations, and "place of residence" in the sense that their most important staff can live "where is the most beautiful, and pay taxes where is the cheapest" (Beck, 2003, p. 10-12).

Regardless that neoliberalism is trying to call into question the national state, however, the economic development cannot be achieved only by stimulating market competition, without the state providing necessary reforms. Its wrong economic policy could lead society into disaster, which can be seen on the example of some countries and companies.

If the state directed its economy towards free trade but does not implement the necessary reforms, it will face the possibility of economic decline rather than progress. Therefore, it is essential that it "has a management role" and

makes the necessary social and economic reforms (Giddens, 2005a, p. 23).

In global neoliberal relations, the position of "national" or "civil state" is very difficult. Compared to the neoliberal state or "supranational supervisory" or "cosmopolitan state", these "ethnic states" are doubly handicapped. First of all, they are always "second on the move" because the world economy makes the moves, and, then, the state must create a kind of "counterforce" in relation to the actors of world economic and political power. These handicaps are limiting the success of the states initiatives (Beck, 2004, p. 333).

Of course, the centers of economic and financial power are trying to tear down the barriers of *free trade* by mechanism that exist between developed and undeveloped countries and to integrate them into the global economy

However, not everyone agrees that this is the right decision, arguing that since it will benefit only the rich and that will further increase global inequality, poverty and dependence backward. Thus, the 1999 protests broke out in Seattle when 50,000 people opposed the policy of the World Trade Organization and other international financial institutions, considering that they put economic principles above all other issues, such as protection of human rights,

workers' rights, sustainable development, and provide a profit to already rich corporations neglecting the local economy, thus the protest is considered as the greatest advocate of "global justice" to the present (Giddens, 2005b, p. 76).

Relationship against globalization

Considering that globalization suits to the some, but does not suit to the others, relationship against it is so different that, understandably, Giddens talks about two orientations:

- *sceptical*, and
- *radical*.

In the view of *skeptics*, whole story about globalization is only that - a story. "Whatever the benefits brought, the global economy is not much different from the earlier one; most countries acquire a small portion of foreign trade, while a large part of the exchange is performed between regions, for example, Asia-Pacific or North American. Skeptics are usually found in the position of the political left, especially the old one. In fact, if all of this is essentially a myth, governments can still control the economic life,

and the state of welfare remains intact. The skeptics consider the concept of globalization as the ideology supported by supporters of the free market who want to abolish the system of social welfare and reduce state expenditure. What happened is, in fact, return to the way they ruled the world a century ago. At the end of the nineteenth century, there already existed an open global economy in which it was traded, including trade in currencies. *Radicals* belong to the second orientation. They find that globalization is a "very real" phenomenon whose consequences are felt everywhere; global market is much more developed than it was before, and so they "do not attach importance to national borders". They find that the countries lost much of its sovereignty, while politicians lost their "ability to influence events." For them it is completed, "the era of nation-states" that „have become a mere` fictions` (Omae) ". Posing a question of who is right, Giddens believes that these are the *radicals*, because it has shown that the level of world trade today is really much bigger than ever before, and the extent of goods and services comprised within it is much wider, but the biggest difference lies in the level of flow of finance and capital. Globalization processes show us that we are in a world that is interconnected. "Global perspective reveals us

the fact that growing relations with the rest of the world means that our actions have consequences for others, and that the world's problems have consequences for ourselves ... Globalization refers to the fact that we all live in 'one world', so that individuals, groups and nations become more *interdependent*". And, although the exterior somehow remained the same, however, it changed from the inside, and this change affects not only some, but all countries, nations and peoples (Giddens, 2005a, p. 34, 35, 44, 55, 56).

One of the fundamental consequences of modernity which is manifested as a process of unequal development, fragmentation and interdependence in the world that creates new forms of risk and danger, is globalization. In this network of relationships, Giddens stated the existence of four institutional fields of modernity which rebellious social movements correspond to which field. These are:

- *capitalism*
- *tools of monitoring, control and integration*
- *military power*
- *industrialism.*

By its nature, ***capitalism*** is a system of commodity production, in the center of which there is a relationship between private ownership

of capital and wage labor, and this relationship forms the main axis of the class system; within the institutional dimension of capitalism appear *labor movements* as combat association whose origin and also the field of action, is connected with the expansion of capitalist companies; and regardless of whether these movements are reformist or revolutionary ones, their roots are in the economic order of capitalism, especially in the part where is accomplished defensive control of the workplace through union organizing, but in the space within which it is possible to influence the state government, or which is won by the socialist political organization. ***Apparatus of supervision***, control and integration, largely exceed abilities of traditional civilizations; this monitoring can be *direct* (in prisons, schools, factories), and *indirect*, based on the control of information; in the institutional field of supervision and administrative political control there are various *movements for freedom of speech and other human rights - democratic movements*. Third institutional field refers to the ***military power or control over the means of coercion*** - in which the social field *peace movements* emerge, a fourth institutional field refers to ***industrialism*** - whose main feature is the use of inorganic sources of material energy for the production of goods, associated with a

significant role of machines in the manufacturing process and industrial organization of work; in the institutional field of industrialism and transformed nature, there are *ecological movements* which, in a broader sense, present countercultural movements (Giddens, 1998, pp. 61-64).

Demonstrating the meaning of globalization, Giddens stated film *Titanic* as an example the global diffusion of cultural homogenization.

The huge success of the film was not only the result of scenography related to a historical event, but also the plot through which a discursive "set of ideas and values" was offered, one of which is an essential and refers to "the possibility of realizing romantic love despite class differences and family tradition." Although these ideas are quite present in many countries of the world, there are some areas where they have yet to develop. The film speaks about certain changes in attitudes towards "personal relationships and marriage", which is especially important for the traditional environment in the world that should be incorporated in the world of unified globalization. In this way, an industry of global cultural values is expanding that will "run over the power of local customs and traditions," „cultural imperialism“ spreads in which the

values, style and views typical for the West expand so aggressively that they will suppress individual national cultures"(Giddens, 2005b, pp. 68-69).

In an effort to make a profit, but also to impose a certain cultural and valuable paradigms of life throughout the world, Western cultural industry is spread.

According to Giddens' opinion, "Western, and especially American cultural influence is visible everywhere - in film, television, in popular music and in other areas. Standardization in culture is an integral part of this process ", for which Giddens believes that it is" relatively superficial layer of culture", and that "deeper effect of globalization "refers to" the creation of larger local cultural diversity, not homogeneity." As an example, he takes the United States which it considers to "represent the complete opposite to cultural monolith, since they consist of a staggering variety of different ethnic and cultural groups. Owing to the fact that it acts `down` ... globalization seeks to promote the restoration of local cultural identity. They sometimes reflect the wider world forms, but very often self-consciously are moving away from them "(Giddens, 2005, pp. 18-19).

Some believe that so called „transition countries“ particularly have the benefits of

globalization that comes into contact with new technologies, new organizations of work and production occurring in rich countries. Because of cheaper resources and labor, rich countries transfer capital and technology in undeveloped so that they have the benefit from globalization.

But, on the other hand observed, many believe that globalization is neoliberally oriented, imperial and neocolonial.

Precisely because of its inhumane neoliberal orientation, globalization has created movements - *against globalization*. Neoliberal globalization, in the post-Cold War period became influential "and decisive normative and political force in world politics." By preaching "almighty god of the market", neoliberal ideologues promise that those who will be subject to "demands of the world market" actually "be blessed with earthly riches." So neoliberalism 'appears with the promise that ... in the world will implement a new policy of fair distribution. " In this sense, neoliberalism "established itself as quasi world party that imposes" its power and its influence "within the various national parties and political arena, but at the same time claims that it does not represent and not defend the interests of the economy but the global value. The real utopia is: the rule of the neo-liberal regime succeeds in the liberation of millions of people around the world

from the shackles of poverty, because it creates a situation in which everyone wins, and not dynamic in which winners win all. But the credibility of the neoliberal regime is linked to its success, and disappears with his failure. In the extent they emerge, ie. in which the global crisis and risks are noticed, and where they lead to a global collapse and conflict, opportunities are growing for the establishment of power cosmopolitan counter-movements" (Beck, 2004, p. 117-118).

It is very important the role of these "cosmopolitan counter-movements", social and environmental movements in particular, as well as movements in the field of culture. These are movements that are committed to raising the level of environmental awareness, as well as changing existing values of the consumer society and consumerism which are dominant in today's neo-liberal oriented hedonistic globalization

These are movements that are committed to raising the level of environmental awareness, as well as changing existing values of the consumer society and consumerism which are dominant in today's neo-liberal oriented hedonistic globalization.

Therefore, it is necessary to develop a "*reflexive modernization*" (Beck) and "*social reflexivity*" (Giddens), ie. critical theory, which

according to Giddens must be *sociologically sensitive* to all immanent institutional transformations which modernity constantly opens for the future; that includes political, *geo-political tactics*, to recognize that commitment to moral purposes and "good intentions" can themselves be dangerous in a world where there are risks of serious consequences; that creates models of *a good society*, not limited to the nation-state, nor just to one institutional dimension of modernity, and to recognize that emancipatory politics should be linked to *life policies* or *policies of self-actualization* (Giddens, 1998, pp. 165-166, 159, 149-150).

2.

GLOBAL RISK SOCIETY

Risk society

On a global level built is a "*risk society*" and a "*world risk society*" with new risks, dangers security threats and uncertainties of living which cannot be controlled nationally or by the state. As Beck states, we no longer live in society "behind the modern" but are instead moving towards the phase of the "other modern" in which originate contemporary global institutions which destroy the traditional ones. The "classic" or, as it is usually called, the old industrial society is disappearing, and a new *risk society* and the *world risk society* is being created. We could say that a "*global risk society*" is being created.

Under the term of *risk society* Ulrich Beck does not assume an industrial society, but a society on a higher level of modernity in which the "production of *goods* is systematically followed by the social production of *risk*". That is exactly why Beck believes that the presentation of the "linear growth of technical or also the organizational rationality is out of date", and that is the reason due to which the phenomena of the environment has become an important sociological problem, because sociology is the science on society, and the use

of technical means has in production lead to endangering of life and society. “Ecological problems are *no longer* the problems of the surroundings, but are – in its genesis and consequences – completely *social* problems, *problems of people*, their history, their living conditions, their relationship with the world and reality, their economic, cultural, and political conformation. The industrially transformed “internal nature” of the civilized world must be understood as an example of a *non-environment*, as an *internal* environment, against which *fail* all our highly developed abilities of distancing and exclusion. At the end of the XX century nature *is* society, and society is (also) ‘*nature*’. Those who today still talk about nature as non-society, talk about categories of some other century, which no longer touch our reality” (Beck, 2001b, p. 31, 118).

Many accept the concept of a “risk society” and the “world risk society” which Beck has formulated, and one of them is also – Anthony Giddens.

By explaining Beck’s concept of a “risk society”, Giddens states that Beck also believes that we are not living “behind the modern”, but in a phase which he calls “*the other modernity*” (“*the other modern*”). In a world in which disappearing are customs and tradition, and in

which the industrial society is disappearing, and institutions are gaining global character, a “risk society” is being developed, and “risk management is the main characteristic of the global order” (Giddens, 2005b, p. 696-697).

For illustration of existence of global risk Beck decisively reminds us that forests have also been dying for a few centuries already, firstly because they are being turned into arable land, and also by ruthless cutting. However, these current dying of forests are global and have originated as a consequence of the development of the process of industrialization which carry with it a whole string of consequences. These processes have with its consequences also hit countries rich in forests, such as Norway and Sweden, which do not have such industrial plants which would cause great pollution and endanger forests, flora and fauna. That is how risks, as well as the problems that come with them, have gained global significance.

By striving, in an illustrated way, to make a difference between *local* and *global risks* and *problems*, Beck also states some examples. He says that familiar are the stories that sailormen, which have fallen in Thames in the XIX century, have not drowned, but that they suffocated from “gross smelly fumes and poisonous vapor” of the former “London cloaca”. Even movement

through the narrow streets of some middle aged cities has “looked like abuse of the sense of smell”. Everywhere on the streets, in carriages, there were feces, and facades of Parisian houses started to fall apart due to urine threatening that the process of rotting will seize the whole Paris. “However, it is obvious that the former dangers, unlike the present day dangers, were attacking the nose or the eyes, therefore they were sensuous, while it is typical for the risks of civilizations today that they elude senses and that they are better localized in the sphere of the physical-chemical formula (for example toxins in groceries, nuclear danger). The second difference is directly related to this. In the past these dangers could be reduced to *insufficiently* developed hygiene. Today they are based on industrial *hyper* production. Today’s risks and endangerments are very different from seemingly similar risks and endangerments of the Middle Ages by the *globality* of its threat (humans, animals and plants) and by its *contemporary* reasons. They are the risks of *modernization*. They are a *lump product* of the machinery of industrial improvement and they *systematically* increase with its further development”. A risk society is a society of various forms of catastrophes.” Socially recognized risks, which for the first time is clearly exerted in the example

of discussions of deforestation, contain one specific flammable substance: *what was until now considered non-political is becoming political – removal of “causes” in the actual process of industrialization...* Thereby in an exemplary way it is becoming obvious what public discussions are about in relation to defining of risks: not only about the secondary problems of health of nature and man, but also about *social, economic and political side effects of these side effects*: collapses of the market, devaluation of capital, bureaucratic controls of decisions of companies, opening of new markets, gigantic costs, court proceedings, loss of reputation. In smaller or bigger hits – in announcement of dangers of fog, pouring of poisons etc. – therefore of what is appearing in a risk society, is a *political potential of a catastrophe*. For protection from catastrophes and their overcoming there is need *to reorganize power and authority*. A risk society is a *society of catastrophes*. In it a state of emergency threatens to become normal”. (Beck, 2001b, p. 34-35, 37).

Living in the *world risk society* or the *global risk society* means that we are living in a society in which we are faced with risks of our safety, like we are faced with ecological risks

with which earlier generations were not faced with.

They are risks which “do not make a difference on the basis of nationality, wealth or social origin” and therefore they present a threat to “all human societies”. Even though they are not the only ones, Giddens especially singles out two risks: *global warming* and *genetically modified organisms*. On the other side, Beck believes that unwanted consequences of human activities create a new global order in which developed are global ecological threats which are a *consequence of wealth* (ozone holes, the glass garden effect, genetic engineering), which are the *consequence of poverty* (deforestation, bad storage of poison, “bypassing” of ecological right and low standards of ecological protection), as well as *weapons of mass destruction* which can be used by members of different radical, fundamentalist movements and terrorist groups. The process of modernization has lead to transitioning of a *class society* into a *risk society*, believes Beck. And, while in a class society the ideal was equality, in a risk society the ideal is security. The moving power of a class society is the sentence “*I am hungry*”, and the moving power of a risk society is “*I am scared*”. In a risk society originates “*solidarity out of fear*”

which becomes political power (Beck, 2001b, p. 73).

Risks powerfully occur as a consequence of scientific-technological and economic influence on nature and some of its consequences are *predictable* but some of them are *not predictable*, because with them they carry an opposite effect such as for example, global climate changes and the dangers that come with it. These are not natural occurrences, but those that have originated by an anthropogenic effect.

Considering that the risks are really very threatening (for example dangers from nuclear energy, dangerous waste, destruction of nature, as well as numerous others) necessarily is forcing the members of different classes, parties, and groups into *civil initiatives*. That means that the “risk society produces new antagonisms of interest and the new type of togetherness of the threatened, whose political capacity in any case stays a completely open matter. To the extent in which the risks of modernization are increased generalized and therefore abolished are the other zones of non-conveniences, a risk society (unlike the class society) is developing a tendency towards an objective unification of those affected in global risk positions. Therefore, bordering are friend and enemy, East and West, above and beyond, black and white, South and North

exposed to the same pressure of growing risks of civilization. Risk societies are not class societies – that doesn't say enough. They contain in themselves a *basic democratic development dynamic, which passes borders*, through which people are cornered into a unique position of civilization self threatening” (Beck, 2001b, p. 70).

The world society of risk, believes Beck, can be explained through three conceptual frameworks: *war and terror, economic globalization and neo-liberalism, and state and sovereignty*. He states that, due to an aspiration for imperial conquering and domination risks occur and that, in spite of endeavors to manage crisis, their control is not successful, especially because it is founded on unilateral politics especially of USA. Neoliberal economic globalization leads to the destruction of the environment, social layering, unemployment and poverty, globally organized crime, uncontrolled domination of global elite of power. The area of state and sovereignty represent a framework which in the area of global functioning needs to be oriented to decrease of risk and securing of world society, which necessarily requires true international cooperation of states and an alliance against terrorism as the highest social risk of world society of risk, in other words it requires a

dialogue of cultures, confessions and ethnic communities.

Giddens decisively emphasizes that today threatened is the connection between man and nature and that relationship must change. “Human societies depend on many resources from the natural world – such as waters, forests, flora and fauna. They are often called *resources which can be renewed*, because in preserved ecosystems they automatically replace themselves. However, if violated is the balance in consumption of those resources, there is a danger of their complete depletion. There is certain evidence that it can come to a process like this. The worsening of the situation in which renewable resources are in is giving great concern to many ecologists”. Giddens decisively reminds us that the possibility of an ecological catastrophe is not so direct today such as the risks from a big war, but it is by its implications “equally disturbing”, because “long-term, grave, irreparable damage of the natural environment may have already happened” and it is about such “occurrences which we are still not aware of” (Giddens, 2005b, p. 632; Giddens, 1998, p. 164).

In a risk society mankind risks its survival. Risks relate to depletion and excessive consumption of resources which are not

renewable or are hard to renew, as well as an increase in pollution.

Man's effect on climate disturbances presents a risk to his life and survival and it also relates to pollution of water, air, soil, food, radioactive and other forms of pollution. Of course, there are also other risks – risks of bioethics, genetic manipulation, and genetic engineering. Thanks to globalization which is neo-liberally and authoritatively determined, being developed are risks and dangers which are hard to control.

Risks of a risk society

Under the influence of a materialistic philosophy of the XVII and XVIII century in sociology, and especially in Marxist sociology, overtaking was a completely wrong viewpoint on infinity, thoroughness and indestructibility of matter, in other words of nature. However, globalization processes have led to the destruction of natural resources, creating environmental problems and risks of living, thus showing a complete mistake of such viewpoints.

Today humanity is faced with major environmental problems within which

globalization, as one of the fundamental consequences of modernity, creates new forms of interdependence in the world, a therefore new forms of risks and dangers (Giddens, 1998, p. 165-166).

We live in a *world of risk*, or as it is called, a *risk society*, the *world risk society* and the *global risk society*. Indeed, it does not matter where in which part of the world you are located in, people are faced with risks whose consequences are the same. The action of individuals, social groups or institutions in one part of the world can have, or have, significant effects on the residents of other regions. Even earlier people were faced with the risks and lived with them, and then took place various disasters, earthquakes, floods, fires, droughts, wars, famine and epidemics, but all of them had either a local or regional character.

Even though earlier people lived with risks, they did not know about the concept of *risk*. "Traditional cultures did not know the concept of risk because it they did not need it... This word is coming into wide use only in a society that is future-oriented - which sees the future precisely as a territory to be conquered or colonized. Risk is present in a society that actively tries to break away from its past - which is the overriding characteristic of modern

industrial civilization". Risks occur as a result of the existence and development of scientific, technological and economic rationality that creates environmental problems that become very risky. In this society there is no safety and security, but risks which are great and which we become aware of and whose consequences we fear. In traditional cultures, even in an industrial society to this day, people are worried about the external or natural risks, such as risks related to the vintage year, flood, famine, plague and other diseases. Since recently, we are concerned not so much about what nature can "do to us", but what we are doing and what we "did to it". That is how it came to a transition from the domination of *external risks* to the dominance of *manufactured risk*. Risks occur as a consequence of the existence and development of scientific, technological and economic rationality that creates environmental problems that become very risky. In this society there is no safety and security, but only large risks which we are becoming increasingly aware of and whose consequences we fear. "The feelings of ontological security and existential anxiety will exist together in an ambivalent relationship". Risk is a "seemingly simple term," but this, however, is not so, because it "reveals some of the most fundamental features of the world we

live in today." What is characteristic of manufactured risk is that it is not only a characteristic of nature, but that it also "penetrates into other areas of life." As an example may be taken marriage and family who are in all societies, but especially in developed, changed and where the risk is an integral component of these social groups. "Two or three generations ago, people knew exactly what they were doing when they marry. Marriage, to a great extent firmly shaped by tradition and customs, was akin to a natural state, which, of course, still applies in many countries. However, where the traditional means of dealing are in crisis, when people marry or enter into relationships, in a sense, which represents an important aspect of the whole thing, they do not know what they are doing, because the institutions of marriage and family have very much changed. Now people are starting from scratch, like the pioneers of the Wild West. Whether they are aware of it or not, in such situations, it is inevitable that more and more they start to think about risk. They have to face their own future, which is much more open than in the past, with all the opportunities and dangers that it carries" (Giddens, 2005a, p. 49, 53, 47, 54).

With the development of science and technology, urbanization and transport,

developing are risks, risk situations and dangers. Giddens points out that today are developing "new risk situations which differ from those of previous eras." Although from scientific and technological achievements mankind has many benefits, yet many of them "for us present immense risks." So we can safely say that "no one is quite sure what risk involves the production of genetically modified food." It turns out that today's world is riskier than the one before, and that "risk, at the present time, arises less from natural hazards and a lot more than the uncertainty that resulted from social development and the development of science and technology" (Giddens, 2005b, p. 697).

Once, risks had local or regional character, and today they have gained *global character* and global characteristic. Today's risks significantly differ from the previous ones, because they gained global character and therefore they are very dangerous because they are able to destroy life on Earth. "Unlike the former risks that had identified causes and known consequences, the risks of the modern age cannot be determined the origin nor the effects can be seen" (Giddens, 2005b, p. 72).

According to Giddens' opinion, there are *two types of risks*:

- *external risks*, and

- *manufactured risks.*

These former, *external risks*, arise from the outside, tradition or nature (drought, floods, earthquakes).

The latter, *manufactured risks*, arise under the influence of actions of "our growing knowledge of the world", that is, under the influence of human practices, scientific knowledge, power and technology of action on nature. These risks are increasingly influenced by powerful globalization processes. We rarely come into this type of risk, and biggest risks, and the biggest risk which relate to the environment are - the risks of *global warming* that increasingly influence the processes of globalization. Manufactured risks represent a major problem for human health. As an example, he points out that by the media and the media campaigns to protect health sent were messages to people to not expose themselves to dangerous ultraviolet sun rays and that, in order to protect themselves, they should use lotions. Giddens cites examples of manufactured risks, those who are actually connected to food. Namely, the use of pesticides and herbicides, hormones and antibiotics in modern agricultural production of food can have a detrimental impact on the health of animals and humans. Therefore, the debate

about genetically modified food and the "mad cow disease" has disturbed the public because it was realized that the use of beef for human consumption poses a risk to human health. But it is not yet certain what are all the risks that the use of food for human consumption brings. "The sheer amount of unknown factors complicates this task and makes accurate risk analysis a very challenging issue" (Giddens, 2005b, p.72-73).

Risks are an escort of social development, but in a global risk society we are faced with a large number of risks that should be accepted as reality, but they should be tamed and we should dare to do so.

As the word "*risk*" in Portuguese means "*to dare*", Giddens stresses the importance of courage in upholding the "*scientific innovation*" and "*change*" to solve the problems we face. "The fact that we live in a global age means that we have to deal with a host of new risk situations. We may often need courage, not prudence, to support scientific innovations or other kinds of changes. After all, one root of the word `risk` in the original, in Portuguese means to dare." Therefore risks should not be seen only as a danger and threat, although no doubt they are, but also as ***drivers of social change*** in other words "the drivers of dynamics in a society facing changes in society," a society "that wants

to determine its own future, without leaving the job to religion, tradition and the whims of nature." And, precisely such a society differs from previous social and economic systems to the relationship towards the future. For, while the earlier, pre-capitalist market entrepreneurships were sporadic and partial, capitalist calculation of risk is of a "continuous" character. Given the existence of numerous risks, special significance gains the endeavor to manage risk. "From whatever side you look, we are dealing with risk management. Because manufactured risks are becoming numerous, the governments can not pretend that this management does not fall within their job. And they must cooperate with each other, because very few of these new risks which remain within national borders" (Giddens, 2005a, p. 61, 50, 59).

In addition to *risks*, today there are numerous *global dangers*, of which, according to Giddens' opinion, two are especially significant, and they are "polluting and creating of waste substances which are thrown into the environment, and excessive consumption of natural resources which are not renewable" (Giddens, 2005b, p. 628).

Of course, these are not the only dangers and risks which the *risk society* carries in itself.

There are numerous risks of a risk society which we face. Here are some serious ones.

Population growth

Population growth is increasing, so it can be said that there are different futuristic forecasts on possible cataclysmic risks and consequences of its constant growth. Well, no matter the differently tinted projections of future population growth, however, it is a fact that the current population requires a large consumption of goods, resources and energy.

Demographic growth is exponential, but to bring it in an illustrative way into a connection with the problem of which he speaks, Giddens cites a Persian myth. "Courtier asks the ruler to reward him for his service by making the ruler give him twice as much grains of rice than he had up to that time, beginning with a single grain on the first square of a chessboard. Believing that he is acting well, the king commanded that rice be brought from the barn. Up to the 21st field of the chessboard, the barn was empty; up to the 40th field 10 billion grains of rice needed to be given... In other words, if you start to double the number of any object, going so in a row, the result begins to double... Exactly the same principle applies to population growth. This

effect can be measured by doubling the time, that is the period for which the population doubles. Population growth of 1 per cent will lead to a doubling of numbers in 70 years. For a growth of 2 per cent, the population will double in 35 years, while population growth of 3 per cent leads to a doubling of the population in 23 years "(Giddens, 2005b, pp. 618-619).

In developed countries birth rates are low, while in developing countries, they are high. Developed countries have undergone a process of demographic transition while maintaining a small increase in population; In contrast, in developing countries imminent is a demographic transition that will, however, lead to a significant increase in population. As a risk factor, this increase in population could as a consequence create a whole series of security threats and problems. One of them can refer to provoking unrest (especially in developing countries), changes in the economy and the labor market leading to migration, jeopardizing of the natural environment and the risk to health, infrastructure overload, increased crime rates, increasing the number of the poor as well as illegally built slums, food shortages and hunger (Giddens, 2005b, pp. 623-624).

Food and genetically modified organisms

Given that hunger and malnutrition affect hundreds of millions of people in the world, and that the population is increasing, even the potentially poor and hungry, it is believed that food shortages could be a real reality in the future. Therefore, some believe that the way out of such a situation should be sought in the techniques of intertwining of genes and the use of genetically modified organisms.

Although man has for a long time been dealing with genetic modifications, however they were natural, unlike some today. "Genetically modified crops are different from any known until now, because they consist of the genes which are transplanted from a variety of organisms. This is a much more radical intervention in nature than is the case with older methods." Therefore, today, we can justifiably speak of risk, which could lead to the destruction of the natural living environment. And if we add to this fact that chemical and agricultural companies produce vast amounts of herbicides and pesticides, which come into soil, food, water and air, it is clear that the concern is justified. Biotechnologists point out that biotechnology enables us to breed better crops and higher

yields, but we are however witnesses to the fact of increasing of pollution of the natural environment by operations of biotechnology and chemistry.

As genetically modified crops are a relatively new phenomenon in agricultural production "no one can be sure of what effects it will produce when they are used in the environment." Therefore, there is "growing concern about the potential risks in accepting this, to a large extent untested technology." This "concern is particularly widespread in Europe. In Britain, hostility to the commercial cultivation of genetically modified crops is fueled by the discoveries of Dr. Arpad Pustaija, an internationally renowned geneticist who works in a state laboratory in Scotland. In his research, Dr. Pustai tested potatoes that contained the gene for one particular natural insecticide - a protein known as the lectin, which is obtained from certain types of flowers. The results showed that in rats that ate the genetically modified potatoes this caused significant damage to the immune system and slow the growth of organs. The results of Dr. Pustaija were criticized by other leading scientists and he was fired from a state laboratory after being on television, in which he talked about his concerns regarding the use of genetically modified food. "Of course,

companies are very powerful, and do not want the truth to be out in public because it would jeopardize the achievement of enormous profits and their position. However, despite this, there are *protests* against the use of genetically modified organisms in agriculture, the more so because powerful corporations seek to "impose some sort of farmers' 'bio slavery`". Many discoveries and negative examples of the use of genetically modified organisms are still "in favor of advocates of environmental protection, which have for a long time been warning about the harmful effects of genetically modified food." And, although "genetic modification can have huge potential benefits, at the same time, the risks that are associated with them, are unpredictable and not measurable. Once they find themselves in a natural environment, genetically modified organisms can trigger a series of chain effects that are difficult to monitor and control. In accordance with this dilemma, many environmentalists advocate the precautionary principle. This *principle suggests* that wherever there is serious doubt regarding the implementation of new procedures, it is better to stick to the existing practice than to change it " (Giddens, 2005b, p. 644-646).

Should we use in food production traditional agriculture or biotechnology?

Precisely, on a second place Giddens points out that some theorists propose a "*medium solution*" when it comes to the attitude towards the use or non use of genetically modified organisms. "Because the pressure for growing and consuming genetically modified crops is partly conditioned by purely commercial interests, would it not be reasonable to ban them on a global level? Even if we assume that it would be possible, things, as always, are not so simple. Intensive agriculture as applied today can not last indefinitely. It uses large amounts of chemical means to increase the vintage rate, as well as insecticides which have a devastating impact on the environment. We can not go back to the traditional ways of farming, as this will not feed the world population. With crops that are the result of bioengineering we could reduce the use of harmful chemicals, which would help in resolving these problems." Given that we are talking about a *manufactured risk*, and that it, along with other manufactured risks, "all the more numerous," Giddens points out that increasingly posed is a question of the problem of *risk management*, and that governments can no longer pretend "that this management does not belong to their work"; on this issue, "they must cooperate with each other, because very

few of these new risks which remain within national borders" (Giddens, 2005a, p. 59).

Water

Water is distributed to 71% of the earth's surface; the salty sea water accounts for about 98%, water in the polar regions to the north and south of Earth 2.01%, and drinkable and for use only 0.6%. Although it is a renewable resource, the supply of fresh water is limited by the available quantity, and the ways of its distribution.

What are all the things that significantly affect the water shortage?

Giddens points out that the lack of water will especially influence population growth and global warming. "There are several reasons why this is so. The first is that a large part of the projected population growth in the world over the next decade will likely be concentrated in those areas that already have problems with the shortage of drinking water. Moreover, much of this growth will occur in urban areas, where existing infrastructure will need to meet the needs of a growing population for water. Global warming also has a potential impact on the consumption of water supplies... As it come to an increase in temperature on the earth, there will be

a need for more water for drinking and irrigation. One can also assume that groundwater will not be renewed as quickly as before, because with the increase in temperature, increased will be the evaporation of water. Finally, climate changes that may accompany global warming will likely affect existing patterns of rainfall and therefore change the access to the water supply in ways that still can not be completely predicted"(Giddens, 2005b, pp. 632-633).

The existing water supplies are increasingly depleted, and research shows that water consumption has been growing at a high rate of 2.5% per year over the past decade. In the nineteenth century spent was six times more water than in the past century, and most affected areas threatened by water shortages are traditionally North Africa, South Asia, Middle East. It is believed that in 2025 due to the current trend of pollution around 2 billion people will live in absolute water scarcity. To make things worse, groundwaters are decreasing and disappearing. The problems to drinking water are created by contamination of surface water by waste materials of organic and inorganic origin, toxic chemicals, pesticides, sewage contents, etc.

Air

The atmosphere is the air layer of Earth consisting of solid and liquid matter and gases, the most important being the oxygen without which there would be no life. In addition, the importance of the atmosphere is because it represents a protection from the negative impact of the cosmic and ultraviolet rays and radiation.

But, due to increased pollution, reducing is the amount of oxygen and increasing is the concentration of carbon dioxide.

Although a significant component of the assumption of life, the air is being more polluted, and it does not need special mention that air pollution is very *dangerous to health*. This type of pollution accounts for more than 2.7 million lives a year. So, although the external pollution was for a long time tied to industrialized countries, it is recording a rapid increase even in the developing countries. Impure, contaminated and polluted air creates major health problems, especially respiratory but also other organs. Of course, air pollution does not only affect the health of people and animals; It has a detrimental impact on other elements of the ecosystem, and one of these harmful effects of air pollution refers to acid rains, which occur when oxides of sulfur and nitrogen come into contact with water,

thus becoming detrimental to forests, rivers and lakes, crops, plant and wildlife and man. Once, in the beginning of the development of the process of industrialization, factory chimneys were lower, so the air pollution affected the local area. But when they built factories with high chimneys air pollution has not disappeared but, with the aid of air currents and wind, it affected the wider area. This shows that air pollution and acid rain cross borders of places where they originated and fall on other areas jeopardizing waters, lakes, crops, forests, flora and fauna. Thus, for example, in Sweden, out of 90,000 lakes, 20,000 of them are polluted (Giddens, 2005b, p. 628, 629).

The destruction and devastation of the soil

Due to the minerals and energy it contains, as well as other important elements, land, in other words soil, also represents a vital prerequisite of life. However, it is also threatened by the presence of different types of waste and toxins that contaminate and endanger it.

To list a risk problem of destruction and devastation of soil, Giddens cites the *United Nations Human Development Report* (UNDP, 1998), pointing out that one third of the world's

population supports itself from soil, ie. "From what they are growing in the fields and the venison which they hunt. This population is therefore particularly sensitive to changes that affect their ability to live off the land. In many areas of Asia and Africa, where there is rapid population growth, the problem of *destruction of soil* threatens to impoverish millions of people. The destruction of soil is a process in which it comes to a deterioration of the quality of soil and its valuable natural ingredients are increasingly disappearing due to excessive `use`, drought or inadequate ways of fertilising. Long-term effects of the destruction of the soil have serious consequences, and the process is difficult to stop. In those areas where the soil is of poor quality, there is a decline in agricultural productivity and there is less available arable land per capita. Due to the lack of animal feed it is difficult to, or even impossible, to raise cattle. In many cases, people are forced to migrate in search of more fertile land. The devastation of the soil refers to cases of intense destruction of the soil, leading to the conversion of large areas to almost a desert. As a result of this phenomenon, there has been formation of desert areas that cover the area as far as Russia and Indonesia together ... exposing, thereby, to risk more than 110 countries" (Giddens, 2005b, p. 633).

Forests

As an important element of the ecosystem, a source of resources, a manufacturer of oxygen and regulator of water reserves, forests play an essential role in sustaining life.

Also, forests are important in everyday life because they are a source of food, energy, materials, medicine, space for unfolding of tourism and recreation, and so on. "Yet despite their exceptional importance, more than a third of initial forests on Earth have disappeared... While many types of forests are endangered by the process of unplanned deforestation, the fate of tropical forests attracts the most attention. Tropical forests, which cover about seven percent of the Earth's surface, are a habitat for a **large number of plant** and animal species, which contribute to the **diversity of living things** on earth. They are also the habitat of many plants from which oils are obtained for manufacturing of medicaments. Tropical forests today are disappearing at a rate about 1 percent a year and could disappear altogether by the end of the 21st century, if current tendencies of their unplanned deforestation continue" (Giddens, 2005b, p. 633).

Yet, every year, due to the conversion of forest land to agricultural land, use of wood as fuel, home furnishings also for industrial

purposes, or as a result of air pollution and acid rain, on earth disappears 17 - 18 million hectares of forest disappears on Earth.

Endangering survival and disappearance of plant and animal species

Fifteen years ago over 34.000 plant species and 5.200 animal species in the world were on the verge of extinction.

In 2008 it has been estimated that a quarter of all species of mammals, an eighth of all species of birds, a third of all species of amphibians and nearly all plants are threatened with extinction.

Although it is assumed that on Earth there are almost ten times as many plant and animal species than those described, up to the twentieth century were discovered and described: 370,000 plant and 1.4 million animal species. On Earth, there is a biological diversity of endangered species because every year disappears 20,000 plant and animal species. If this trend of disappearance of plant and animal species continued, it is assumed that until 2050, only 10% would remain.

Beck says that of 680 plant species in Greenland, 519 are endangered, and also

decreasing are the bird species that depend on the ecosystem of meadows, such as the white stork, skylark, etc. Some are trying "to save the last samples like for example in Bavaria, using the `Program for field birds`... Among the animals endangered are birds that lay on the ground, animals that are at the top of food chains, such as birds of prey, owls, dragonflies, as well as those that specialize in food which is rarer, for example for large insects or for flower nectar available during the growing season... Former `unseen side-effects` become the visible main effects which threaten the very centers that are the cause of their production" (Beck, 2001b, p. 56).

By constant polluting of the natural environment, water, air, soil, brought into question is not only the survival of plant and animal species, but also the very presuppositions of life.

Waste

For the developed industrialized societies it can be said that they are „*societies of waste*“ because of the amount of waste materials and objects that are thrown very high. Thus, for example, on an island near New York City daily is deposited 24,000 tons of waste and in

countries of the EU 350 kg of waste is created per person per year. Also, the landfill in which this waste is disposed, are large and quickly fill up so often free space for waste disposal runs out. And, as societies become richer, it gradually comes to the transition from organic waste such as food scraps, to the increasing amount of plastic and synthetic materials, which are used for packaging and which need much more time to decompose (Giddens, 2005b, p. 631).

The concept of ecological modernization can not be based on constant use and depletion of resources, but also on *recycling*, in order to protect the environment.

Until recently, a large part of industrial and municipal waste was burned, but the technological development has enabled an increase in environmental awareness, so, say for example of paper, it was realized "that it is much cheaper to produce newsprint from recycled paper than from wood pulp that was previously used for this." For such a change of behavior influenced economic and ecological reasons "to use and recycle paper rather than to endlessly cut down trees." Companies, as well as "entire industries, actively pursue policies called `prime Waste` - that is, complete recycling of all waste products for future industrial use." In this sense, the vehicle manufacturers such as, for example,

Toyota and Honda, "reached the level of 85 per cent of recycling of automobile parts. In that context, the waste is no longer just the harmful accumulation of materials, but also a resource in the industry, and to some extent, the means to encourage future technological innovations. It is significant that the main contribution to the recycling of materials, and therefore sustainable development, comes from an area with a high concentration information technology industry, such as Silicon Valley in California. Information technology, unlike many of the former forms of industrial production, is clean in terms of environmental protection. The bigger the role of this technology in industrial production is, the higher the probability that reduced will be the harmful effects to the environment. That fact may have certain consequences for the future development of the poorer countries in the world. It is possible that, at least in some areas of production, those countries achieve rapid economic development without the pollution of the environment, which was a characteristic of the old industrial economy, because information technology will play a much larger role" (Giddens, 2005b, pp. 646-647).

By daily production of extremely huge amount of waste, its disposal everywhere, as well as the inability to permanently destroy it, at the

same time created are the risks and dangers that threaten the safety of humans, plant and animal species.

Climate changes

Even after 1988, when the *World Meteorological Organisation and the United Nations Environment Programme* established the *IPCC - International Panel of Climate Change*, the global public began to devote a lot of attention to climate change. With concern it was pointed out that, since the Industrial Revolution, the concentration of gases that create the so-called "*greenhouse*" effect has effected the increase of global warming and climate change.

Giddens believes that most of the "experts believe that global warming is occurring and that we must confront it. However, only in the mid-seventies of the twentieth century, widely accepted opinion in the scientific community is that the world is in a phase of global cooling. Almost the same evidence which corroborated the hypothesis of global cooling is now used for the opposite hypothesis - heat waves, gusts of cold, unusual weather conditions. Is global warming at work, and is it the result of human action? Probably - but we will not, and

we can not be sure until it's too late" (Giddens, 2005a, p. 55).

Globalization processes influence changes of global climate whose the impact on the biosphere is so evident that it is the greatest risk that is caused by human activities and anthropogenic influences.

Starting from these impacts, *Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* cites an assessment of the effects of climate change by the end of this century in six scenarios. Even the most favorable scenario is not good. It predicts a warming of 1,1-2.9 degrees Celsius which would mean that by the end of this century the water level in the oceans would be raised by 18-38 centimeters. If the trend continued of the present level of consumption of oil, coal and gas (which leads to high level of economic growth) - the temperature would be higher by 6 degrees. The water level in the oceans would increase between 26 and 50 centimeters. However, the "most likely scenario", within the current use of fossil fuels and energy sources, with a controlled population growth, is also disturbing because it shows an increase in temperature of 4 degrees Celsius, and a rise in the water level in the oceans by 48 centimeters. This increase in global temperature would result in an increase in the number and

size of glacial lakes, the faster melting of the "eternal" snow and ice and significant changes in the ecosystems of the Arctic and Antarctica, bigger and faster breaking of glaciers, flourishing of rivers and flourishing and movement of some plant and animal species toward the poles. In addition, increased levels of ocean water would flood submerge coastal cities which would lead to hunger and large-scale shortages and migration and possible conflicts and wars (Giddens, 2010, pp. 31-32).

We see that one of those damaging effects of climate changes refers to the *rising level of the sea*. The mentioned global warming would lead to the melting of the polar glaciers and warming and spreading of the ocean. Then the level of sea would be lifted, and cities near the sea coast would be flooded; also flooded would be many plains, islands, ports, sea coast cities and areas. If the level of the sea was to increase by 1 meter, Bangladesh would lose 17%, Egypt 12% and the Netherlands 6% of their territory. If the sea level increased, a cataclysm would cover those areas, and the ocean water would get warmer, it would lose a certain level of salinity and it would endanger the flora and fauna.

Second, the adverse impact would be related to the *conversion of fertile land into desert*.

Third, the adverse impact would lead to the *spread of infectious diseases*, because global warming would allow some organisms, and especially mosquitoes to transmit and spread infectious diseases (malaria, yellow fever) even in countries that did not have them. But if temperatures rise by 3-5 degrees Celsius, then the number of those suffering from malaria would increase by up to 80 million per year.

Fourth, the adverse impact would be related to *poor harvests* because global warming would lead to a decline in agricultural yields and environmental vulnerability of the population in most of the poorest countries, especially Southeast Asia, Africa, Latin America.

Fifth, the harmful effect would be related to *changes in climate patterns*. Although relatively stable for thousands of years, under the influence of global warming, droughts, storms, hurricanes, floods, climate patterns would be disrupted (Giddens, 2005b, pp. 637-638).

Global warming is not evenly distributed on our planet.

Processes of global warming are higher "over land than over oceans" higher "in the north than in other parts of the world. The latest

research shows that the temperature of the ocean is growing several times faster than predicted a few years ago. Higher temperature produces a greater amount of acid in the water, which may seriously jeopardize the life in it. Warmer seas emit more carbon dioxide and contribute to faster global warming. In the period from 1982 - 2006 the temperature increased the most in the Baltic (1.36 degrees C), the North (1.3 degrees C) and the South China Sea (1.22 degrees C) "(Giddens, 2010, p. 29). When it comes to different scenarios of possible climate change, we will present two directions or approaches:

- *skeptical*, and
- *optimistic*.

To the minority direction belong - the *skeptics*. They believe that global warming does not represent the result of anthropogenic activities of human activities, and that the temperature rise is not something new. In fact, geologists say that in the last fifteen hundred years climate changes are a result of impact of changing of the position of sun spots, and that right now we are in the phase of heating, and after this phase follows the phase of the Ice Age, that is after a relatively mild climate in which we now live will come the ice age, and this is what, in the opinion of skeptics, should concern us.

Also, skeptics believe that to the current climate change, as a risk, incorrectly is attached greater importance in relation to the more significant problems which present greater risks, such as poverty, AIDS and nuclear weapons. Dismissing the story of global warming, skeptics point out that we live in the "age of fear" and among them are listed the risks of climate change. In fact, we live in a "new era of prejudice" which strongly resembles the "mass panic in the past" as once were those related to witch hunts. These fears and anxieties are part of our daily life within which they frighten us with "mysterious and deadly" viruses and bacteria that are found everywhere, toxic substances that are found in our homes, workplaces and in nature, and culmination of such fears is related to fear from global warming. But, regardless of the fact that it is considered that after global warming follows an ice age, this however is under the influence of human activities, global warming and melting, do not present the only danger of anthropogenic origin. Precisely, the other ones relate to nuclear weapons, AIDS, the food crisis and poverty, so there are views that the XXI Century is "our last century," and that as a human race, we will not survive the XXI century because of the great dangers that man has made

by being excessively involved into "matters of nature" (Giddens, 2010, p. 40).

Into the other direction, or orientation, are classified - *optimists*. They reject the "story" about the "doomsday" believing that we are too obsessed with safety and that therefore we see threats in everything which leads to concerns and fears, anguish and helplessness. They believe that viewpoints on climate change are the reason for our irrational pessimism and fears which is pointless because, after all, we live in the right and best moment. Citing two approaches on climate changes Giddens is more inclined to accept the view of *optimists*.

Social inequalities and poverty

More than half the world's population live below the "poverty line" (370 dollars per capita per year), and 500 million people on the global poverty line, with an annual income of less than \$ 275 a year.

Proponents of the concept of ecological modernization and sustainable development point out that rescuing of the global environment requires changes in global levels of inequality. On the one hand speaking, industrialized countries have 1/5 of world population, and they emit into the atmosphere 75% of the gases that

pollute the environment and contribute to global warming. On average, one person in the developed world consumes natural resources at a rate that is 10 times higher than those in less developed countries. And, on the other hand, in underdeveloped countries poverty contributes to environmental problems as the need to survive leads to the destruction and devastation of local resources. It turns out that even in both the first and the second case sustainable development can not be considered separately from the problem of global inequalities, and that global inequality is one of the factors that determine unsustainable development (Giddens, 2005b, p. 647).

In the neo-liberal oriented globalization, social inequalities within countries and between countries, are being increasingly deepened and enlarged.

Statistical data are "frightening" because they show that the share of "the poorest fifth of the world population in global income has fallen... from 1989 to 1998 from 2.3 to 1.4 percent. On the other hand, the share of the richest fifth has increased. In sub-Saharan Africa, 20 countries have lower real income per capita than at the end of the seventies of the twentieth century. In many less developed countries, environmental safety and legislation are weak or almost non-existent. Some transnational

companies sell goods that are controlled or prohibited in industrialized countries - poor quality drugs, harmful pesticides or cigarettes with high tar and nicotine. You could say that this looks more like a robbery than on global global village. Besides the environmental risks, with which it is associated, growing inequality is the most serious problem that global society faces. "Contemporary globalization processes have increased economic inequalities which are increasingly growing. They have increased between 1860 and 1960, when Western countries and Japan have developed industrialization and thus "made great economic progress, unlike most of the world." Precisely "opposing trends have led to significant divergence between the richest and poorest countries in the world. The distance between the richest and poorest countries in the world in 1820 amounted to approximately 3 to 1, 11 to 1 in 1913, 35 to 1 in 1950, and 72 to 1 in 1992. ... During the past century, among the quarter of the world's richest population, income per capita has increased six-fold, while among the poorest quarter this increase was less than three times. It seems that globalization reinforces these trends by further concentration of income, wealth and resources in a small number of countries ... the global economy is growing and is integrating at an extremely fast pace. The

expansion of global trade represents a key place in this process - in the period between 1990 and 1997, international trade has increased by 6.5 percent. However, only a few developing countries benefited from this growth, and the process of integration into the global economy is very uneven ... Some countries - such as the East Asian economies, Chile, India and Poland - did well, with an increase in exports of over 5 percent . Other countries, such as Russia, Venezuela and Algeria, profited poorly from growing trade and globalization (UNDP 1999). Data from the World Bank complement this picture: among the 93 countries from the developing countries, for only 23 it can be said that they are quickly integrating. There is a danger that the countries that have the greatest need for economic development will continue to lag behind as globalization further progresses (World Bank 2000)" (Giddens, 2005a, pp. 41-42, 20-21; Giddens, 2005b, p. 75).

Social inequalities are the *risk factors* and a serious *security threat*.

New international inequalities occur as new forms of *social inequalities* which carry with it *risks* because they occur precisely where overlap class and risk positions: in the foothill of factory chimneys, next to refineries, chemical factories and industrial plants. These risk

industries have relocated to countries of low earnings where corporate agriculture uses pesticides, fungicides, herbicides and other chemicals to increase food production and make huge profits. Therefore, food, water and even the air are polluted with these poisons which enter the ecosystems and food chains. At the international level, poverty coincides with a lack of awareness of the risks. Thus, in Sri Lanka extremely toxic DDT was sprinkled with bare hands, and in 1993 on the island of Trinidad 120 deaths were registered from contact with pesticides. This "green revolution", supported by the highly developed western industrial countries, has increased food production by 30-40%, but with the use of hundreds of thousands of tons of pesticides in the fields of cotton, rice, tobacco and fruits in Asia and Latin America. Even "in a competition between a visible danger of hunger and the invisible threat of death from toxic substances," precisely „winning is the evident fight against material poverty". This "fight against hunger and for the autonomy is making a shield behind which the risks that can not be observed anyway are suppressed, minimized, and *thus* multiply and spread and finally through the food chain eventually are returned to the rich industrial countries." In the area of the global economy *global inequalities*

are increasingly deepening, resulting in the creation and deepening of risk. So it shows that on one side there is the ultra-rich and on the other the ultra poor population, but also that this deep gap and the economic and social gap "ethically unacceptable and politically unsustainable" because exploitation creates inequalities and they produce - *risks* in the *risk society* where risks "grow, flourish and advance," so that in that competition of industrial societies and risk society "at the end wins the risk society" (Beck, 2001b, pp. 62-63, 69, 67).

Crime

In modern societies, crime is a very widespread and risky social phenomenon. It manifests itself in a wide range of crime from youth crime and the elderly, men and women, "white collars", drug trafficking, weapons, human beings and organs, organized crime, smuggling of nuclear waste, money laundering, as well as crime in cyberspace (cybercrime).

Due to an increase in the use of computers, computer crime is becoming more common and more important present, and therefore more dangerous.

Crime in cyberspace, or *cybercrime*, occurs in many forms. Giddens states the

viewpoint of Grabosky and Smith which point out the "nine major types of technological crime":

- *eavesdropping* - has become easier due to illegal intrusion into telecommunications systems and it is developed from the 'control of marital spouse` to espionage";
- *electronic vandalism and terrorism* - due to the increasing relying and dependence, societies are often subject to attacks on their computer systems that endanger their safety;
- *theft of telecommunication services* - which means that performed can be completely illegal activities and jobs, but that they do not have to be disclosed;
- *protection of telecommunications services* - is difficult, as well as the protection of copyrights by copying of materials, films, CDs, software;
- *occurrence of material with pornographic and offensive contents* - sexual, ethnic, racial, personal;

- *fraud through telemarketing* - by advertising of fake charities, investment programs and other activities that are difficult to legally regulate;
- *crime in electronic transfer of cash* - which includes jamming and endangering of money transfer;
- *electronic money laundering* - which includes "transferring `of illegal income to hide its criminal origin";
- *criminal conspiracies* - that to the civil services, due to sophisticated systems and data transfer rates, create problems to obtain information about criminal activities (Giddens, 2005b, pp. 246-247).

Precisely computer crime can build on the criminal activities including the information technology infrastructures, including illegal (unauthorized) access, illegal interceptions, unauthorized damaging, deleting, the collapse of the system, system of mixing and the cover-up of computer data, misuse of the computer, forgery (ID theft) and electronic fraud. This type of crime is on the rise, and with the development of

information and communication technologies and resources will also be developed *the "crime of the future"*, especially the one that refers to *"identity theft"*. If we imagine a time in which there will be no cash in the physical sense and in which all personal property will be marked with electronic chips where our personal identity will have the highest value, then the nature and forms of crime will significantly change precisely under the influence of information technology resources. And then will many items and goods, such as, for example, cars, cameras, computers, become less attractive to steal because they will be programmed to be able to be used only by their legal owners. "Personalized` identities` such as computer chips, personal identification numbers (PIN) and security codes will become a widespread phenomenon. They will be required in order to perform *online* transactions, the use of *smart cards* (virtual cash) and passage through protected systems "but" cases of *identity theft* will skyrocket due to the fact that more and more aspects of life are based on high technology ". Cyber crime will be more developed and therefore, as a special problem posed is the question of *legal and legislative protection* from this very dangerous phenomenon, especially since crimes that were committed in one country, will produce serious consequences throughout

the world, which will have serious implications in the process of identifying and processing of crime. It will be for the police service very important in order to establish the jurisdiction of the court and to achieve agreement on the extradition of the perpetrators of criminal acts and to provide "the necessary evidence for prosecution" (Giddens, 2005b, p. 247).

Terrorism

Beck quite well notes that "the outbreak of global terrorism" has become the "Chernobyl of globalization." And, that is the problem of neo-liberalism, which advocated the slogan "dare for *smaller* states," and *after September 11*, he advocated the slogan "dare for *higher* countries". So it turned out that "the utopia of the neoliberal state" suddenly "became politically obsolete" because from "the triumphant march of the economy" completely was "removed the magic" so quite well and clearly showed the error which advocated the mantra of market fundamentalism as a landmark of "successful" state and social development, safety and security. However, the "primate of the state was re-discovered" and terrorist attacks showed all the vulnerability of neo-liberalism of Western civilization. "The suicide assassins and mass murderers not only

revealed the vulnerability of Western civilization, but thereby they suggest in what kind of conflict the neo-liberally misunderstood globalization. In a world of global risks, foreign currency of neo-liberalism on replacement of policy and state with economy is rapidly losing its credibility. To the extent to which these findings break, broken is the hegemonic power that neo-liberalism in recent years acquired in thinking and action... In time of crisis, considering the global perception of risk, neo-liberalism apparently has no political response“ (Beck, 2004, pp. 338-339).

Of course that neo-liberalism on such phenomena has no response. Well, it has contributed to the radicalization of terrorism.

Environmental problems and the boomerang effect

Environmental problems are essentially *social problems*. What man does to nature is returned in the form of the so-called *boomerang effect*.

Boomerang effect affects all - rich and poor. The rich were hoping that the environmental problems will hit the poor, and

that by the relocation of dirty and risky industries to the areas inhabited by the poor, they will get rid of risks. Of course, they did not think about the *boomerang effect*. "But that's why they must import food, at cheap prices. In fruit, cocoa beans, food, tea leaves etc. pesticides are returning to their highly industrialized homeland. Extreme international inequalities and the intertwining of the world market are pushing poor neighborhoods in the peripheral countries to the doors of the rich industrial centers. They are becoming broods of global infection which - like infectious diseases of the poor in compaction of medieval cities - do not spare the rich neighborhoods of the global community" (Beck, 2001b, pp. 65-66).

This *boomerang effect* quite well demonstrates the globalization of pollution and endangerment of life and health. It shows the dangers and risks.

Under the influence of the *boomerang effect* everything changes and everything is called into question, from the "socialized destruction of nature" to "everyday social rules." Beck explicitly states: "The markets are collapsing. There is shortage in abundance. Caused are floods of requests. Legal systems are not dealing with the facts. The questions that most concern us, are answered by shrugging

shoulders. Medical care is not effective. Buildings of scientific rationality are collapsing. Governments are shaking. Voters, who vote one time for one party and the other for the other party, are fleeing... And all this, while for our senses reality remains *unchanged*, as if the fact that people are hit has *nothing* to do with their actions, their injury with their achievements. That is the end of the nineteenth century, the end of the *classical* industrial society with its notions of sovereignty of the national state, the automatic of progress, classes, principal of effect, nature, reality, scientific knowledge etc." With powerful globalization processes are developed also *risks*, as well as their distribution which" contains a considerably amount of political explosive: sooner or later they will turn the tables on those who produce them and profit from them. Risks in this dispersal show a social *boomerang effect*: even the rich and powerful are not safe in respect to them. The former `latent side effects` strike back even in centers of their own production. The precise actors of modernization fall specifically into the vortex of danger, which they produce and from which they profit" (Beck, 2001b, pp. 14-15, 55).

As a very illustrative example of the "*boomerang effect*" Beck takes *agriculture* in the Federal Republic of Germany.

In it artificial tobacco consumption increased from 143 to 378 kilograms per hectare in the period from 1951 to 1983, but the consumption of chemical agents in it also increased from 25,000 in 1975 to 35,000 in 1983. Indeed, the yields per hectare have increased, but not that much despite an increase in the use of artificial fertilizers and chemical agents. Cereal yields have doubled, and 20% in potatoes. "Disproportionately *small* increase in yield compared to the use of fertilizers and chemicals contrasts with a disproportionately large increase in damage in nature, visible and painful for farmers." But the *boomerang effect* has demonstrated that such agriculture, based on chemical contamination, is leading to the *endangerment and disappearance of plant and animal species*. Thus "production modernization risks follow the *curve of the boomerang*" for industrialized intensive chemical agriculture, for example, "causes not only in distant cities a dramatic increase of lead in breast milk and in children" but also "undermines the very natural base of agricultural production" because "declining is fertility of fields, vitally important animals and plants are disappearing, increasing is the risk of soil erosion". In this roundabout of a *boomerang effect* and "*the perpetrator and the victim become equal*" (Beck, 2001b, p. 56).

Polluted natural environment is an environment of the *boomerang effect* because it creates certain disorders and diseases. In the global area environmental problems and ecological crisis are becoming global and universal, because they are "crawling below the limits." That is the *universal globalization of danger* that refers not only to industrial production regardless of where they are produced, but also to the food chains. Hydrochloric or sulfuric acid in the air corrodes not only mordents sculptures and works of art, but has long ago disintegrated tariff barriers. The destruction of the environment is very strong. Although it is not located near industrial plants in Canada lakes are "sour", and forests are dry and are dying on the fringes of Scandinavia. All these, as well as other negative phenomena quite well show a holistic component according to which in the ecosystem everything is connected with everything and is in a mutual interaction relation. A man's not taking into account that this completely elementary fact precisely leads to - a *boomerang effect*.

Global management

Globalization is not some unified one-way and simple process, but it is a very complex and contradictory process. "Many very one-sided see globalization as a process of concentration and centralization - in dimensions of capital, power, information, knowledge, wealth, decisions, etc.; and therefore often cite good reasons. However, it is envisaged that the same dynamic also creates *decentralization*. Local, namely trans-local communities gaining influence in shaping their social space, but also in their local, in other words national contexts. National states can be closed inward. But equally they can be actively oriented towards the outside, and its policy and identity newly locate and define in the global context of mutual entanglements, dialogues and conflicts. The same goes for the actors at all levels and social inter-levels - from trade unions to the churches, associations of consumers, all the way to individuals" (Beck, 2003, p. 122-123).

What else, does in fact, globalization mean?

Globalization certainly "also includes a *non-global state*", or "*global society without a global state and without a global government*". Expanding is one globally disorganized

capitalism. Because, there is no hegemonic power and no international regime - neither economic nor political." In the "transnational civil society" are becoming quite visible "socio-cultural processes, experiences, conflicts and identities which are oriented towards the 'model of one world', towards transnational social movements, towards globalization 'from below', towards a new global citizenship". Beck points out that "global society without a global state involves a society that *is not politically organized*" and "in which arise chances for action and power for a democratic non-legitimized transnational actors" which "means that opening is a new transnational space of moral and sub-political, as it is happening for example, in consumer boycotts, but also in issues of trans-cultural communication and criticism" (Beck, 2003, p. 33, 64).

Although he is not the only, Giddens is decisive when he claims that it is necessary to establish forms of global governance.

Global governance 'will address global issues in a global way. As an increasing number of problems are occurring above the level of individual countries, it is believed that their solution should be transnational in scope" (Giddens, 2005b, p. 80).

The globalization of risks and problems, especially those environmental demands their global resolve and for something like that it is necessary to create an effective international body that will be responsible for monitoring, control and resolution of these complex problems. But it is an issue that falls within the scope of *national state sovereignty*, as well as the creation of a *global civil society*. Ecological slogan that we should "think globally, but act locally" because of the global nature of environmental problems, should be converted into the slogan "think locally and globally, act locally and globally."

Not only local, but also global environmental problems necessarily require of us as a human race to establish a "balance between the utopian ideal and realism." That is possible if we create a reflexive critical thinking that will be sociologically sensitive to all those transformations that modernity opens to the future, to create a better and fuller life in "good society" and, of course, to develop emancipatory activities (especially ecological movements) which would be able to achieve the projected "utopian objectives" (Giddens, 1990, pp. 155, 156).

So it turned out that ecology has become part of the policy - *environmental policy*. It is an

organized social activity, which through the state and other political organizations in particular, directs the attitude of society towards nature with the aim of protecting and improving the environment. Although we can talk about some "partial" forms of politics (party politics, enterprise policy, economic policy, social policy), we still associate the term *policy*, at least when it comes to many things, among them ecological problems, with the - *state or states*.

No doubt, *politicians* are becoming increasingly aware of environmental issues and those related to climate change. Thus, the United Nations have organized several conferences on which there were negotiations done on limiting global warming.

Giddens points out that the *policy* assumes primary responsibility for the control of emissions of gases that cause climate change.

Environmental problems must become part of everyday public discourse of *civil society*. How important environmental issues are show polls that young people in the West among the most important issues include environmental issues, human rights, family policy and sexual freedoms (Giddens, 2005a, p. 97).

Due to the great problems we face today, it is shown that *transnational cooperation* is very necessary. "Previously it was thought that

foreign policy is a matter of choice, not a necessity. Today, on the contrary, both one and the other: foreign and domestic policy, national security and international cooperation are directly intertwined. The only way due to the threatening global terrorism - but also financial risks, climate catastrophe, contaminated food, etc. - to national security is transnational cooperation". But on the other hand looked at, there are real dangers that threaten the nation-states, and they are located in the "new fortress" called "*supranational control state*" that, like Orwell's, can be built as a "global-unilateral" (USA), "corporate-multilateral" (Europe), or as a "cosmopolitan state" (Beck, 2004, p. 334).

As it can be seen, civil society is a considerable space of autonomous, free and active participation of individuals and groups, and therefore significant space to develop democracy and the foundation and affirmation of human rights.

Beck believes that neoliberal globalization does not lead to universal prosperity and progress and that the impact of the global market, transnational capital, corporations and international financial institutions should be opposed. In this sense, he highlights the role and importance of global civil society. He believes that *global civil society* has most of the world's

population, and that's why it has great potential power in the direction of building a more just and humane society. Therefore, he proposes a transformation of the state into an *alliance with civil society organizations* in order to build a new efficient, equitable and sustainable social order. In the splice of new relations *civil society* and the *state* shall have to cooperate with other institutions and bodies, but also with "other countries and international organizations" (Giddens, 2010, p. 14).

In the formation of future social and environmental orientations, *social movements* will certainly have a significant role.

Because of its "radical engagement" social movements are gaining "all the more significance in modern social life" and "represent an important guidance line for potential future transformations"; they "illuminate possible futures, and are partly a means for their realization" (Giddens, 1998, pp. 152, 154).

As anti-globalization new social movements act and exert considerable pressure in *local* and *global civil society*. They are themselves a local and global phenomena and a reaction to local and global problems, risks and dangers.

In addition to new social movements, a significant role in understanding the

environmental and other problems have: *non-governmental organizations, public opinion, political parties, companies, trade unions and citizens.*

Giddens believes that the need for global governance stems from the actual development of globalization. Because, given that globalization is becoming more developed, he believes that "the existing political structures and models become unfit for a world full of risks, inequalities and challenges that exceed national boundaries." As individual governments no longer have the power to control many phenomena (the spread of AIDS, global warming, sudden changes in the financial markets), and as many in the world "elude the existing management mechanisms," and precisely "in the context of that 'deficit' of adequate management", Giddens joins those conceptions which emphasize the need for new forms of "global governance that will address global issues in a global way." If we take for example trade, then we can see that on a global scale there is a whole number of problems faced by national economies, and that, therefore, that area must be regulated by different rules compared to those which are promoted by the World Trade Organisation. This "trade regulation should be primarily directed at the protection of

human rights, the environment, workers' rights and access to large markets of agricultural products in developed countries." Also, the changes must be refer to the protection of intellectual property rights. Industrial countries have 97% of all patents in the world, and the concept of intellectual property was totally unknown in developing countries. That is why it happens that "biotech companies increasingly control and `possess` new forms of knowledge and technology", and that pharmaceutical companies take many samples of raw plant materials from the area of tropical rain forest, processing them and transforming them into a patented and highly profitable drugs. Thus, the "local knowledge about the medical use of plants is often used in the creation and marketing of drugs, but, nevertheless, indigenous population from such areas do not receive any compensation for their contribution." This, and other issues necessarily impose the theme of global governance. Indeed, Giddens points out that many people think it is "unrealistic to talk about governance and management above the level of national states," and that, therefore, it is necessary to undertake activities "in the direction of creating a global democratic structure." Is he really right when he points out that the European Union, "is especially considered as an innovative

response to globalization and could become a model for similar organizations in other parts of the world where there are strong regional ties," remains to be seen. However, he believes that "new forms of global governance could promote a cosmopolitan world order with transparent rules and standards for international behavior, such as laid down for the protection of human rights. A decade that has passed since the end of the cold war was marked by violence, internal conflicts and chaotic transformation in many parts of the world. While some pessimists consider globalization as a process that just speeds up the state of crisis and chaos, others see it as an extraordinary opportunity for directing globalizing forces in the direction of greater equality, democracy and prosperity. A step towards the global governance and more successful regulatory institutions is certainly not wrong at a time when our global interdependence and fast tempo of changes interconnects us more than ever before. It is not beyond our abilities to re-establish power over the social world. Such a task is the greatest need and the greatest challenge facing the human society at the beginning of the twenty-first century " (Giddens, 2005b, pp. 78-80).

Today endangered is the connection between man and nature, and this relationship

must change. What is characteristic for the vast majority of the population of the Planet is the lack of environmental awareness on climate change and other environmental problems. Only a few realize what kind of threats and risks are involved considering the consequences that occur as a result of the development of industrial production, which ejects gases that produce the greenhouse effect which leads to increased temperatures on Earth. This problem in the future could create even greater problems which the vast majority of people are not even aware, and that's why they are not doing anything to change their habits in daily life and to minimize the dangers that climate change can bring to us.

In an effort to find new forms of cooperation, as well as new technologies, necessary is bilateral and multilateral cooperation because "the day of judgment is no longer a religious concept, the moment of payment of spiritual bills, but something that in our society and economy is ahead." And therefore, if it is not brought under control, climate change could cause enormous human suffering". Giddens rightly believes that in many elemental processes of globalization they offer us rational solutions to environmental problems that threaten life on Earth. In this sense, he points out: "Much can be done to reduce emissions of

harmful gases at no additional cost. But the area of technology is the most significant area in which the principle applies to us that a sudden quantitative increase in power that caused the dangers to which we are exposed to can help us to deal with them. New Dark Age, a new age of enlightenment, or perhaps a confusing mixture of both of these ages - what lies ahead? The third possibility is, in all likelihood, most likely. In this situation, we must have hope that they on that scale will prevail the side of the Age of Enlightenment" (Giddens, 2010, pp. 14, 271, 273).

Although, due to environmental risks, some ecological theorists have developed a strange aversion to science, though without rational and scientific thinking we can not get to the right solutions and other environmental problems.

Industrial civilization is different from earlier civilizations. Previously, for example, the civilization of ancient China and Rome, were *regional* and the range of their influence was limited to one part of the world. These civilizations used inorganic sources of energy (water, wind) and their impact on the natural world mainly related to the change of the look of the land surface. Our industrial civilization is *global*. It also uses inorganic sources of energy

that enabled the modern industry and gave it power that earlier technologies did not know.

Enlightenment philosophers thought that the possession of power is safe and Marks on this track, said that "human beings are themselves only those problems that they can solve." However, there are those theorists who believe that with the industry developing is a new power that is totally destructive.

Increased global problems of global risk society necessary into the first plan, as Giddens also points out, put *reflexive thinking* and *science* that must be de-monopolized, and must not represent any longer the monopoly of scientists, but a place of negotiations, which must "include a lot of people," and actors of linking ecology and democracy such as environmental movements, environmental NGOs and active members of global civil society.

So think Giddens, and a similar opinion represents Beck. In order to successfully solve ecological problems, they believe that a fundamental change is necessary which refers to a change in the management.

The issue of global risk management of global risk society refers to the globalization of politics and globalization of action of its actors, in order to end or minimize the risks and effects of global risks and providing of minimum of

security from risks such as terrorism, disease, famine, natural disasters, wars, abuse of technology, global climate change, nuclear disasters, conflicts of cultures. The concept of global governance is not the concept of governance by a so-called world government or world state, but the concept of a new model of politics within which comes to the fore comes pluralism of the activities of institutions and individuals. Beck believes that possible are reforms in the global risk society in an area called „*sub-politics*“. Although there are supranational institutions and organizations, however the actors of 'sub-politics' are beginning to establish some new rules, establishments of a new international economic, political and legal order. Special importance in the area of "sub-politics" has *civil society*, and *global civil society*.

As Giddens also said in his review of Beck's concept of a *risk society*, under the notion of *sub-politics* implied is a space of "activities of groups and associations which operate outside the formal mechanisms of democratic politics - such as groups for the protection of the environment, human rights or the rights of consumers. Responsibility for risk management can not be left only to politicians and scientists: it should include other groups of citizens. Groups

and movements that operate in the field of sub-politics, however, can have a huge impact on the usual political mechanisms. For example, responsibility for the environment, which was previously under the jurisdiction of activist environmental movement, is now accepted as part of the conventional political framework" (Giddens, 2005b, p. 697).

Global civil society is comprised of autonomous, independent and self-organized groups and organizations, social movements and non-governmental organizations whose organization and operation is voluntary and independent from the power of private corporations. Using modern information and communication tools whose information national states can not control, it is clear that the position of these countries is necessarily changing.

Proponents of the totalitarian concept of *global governance* deny the role of the state, while advocates of democratic concepts reject the views that from global governance evict the state. But, in addition to other assumptions of its achievements, the *concept of sustainability* and *sustainable development* must be based on finding precisely sustainable solutions. The realization of *economic* and *social justice* implies *overcoming the crisis of world governance*. And that means that it is necessary to develop *global*

governance that will be different from the previous, that will not be exploitative and (neo) imperial, but really democratic and human...

3.

**SOCIAL
REFLEXIVITY
AND REFLEXIVE
MODERNIZATION**

Modern societies are in deep crisis and will therefore rescuing the global environment will require technological and social change, but also a change at the level of existence of critical conscience. Greater and prominent environmental problems, their risks, as well as people's fear, were understandable reasons due to which nature has become a subject of theoretical scientific interest. Nature becomes the subject of that interest due to the fact that modern industry and technology originated in certain social conditions and social institutions, and because the destructive influence of man on nature was precisely created under the influence of such modern technology and industrial production. So the "rescue of the global environment" will include not only technological, but also social change (Giddens, 2005b, p. 647).

Because of the environmental problems that have arisen as a result of technological application of science to nature, some ecologists have developed a negative attitude towards *science* and *rational thinking*.

Such negation attitude towards science and rational thinking is not acceptable because without science and scientific analysis we could not explain the causes of the existence of environmental and other issues and risks. "At the moment we have no institutions through which

we monitor technological changes at the national or global level. Catastrophe with the `mad cow` disease in the UK and elsewhere could have been avoided if established were a public dialogue about the technological changes and the problems arising from their application. Greater public engagement with science and technology would not resolve the dilemma between the spread of fear and hiding, but it could enable us to mitigate some of the more harmful consequences" (Giddens, 2005a, p. 60).

Negation attitude towards science can not help solve the problems that man, human society and nature are facing.

We should not reject *science*, but *scientism* as "unlimited faith on science, and especially the technology." What constitutes "a key aspect of green thought in relation to technology is the principle of caution" - the technology should not be rejected if it can be clearly established that it does not create harmful effects (Giddens, 2010, p. 68).

Speaking of *social reflexivity* Giddens actually reflects the consequences of the changes taking place in the modern world saying that we live in a "decadent world," which is full of uncertainties, risks and dangers. Reflexivity means continual thoughtful reflection and review of our activities with the aim of their changing.

Given that we live in a *world of risk*, it is *necessary to develop trust* in individuals and institutions, for solving problems of risk can not be achieved without trust. Given that the world is dynamic and full of accelerated changes, "the traditional forms of trust are beginning to disappear"; once the trust in other people stemmed from the local community but, "as we live in a globalized world, our lives are affected by people that we never meet" and that are not in our immediate vicinity, but somewhere far away. In this sense, Giddens points out that we need to "have confidence in organizations dealing with regulations on food safety, water purification or efficiency of the banking system." As *trust* and *risk* are very "interrelated" that is why people must "have confidence in such institutions if we are to stand up to the risks that surround us and react to them in the right way." In the globalization and the information age, it necessarily comes to an increase in *critical consciousness as a "social reflexivity"*, which means that it is necessary to constantly reflect on the world in which we live, and it represents a "new stage of development of sociological theory." Since the theories and ideas of classical thinkers (Marx, Durkheim, Weber) formed in the period of "great social and economic changes," that is why today it is necessary to "develop new

theories in order to understand the events that transform the society in which we live today" (Giddens, 2005b, pp. 698-700).

Giddens speaks of *social reflexivity*, and Beck of *reflexive modernization*.

Reflexive modernization, says Beck, "does not mean... *reflection* but self confrontation", ie. it means "self confrontation with the consequences of risk society". Reflexive modernization implies a "change of industrial society" and "*radicalization* of modern that *dissolves* the premise and the contours of *industrial society* and opens the way to the *different modern* and *anti-modern*". For Beck, sociology is "controversial science": on the one hand, in it is present theoretical pluralism, which excludes the possibility of existence of "more modern", and, on the other hand, it should develop a "concrete possibility to change society." Sociology can not be "administrative" and "clerical science at universities"; sociological critique "might ignite a public spark without which sociology easily becomes a very expensive project of subsidization of social self-understanding". As "society is self-critical, non-critical sociology becomes wrong, and the critical one becomes conformist. But criticism of criticism would still have to be found." Reflexive modernization shows that society "produces self-

criticism that a sociology which is hesitant of any criticism of society can not observe and decipher. Chances of social critique are therefore in the fact that it does not need to be applied to society from the outside, normatively, with a gesture of wisecracks, but it arises and emerges from the base and source at the center of society. Criticism of society at the stage of reflexive modernization is not a question of normative option but *empire*, and therefore the terms for which are, of course, required adequate sensors" (Beck, 2001a, pp. 42-43, 76, 78-79, 262, 264).

Sociology is often closed to their rigid frameworks, so that criticism of the risk society does not necessarily have to normatively come from "above", but from "bellow" in the field of autonomous reflective action of civil society actors. Of course, this does not mean that sociology is not welcomed but, on the contrary, it only means that on the scene of "reflexive modernization" appear those who are directly affected by the risks of risk society.

So it shows that existing problems require effective *fundamental "policy of opposing interpretation"* or change of opinion, but also a change of the dominant paradigms of modernization. Reflexive modernization rejects modernization and its wrong idea of "linear growth" and "technical" and "organizational

rationality" that has created huge problems to humanity and therefore poses a serious risk and danger of its survival which, of course, means that it is necessary to replace it with a different performance and philosophy of life and the construction of *another modern* or *anti-modern*. This *other modern* or *anti-modern*, implies the collapse of the modern and its neo-liberal globalization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beck Ulrich, *Moć protiv moći u doba globalizacije: nova svjetskopolitička ekonomija*, „Školska knjiga“, Zagreb, 2004.
- Beck Ulrich, *Pronalaženje političkoga: prilog teoriji refleksivne modernizacije*, „Naklada Jesenski i Turk“, Zagreb, 2001a.
- Beck Ulrich, *Što je globalizacija*, „Vizura - Biblioteka Novi Poredak“, Zagreb, 2003.
- Bek Ulrik, *Rizično društvo: u susret novoj moderni*, „Filip Višnjić“, Beograd, 2001b.
- Bek Ulrik, *Svetsko rizično društvo: u potrazi za izgubljenom sigurnošću*, „Akademska knjiga“, Novi Sad, 2011.
- Gidens Entoni, *Evropa u globalnom dobu*, „CLIO“, Beograd, 2009.
- Gidens Entoni, *Klimatske promene i politika*, „CLIO“, Beograd, 2010.
- Gidens Entoni, *Odbegli svet: kako globalizacija preoblikuje naše živote*, „Stubovi kulture“, Beograd, 2005a.
- Gidens Entoni, *Posledice modernosti*, „Filip Višnjić“, Beograd, 1998.
- Gidens Entoni, *Sociologija*, „Ekonomski Fakultet“, Beograd, 2005b.

- Giddens Anthony, *Treći put: obnova socijaldemokracije*, „Politička kultura“, Zagreb, 1999.
- *Na ivici: živeti sa globalnim kapitalizmom* (Priredili Vil Haton i Entoni Gidens), „Plato“, Beograd, 2003.

BRACO KOVAČEVIĆ IRINA KOVAČEVIĆ
SOCIOLOGY OF GLOBAL RISK SOCIETY
(ANTHONY GIDDENS AND ULRICH
BECK)

Press:
MARKOS, Banja Luka

For printing firm:
Igor Jakovljević

Technical preparation:
Danijel Jović

Circulation:
200

CIP - Каталогизација у публикацији
Народна и универзитетска библиотека
Републике Српске, Бања Лука

316.42:502.1

КОВАЧЕВИЋ, Брацо, 1952-

Sociology of Global Risk Society : (Anthony Giddens and Ulrich Beck) / Braço Kovačević, Irina Kovačević. - Banja Luka : European defendology center for scientific, political, economic, social, safety, sociological and criminological research =Evropski defendologija centar za naučna, politička, ekonomska, socijalna, bezbjednosna, sociološka i kriminološka istraživanja, 2017 (Banja Luka : Markos). - 118 str. ; 18 cm

Tiraž 200. - Bibliografija: str. 117-118.

ISBN 978-99976-22-22-8

1. Ковачевић, Ирина [аутор]

COBISS.RS-ID 6539288

ISBN 978-99976-22-22-8



9 789997 622228