

## SOCIAL CAPITAL, ITS PARADIGM AND REALIZATION OF DIGNITY OF HUMAN LABOR ACTIVITIES

Miloš D. Lutovac

Belgrade Business and Arts Academy of Applied Studies, Belgrade, Republic of Serbia  
milosdlutovac@yahoo.com

Aleksandar Živković

Faculty of Economics University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Republic of Serbia  
aca@ekof.bg.ac.rs

*Paper presented at the 9th International Scientific Symposium „EkonBiz: Economy and COVID 19“,  
Bijeljina, 17 – 18th June 2021.*

**Abstract:** *The development of productive forces in the twentieth, and especially in the twenty-first century, takes place in the sign of the affirmation of knowledge, as a basic resource of the development of society and changes in its civilization that is taking on a new era in its evolutionary development. The importance of knowledge has grown thanks to changes in the content and character of human labor activities expressed in its intellectualization, which is realized primarily not in the engagement and spending of human muscle power, but in activation, manifestation and confirmation of his intellectual abilities. Changes in the content and character of human labor activity also require changes in the paradigms of its management at all levels of its manifestation, from concrete forms of organization to the global structure of society. Those changes, starting from changes in its content, should mark harmonization of requirements of its purposefully targeted activity with certain positive consequences of creatively profitable aspects and human characteristics as a thinking and valued being on the line of understanding, thinking and treating man in labor activities to a lesser extent as a being capable of expressing the demands of the executor of work orders, but more as a creative being. With such a development, the evolution of human society would mark its development in the direction of the realization of man as a creator, which is in accordance with the development of man as sui generis.*

**Key words:** *social capital, intellectualization of labor activity, decent work, dignity of labor.*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The increase in the importance of knowledge in the realization of human labour activity occurred with a change within its content, which with its intellectualization acquired the character of intellectual or social capital in socio-economic relations created in the evolution of human society.

Paradigms of intellectual and social capital should express the realization of the requirement to overcome the contradiction between its need to express its purposeful economic effectiveness (profitability), creating certain changes by meeting human needs and its character, by which man as a conscious being, expresses his creativity in which he has his place and the ability and need to express oneself as a being of a certain imagination when choosing one's target behaviour.

The demand for harmonization of this contradiction basically comes down to the need to preserve the meaning of human labour activity and in conditions on a scientific basis of developmental productive forces in the form of digital systems, in such a way that robotics threatens to turn people into robots, whereby if that happens, human civilization loses its meaning.

This paper seeks to draw attention to some of these problems that are in some way present in the

modern human civilization, but often not taken seriously.

## **2. SOCIAL CAPITAL AND A NEW MANAGEMENT PARADIGM**

Social capital represents a very complex and dynamic social category that acquires a global character, which is reflected in management and requires its adaptation to this capital, that is, the development of a new type of management with emphasis on affirmation and manifestation of the man as a thinking, free and valuable being in the labour activities. Changes in the concept of new management should represent a contribution to the realization of decent (worthy) work of a man as a free being, who by his activity satisfies the needs while preserving individual integrity and dignity.

In modern, especially social and particularly economic and organizational sciences, more and more attention is paid to the consideration and reflection of new paradigms of management, which is conditioned by changes in the content and character of the capital and which gained the scope of the social capital. However, these considerations of new paradigms of capital, i.e. social capital, cannot be successful if it does not take place in the context of the realization of the current process of globalization.

Globalization is a social reality of a global character that unifies the society by talking about a "global society" or a "mega society" with many contradictions. The process of globalization is studied by many sciences, signifying the complexity and intricacies of problems of global character and the phenomenon of globalization, resulting also in a new academic and scientific discipline, Global Studies (Chumakov, 2009, pp. 60-89).

In the sociological thinking of globalization, it is considered primarily as a process of emergence of the global economic system and is expressed by expanding the area of economic power, conquering new territories as a source of raw materials and markets, without the use of war (Grigoriev, 2006, pp. 60-61), but then again with the use of money (Boriko, 2002, p. 25). As a process, it is enabled by the development of high technology (which enabled the compression of space and time) and market forces (expressed by market competition and the dominant form of capital movement in the form of money-money that brings profit, thus enabling the formation of overall human financial information technology) (Ushkin 2003, p. 185).

The global system that emerges from globalization as a new information-technical, economic-ecological, scientific-political, socio-cultural reality and social reality, with specific structures and processes, developing within the borders of humanity, is imbued with complex world economic and international relations and modifies according to the newly created circumstances, the natural and social environment of man, thus creating the material and spiritual culture hence forming the individual interests and values and different development goals (Leibin, 2003, p. 57). This system consists of subsystems that are mutually interconnected and show the appropriate influence on each other. The global economy appears as a subsystem of the global system. It signifies the totality of national economies. It is the individual contradictory system of rich and poor countries. The countries entered it unequally developed and this inequality in the system has been maintained (Reirnet, 2006, p. 57). In fact, the global economy in a certain way represents the conquest of the planet by transnational corporations that dominate national economies (Marković, 2008, pp. 37-90).

With globalization, the neoliberal capitalism acquired global proportions and became the global capitalism. It is dominated by transnational corporations, the role of the state is reduced, the mass culture is widespread and information reality is accomplished (Babkov, 2003, pp. 69-103). Everything is networked on the basis of privatization, deregulation and liberalization, in the name of the "free market", while the wealth is generated with the promise "that all who submit to the demands of the world market will be blessed with earthly wealth" (Beck, 2004, p. 117). However, the accomplishment of this promise is not realistic, let alone achievable. There is a gap between the principle of profit and the principle of humanism, on the basis of capitalism at any level of development, even in the global neoliberal capitalism (Đorđević, 2006, p. 69). In there, the money is positioned as the supreme ruler. The efficiency and profit maximization create the absolute value and myth. The power of money walks over man's dignity insults his honour and destroys hope. The new trinity "market-competition-money" appears on the world stage with the intention of rising to the supreme power, which will rule the affairs of the planet, imposing its rules and its unifying norms on the national states despite cultural values and identity (Major, 1977, p. 53).

Globalization and global capitalism (created with it) require new (scientifically based) answers, not only to the traditional philosophical question about

the position of man in the world and the universe, but also about the position of man in everyday life, primarily in the global economy and the work environment that is taking shape within it (Vidyaniin, 1997, p. 63).

This approach should explore the global neoliberal capitalism with the market as a decisive mechanism for regulating commodity exchange and the consequences that arise from that, in the context of comprehending that majority of economies are endangered by the modern market mechanism, mainly due to disregard of the social factor. For, the market does not exist without people, and it is included in the structure of social relations (Gozabov, 2007, p. 283). With this approach and reflection, one should critically consider and reject the notion that people are means whose labour (self) contributes to the social progress, and at the same time, should respect and theoretically improve the notions that people's labour activities contribute to social progress, where people express themselves as creative and free beings, accomplishing the conditions of their material existence and the social status by establishing mutual relations (Sharkov, 2007, p. 52). In these relations, people express their ideological and political orientations and their role in the political organization of society.

### **3. CONTEMPLATIONS ON THE ESSENCE OF GLOBALIZATION**

Thinking about the essence of globalization as a global social process and the basic features of global neoliberal capitalism as a system based on knowledge as a basic development resource, is referred to as "knowledge capitalism", and it should be studied in the context of the development of the technical basis of the labour and changes in its content with the consequences that accompany it. Namely, the development of productive forces represents the basis of the phased development of the capitalism, but capitalism too, aiming for the greatest possible rationality and productivity in order to take hold of the highest possible profit, stimulated the development of productive forces. In such an approach, the technological globalization also leads to the replacement of human labour with machine labour. In this sequence of development, along with globalization and its expansion, the importance of knowledge as a development resource has increased. Man expresses himself with labour activity less and less with his physical strength, and more and more with his intellectual abilities. In this way, in a certain sense, the intellectualization of human labour (especially production) activity is performed, and intellectual

capital becomes the reality of economic and social life. To be precise, now with the modifications in the content of labour, the capital is designated as the intellectual human mind of social capital.

With computer-information technology, significant changes occur in the content of human labour (Kozlovsky, 1996, p. 68). They result in the loss of a sense of its purposefulness and a sense of self-esteem and self-worth based on it, which, as a rule, is more or less possessed by all human beings (Marković, 2005, pp. 31-39). However, in addition to the negative consequences of changes in the content and character of labour, there are also positive consequences that enable knowledge to become the basic development resource in the conditions of global neoliberal capitalism, to the extent that it becomes its main feature, as well. It is the capitalism conceived (and determined) more on intellectual capital, and less on monetary-physical capital (wealth). The basis of this model of capitalism represents the belief in the market and the individual. The central value and significance of an individual is the delivery of knowledge, and not the strength of muscles. This model recognizes the organization of the processes, routines, and directives that are the content of explicit knowledge that is being disseminated.

From the aspect of indisputably proven claims that the current perception of the global economic concept contained in the laws of the neoliberal model of capitalism as the undisputed ruler of the world economic doctrine, there is an open space for serious consideration of an almost optically easily visible phenomenon. Emphasizing the acquisition and exploitation of the necessary quantum of the knowledge in all social segments, practically takes the form of a merely rhetorical nature.

If we exclude the inseparable synthesis between the use of modern technical and technological achievements in everyday labour and shift the discourse of observation to the general application of knowledge, we come to a paradox of the first kind.

It consists of the strict channelling of millions of working-age population and a precise degree of their positioning within multinational corporations in which awareness and strengthening of a personal intellectual property, according to the originators of labour force exploitation, may create, in future, the severe imbalance in the redistribution of acquired or potentially acquired wealth of a small group of people who currently own it.

The owners of large capital are only interested in the level of knowledge sufficient to achieve the set business projections, which for a long time now, have not been based on making a profit; profit has given way to extra profit, as the dominant category in the economy and in the smallest of companies.

Therefore, the shifting of the pendulum from the aspect of knowledge implementation in the production processes is strictly channelled, to the extent that it does not jeopardize clearly balanced accounts. Otherwise, there would be a shift in the money supply in proportion to knowledge and intellectual services, so that the part of the projected income would inevitably have to be transferred to the educated workforce and their creative and professional abilities.

If for a moment, we exclude the purely economic level of such a claim and transfer the acquisition of knowledge as an opportunity to exploit the enhanced potentials according to an invisible concept and put an equal sign between the current economic doctrine and the current global political elite, we will understand the broader context of this observation.

We are witnessing an overall collaboration of economic and political elites based on money as the master of all currents of the modern world, which results in a clause relationship with clear and unwritten provisions. It is not in the interest of political incumbents for their electorate to reach the level of recognizing the necessary cultural and valuable patterns, nor is it the need of owners of multinational companies. Hence, what politics imposes through concealed methods of action (poor education system, insignificant funds allocated to encourage political culture, critical awareness in social action, understanding of the complete dichotomy between social groups, marginalization of spiritual needs, renunciation of general standard, inability to educate, stratification of social groups, encouraging and not resolving the social conflicts), is in fact the ideal of the dominant economic concept. That is why neoliberalism today is facing a serious loss of its own insight into the real situation. And only because of the lack of an alternative, it is being kept on the pedestal of power, economically and politically. This economic model, wholeheartedly supported by political elites, lingers over the abyss of its own ambition to turn people into consumers of abundance with the help of cheap labour, in which the essence cannot be seen from the general, declarative formulation. In the abundance of everything, there is nothing, Baudrillard noticed nicely. Just there, in the analysis of the relationship between economic and political, although it is

done from a general aspect, i.e. globally, it is necessary in further observation of both concepts, to define clearly the common denominators, in order to present new concepts that suggest output models with high scientific intensity whereby the use of human knowledge would be assimilated to mutual satisfaction.

In fact, in capitalism (knowledge capitalism), knowledge and skills are the only sources of sustainable and long-term compatible advantages of corporations and wider social structures (Marković, 2003, pp. 1-11). That is why people - bearers of knowledge and skills, the essence of society and knowledge capitalism, should be treated as intellectual beings, capable of producing and perfecting their life in a historically concrete living space, on account of their life force. This recognition develops changes in the management paradigms.

From the point of view of this recognition, in the latest research on the position of man (people) in the global economy and in corporations (in which they perform labour activities - expressing their knowledge and skills) two relatively new approaches in contemplating about human potential have also found their place: Human Potential Development Index (HPDI) and the Human Life Force Index (HLFI).

The Human Potential Development Index has four indicators: productivity - growth; rationality - possibility for fulfilment of abilities and use of goods; stability - security of access in the achievements of civilization of present and future generations; expansion of opportunities - development that is achieved not only because of the interests of people, but also because of their efforts.

The indicators of the Human Life Force Index are: lifetime expectancy and real gross national product per capita. Taken together, these indicators reflect three main characteristics: a healthy life, knowledge and a living standard worthy of a human being (Marković, 2005, pp. 1-16). Starting from the characteristics of the global economy and the new approach in contemplating about the human factor in it, we believe that four indicators of the HPDI should be supplemented with the fifth - the statement on working conditions in which the human integrity is not endangered. Human life force indicators (HLFI) belong to the category of sociology that has developed a system of indicators for life force development of a human as a psycho-social being, expressing his ability to produce and improve his life within specific socio-historical and socio-cultural conditions, which

correspond with the needs of progressive development of the society. In accordance with the tradition of the implementation of the HLF and the evolution of the human life force, the indicators of its development have been formulated. Firstly, the average value of indicators of the development of physical, mental and social abilities of a person. Secondly, the existence of basic groups of indicators of physical, mental and social health that express the best existence and development of basic human strengths, formed in all basic spheres of social life, economy, politics, social and spiritual - cultural development. The integration of these factors enables the optimization of efforts necessary to assess the development of human life force as a whole and in particular spheres of social life (Miličić, 2006, p. 229).

Deliberations on the index of human potential development and the index of human life force development arise out of the context of the necessity for more productive and profitable human activity when it is intellectualized, and hence the requirement that people - bearers of knowledge and skills (intellectual capital) in organizing the work environment and the work process, are treated as intellectual and free beings with protected integrity in all its mutually conditioned and connected components (Grigoriev, 2006, pp. 95-96). These deliberations were preceded, followed and are still pursued by the activity of the International Labour Organization (ILO). In this sense, the ILO, at the Philadelphia Conference (held in 1944), undertook an obligation to prepare the program which implementation would provide the working conditions in which employees would feel satisfied with their work, fully expressing their abilities and contributing to the general well-being. Instituting these and similar views in the ILO documents, represents the effort to establish harmony between the content of "decent and deserving work".

Decent work is defined as highly efficient work in good productive, social-working and secured conditions with full capacities, which makes every worker satisfied, enabling him to fully express his abilities and skills. It is a well-paid labour where the rights and dignity of workers are protected, the labour in which workers are actively engaged in the activities of the organization (Zhukov, 2007, pp. 9-11). The accomplishment of such a well-understood multifaceted, decent work in the conditions of a contradictory global system has been studied on several occasions and from several points of view, and most comprehensively in the Report of the Director General of the International Labour Office (1999). In that report, it is said that

the decent work represents a global demand and a political directive, and that much in our future depends on our ability to find a solution to this problem, that is, achieving the decent work. That work – the decent work, as said in the report, represents more of a benchmark than an accomplished goal, and the possibility of turning it into a global goal was also pointed out. In addition, the requirement to accomplish the four strategic tasks as a precondition for turning decent work into a global goal was pointed out. These tasks, these prerequisites are as follows: expansion of the employment opportunities; foundation of a social employment system; development and strengthening of the system of social dialogue and the right to equality (Marković, 2008, pp. 308-338).

The economic activity takes place within the global economy, in the global system with a single market, but also with differences between countries in terms of their economic development and patterns of organization, which affect the accomplishment of the concept of "decent work" as a global process. The accomplishment, more precisely the non- accomplishment or arduous achievement of that concept, is influenced significantly by the two global problems of modern society: employment and poverty. These two problems are mutually interdependent and connected, where the necessity to solve them on a global level (on a global scale) is recognized as a precondition for achieving "decent work". In this sense, the views of the United Nations General Assembly (2000) on social development and support to the ILO Decent Work Agenda should be understood, as well as the views of its 1990 session on its readiness to support unbiased globalization in ensuring the goals of complete and productive employment, as well as of the decent work, while ensuring respect for the basic principles and rights in the field of work. Taking into account the necessity to comprehend, achieve and recognise "decent work" as a global problem, within a combination of statements on human potential development indexes, human life force and the content of "decent work" it is possible to formulate the theory of a new perception of social management, that is characterized by the increase of dynamics and complexity of social relationships, of which solution requires imagination for reorganization, including thereof the change of concept, into the transition from a society of people - producers to a society of creators.

That imagination of the basic problems of the modern world of work should be aimed at finding new paradigms of management in the conditions of

changes in the content and character of human activity, accompanied by its intellectualization, homogenization, standardization and requirements for its dignity and decency, in order to be productive and profitable and where we would not think that we ourselves control our own lives, while in fact, we are slaves to our own actions "alienated from our own nature and left at the mercy of forces we are unable to control" (Varufakis, 2015, pp. 57-77).

#### AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR A CONCLUSION

Thus, a civilization created on the basis of the capitalistic philosophy of development has hit the limits of its development. It does not have, and does not demonstrate the possibility of its further development on the basis of creative possibilities and development needs. The society becomes global, or is limited in its unity to further develop human freedoms and wealth in each and every fragment of its unification. On the contrary, everything in the society of developed material possibilities is not only emphasized by the gap between rich and poor citizens, which has gained global proportions and threatens to outgrow the global dimensions to which their conflict leads. The conflict between poverty and wealth seems to come to the fore, and which could lead to catastrophic consequences, if the assessment about that conflict does not enable its resolution in a resourceful way, within the limits and possibilities of developing new changes in the content and character of human labour activity. This resourcefulness should make it possible to overcome the contradiction between mass wealth and poverty on a global scale, along the lines of finding the concept of social development of people as producers and people as creators in their human dignity.

"The capitalistic philosophy of development", which is based on man as a producer who creates material and all other goods, that are considered productive and rational to the extent that they show lower consumption of factors involved in their creation, and even less consumption in engagement of the human factor, above all the engagement of the physical strength, seems as if it had hit its own limits of development. The civilization that was built and developed on that philosophy of development appears not to demonstrate our possibilities of that development, because it neglected the human ability and the need for creativity as a specific need of a man as a sui generis being. Subsequently, the society is becoming unified and global, but also divided, as academician Radomir Lukić used to say. The society becomes global, but in its unity it remains

limited to further develop human freedoms, primarily due to the restriction to develop human creativity in the process of labour activities in every aspect of its existence, and above all in the process of his fulfilment within his labour activities. Consequently, we get a society of developed material possibilities in the sense of increased wealth, but at the same time, a society of inequality in the consumption of that wealth and opposed interests between the rich and poor at the both micro and macro level of social organization and existence. The antagonism between poverty and wealth seems to come to the fore, with all the accompanying consequences that need to be considered also from the point of view of the opposition between man - the producer of wealth and his abilities as a creator. Resolving this contradiction requires resourcefulness in discovering the concept of social development that will enable the micro and macro level of social existence, to overcome the opposition of poverty and wealth between man as a producer and creator in the unity of his human dignity, i.e. the dignity of his work or labour activity.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Бабков, Ф. Д. (2003). Современный глобальный капитализм. Москва: Алма-пресс.
- [2] Борико, А. (2002). Мала књига о глобализацији у свету будућности. Београд: Народна књига Алфа.
- [3] Beck, U. (2004). Моћ против моћи у доба глобализације. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- [4] Варуфакис, Ј. (2015). Овај свет може да буде бољи. Београд: Креативни центар.
- [5] Видянин, В. И. и Журавлева, Г. П. (1997). Экономическая теория. Москва: ИНФРА.
- [6] Гозабов, И. А. (2007). Социальная философия. Москва: Академический проект.
- [7] Григорьев, С. И. (2006). Глобальная система, Словарь виталистској социологии. Москва: Гродарки.
- [8] Григорьев, С. И. (2006). Индикаторы жизненны сил человека. Москва: Гордарики.
- [9] Ђорђевић, Р. (2006). Човек, вредност и историја. Београд: Институт за филозофију - Филозофски факултет у Београду.
- [10] Жуков, И. В. (2007). Људски ресурси-индекс социјалног развита становништва. Београд: ЦУРО.

- [11] Козловский, П. (1996). Этическая экономия как синтез экономической этической теории. Вопросы философии 8. Москва.
- [12] Лейбин, В. М. (2003). Глобалистика-энциклопедия. глав.ред. Мазур, И. И. и Чумаков, А. Н. Москва: ЦНПП и Диалог, ОАО издательство Радуга.
- [13] Мајор, Ф. (1977). УНЕСКО: идеал и акција. Београд: Републички завод за међународну научну, просветну, културну и техничку сарадњу и Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства.
- [14] Марковић, Ж. Д. (2008). Социологија безбедности труда. Москва: Издательство Российского государственного социального Университета Москва.
- [15] Марковић, Ж. Д. (2008). Глобална економија. Ниш: Економски факултет Универзитета у Нишу.
- [16] Марковић, Ж. Д. (2005). Глобална економика и човечески фактор. Социологически истраживања 13. Москва.
- [17] Марковић, Ж. Д. (2005). Традиционални менаџмент. Менаџмент 2/2005.Београд.
- [18] Марковић, Ж. Д. (2003). Социологија менаџмента и савременог управљања. Директор школе 1-2/2003. Београд.
- [19] Марковић, Ж. Д. (1970). Нормативна делатност међународне организације рада у области заштите на раду. Социјална мисао 3-9/1970. Београд.
- [20] Миличић, В. (2006). Индустија знања-нова парадигма одрживог развоја. Нови Сад: Технички факултет Универзитет у Новом Саду.
- [21] Reirnet, E. C. (2006). Глобална економија. Београд: Чигоја штампа, Београд.
- [22] Ушкин, А. И. (2003). Глобалистика-энциклопедия. глав.ред. Мазур, И. И. и Чумаков, А. Н. Москва: ЦНПП и Диалог, ОАО издательство Радуга. Москва.
- [23] Чумаков, А. Н. (2009). Глобализация-контуры целостного мира. Москва: Проспект.
- [24] Шарков, Ф. Н. (2007). Социология: теория методы. Москва: Экзамен.

## SUMMARY

The paper discusses the connection between globalization as a social process and the intellectualization of labor and changes in the content and character of labor that lead to the manifestation of capital in the form of intellectual capital. In this process, man manifests himself through his knowledge through his work. In this context, the conceptual definition of decent work and perspective and the consequences of its realization are considered, as a given goal in the evolutionary development of human society. In addition, human activity is pointed out from the point of view of homogenization and standardization, and their significance and influence are shown. Changes in the content and character of human labor activity also require changes in the paradigms of its management at all levels of its manifestation, from concrete forms of organization to the global structure of society. Those changes, starting from changes in its content, should mark harmonization of requirements of its purposefully targeted activity with certain positive consequences of creatively profitable aspects and human characteristics as a thinking and valued being on the line of understanding, thinking and treating man in labor activities to a lesser extent as a being capable of expressing the demands of the executor of work orders, but more as a creative being. With such a development, the evolution of human society would mark its development in the direction of the realization of man as a creator, which is in accordance with the development of man as sui generis.