

Kosovo as a *res extra commercium* and the alchemy of colonization

Пише: Časlav Osić
уторак, 12 јануар 2021 20:00

SUMMARY: How much pluralism can democracy withstand? – Global context 1: Quantity vs. quality – Global context 2: Militarization (might vs. right) – Global context 3: Commercialization and corporatization (skill vs. virtue) – Stabilocracy and the new imperialism: Crisis as a permanent situation – Varoufakis: Kosovization of Europe – Hofbauer: Experiment Kosovo – The Return of Colonialism – Is there hope? – Can smaller countries determine their (economic) fate at all? – Strategology: Origins and purpose – The nature of strategy – Three dimensions of strategy – The Kosovo and Metohia issue as a *par excellence* paradoxical strategic question – From anti-strategy to optimal strategy – Kosovo and Metohia 20 years after the NATO aggression: The situation and recommendations.



KEY WORDS: Kosovo and Metohia, Serbia, the Balkans, Kosovization of Europe, new imperialism, strategology, paradox

HOW MUCH PLURALISM CAN DEMOCRACY WITHSTAND?

One of the most important (existential) questions in contemporary pluralist democracies, most pregnantly asked by the prominent Austrian political philosopher Peter Graf Kielmansegg, is: “How much pluralism can democracy withstand?” According to him, it is “necessary... to differentiate between at least three types of pluralism: pluralism of interests, pluralism of values, and pluralism of identities.

- Pluralism of *interests* deals with the issue of how to (re)distribute divisible assets;
- Pluralism of *values* deals with the question of which values to accept as valid;
- Pluralism of *identities* deals with a question whom the word “we” includes; “Whom do I constitute a community with?” [Kielmansegg 1991: 30–40].

Kielmansegg is of the opinion that “democracy can withstand a substantial amount of pluralism of interests; that it has difficulties with pluralism of values, while it has the greatest problem with pluralism of identities.” [\[1\]](#)

For the Serbs, the Kosovo Issue has for centuries stood “at the very foundations of [their] identity” [Пипер 2017: 281–283]. One’s answer to that prerequisite either lifts him up or brings him down [\[2\]](#) . These who try to make deals concerning it, or do actually make them, will not fare well [\[3\]](#) .

GLOBAL CONTEX 1: QUANTITY VS. QUALITY

At the end of the past century most western and transition-era intellectuals believed that instead of a *Hungtintonian clash of civilizations*, the time of universalization, the *era of global civilization* , was coming. This is the period when global power-mongers also intensified their work on a specific kind of historical engineering meant to create an uncontested world order with “new rules of the ‘game’” which would guarantee the survival and expansion of the global civilization under the sign of Capital

[4]

. According to them, no authentic policy and culture should stand in the way of transnational capital's economic expansion. Not even at the cost of this civilization's self-destruction, as the global, turbo-capitalist civilization battles against everything that is, in its essence *singular*

, authentic – against nation and national states, against law, science, upbringing and education, against family, religion, tradition in general, and even against work itself. Or, to put it simply, it seems to be innately against quality and in favor of quantity! It disdains value and upholds usefulness, it stands against creativity and favors imitation and simulation, it strives for uniformity and has little use for diversity, the bleakness and dullness of mediocrity disturb it none, as it reaches for maximization of quantity and speed...

[5]

GLOBAL CONTEXT 2: MILITARIZATON

(MIGHT VS. RIGHT)

Carl Schmitt used to claim that *war is a way out of the crisis*: the way out of a small crisis being a small war, and a big war out of a big one! Creating crisis hotspots and launching *no-win wars*

and

wars by proxy

became, after the Korean War of the mid-20

th

century (the first such war), a routine approach by the international power-mongers. Apparently, it was also a necessity, because the structure of production and consumption, in the U.S. for example, changed drastically in favor of the military-industrial complex, so that intensifying economic activity to overcome a crisis implies an increase in the production of tools, weapons and ammunition. Moreover, demand too can go up only if a new war is launched. This is where the profits are biggest, and the returns quickest. In other words, in the economies structured in such a way,

investments in wars

are

the most profitable

ones

[6]

.

Пише: Časlav Očić
уторак, 12 јануар 2021 20:00

Terms used in the contemporary economic debates are to a great extent defined by the semantic legacy of previous debates. In addition, economic terminology shows a noticeable influence of other, so-called exact sciences: above all physics (“balance”, “oscillatory trends”...), then biology (“circular flow” or “circulation”, “growth”, “development”, “seed capital”), medicine (“shock therapy”) and, increasingly, military science (“economic sanctions”, “economic security”, “economic war”, “hybrid war”, “cost-benefit” analysis of strategic migrations as a weapon of war, “strategic management”... etc.). This semantic militarization of *economics* is undoubtedly a consequence of the *economy*

's militarization. Many criticize the use of military terms in the economic sphere considering such militarization as an expression of neo-mercantilism and economic nationalism; according to them, this unavoidably leads to conflicts. Because the real and “surreal” – speculative, or better still, scheming economies based on military and political power instead on economic efficiency – permanently disturb the balance of capital and production necessary for sustainable economic and overall development.

GLOBAL CONTEXT 3: COMMERCIALIZATION AND CORPORATIZATION

(SKILL VS. VIRTUE)

At the same time, the tendencies of commercialization and corporatization are becoming ever stronger. Everything is for sale, including people, their organs, even their souls. Local and regional markets are becoming part of global flea market of lost souls. The mainstream neoliberal doctrine legitimizes this by citing freedom of choice in the only true, worldwide labor market: of people who, without remorse, “honestly” work for those who pay more. Moreover, this market is becoming overcrowded: supply is growing exponentially, that going hand in hand with the general trend of massive impoverishment. That is, most countries of the Second World have descended into the Third World owing to transitional plunder, whereas the gap between the traditionally developed countries and the underdeveloped ones is deepening – with the price of treason, true to theory, plummeting [\[7\]](#) .

In this case as well, maximum quantity and maximum speed are the supreme (and only) values, replacing every skill and virtue. *Die Schnellen fressen die Langsamen* (“The swift gobble up the slow”) wrote Heike Leitschuh-Fechte in a 1997 article entitled “One day we’ll all be The First,” defining the essence of (turbo)capitalist ideology. In other words, *more and ever more, faster and faster*

! That is the only criterion of success. And in order to be successful, we have to be *incorporated*

[8]

STABILOCRACY AND THE NEW IMPERIALISM:

CRISIS AS A PERMANENT SITUATION

What are our chances to see the end of the world economic crisis in our lifetime? Not very great, since it has become a permanent situation that one has to get used to. (For example, this is what TV reality shows are supposed to train us for.) The post-modern ideology relativizes everything, equalizing all values and, by deconstructing the present as well as the past, prepares us all for a post-human – or posthumous – future.

Meanwhile we are being incessantly told that peace and stability should be our ultimate goals. In this context, “stability” – a Newspeak euphemism for “control” (even surveillance!) – actually means that “everything is under control”, i.e. under *our* [9] control, which is *the essence of both old and new imperialism*

. Under the old imperialism control was executed directly – through application of firm power such as, for instance, a ground invasion – while in the case of the new, so-called economic imperialism, it assumes a subtler form of “soft” and smart power, as defined by Joseph Nye. We use the term “economic imperialism” when one country controls another by using its resources for the purpose. The controller ideologically *justifies*

that by claiming cost-benefits for the victim-country which, therefore, “accepts” such control. Moreover, according to such argumentation, the victim-country can always say “no”, there being no long-term solution, i.e. no permanent economic imperialism, since the domination can last only as long as the resources needed for it are available. The solution, from the point of view of the imperial power’s interests, is to make the victim-country dependent on the “controller’s” resources by, for example, pushing it into *indebtedness*

[10]

– a classical occupation being much riskier and costlier.

VAROUFAKIS: THE KOSOVIZATION OF EUROPE

Before our very eyes the “old order” is crumbling or already lies in ruins under the forces of arrogance which see themselves as “the creators of history” as they cynically engage in the “deconstruction” experiment. With burgeoning loss of sovereignty, that is, with the historical loss of national subjectivity, the less numerous and economically less powerful nations are becoming an object (“guinea pigs”) of the “New Order” [11]: “The policies of Europe as it now stands lead to fragmentation. The worst-case scenario of the crisis would be the

Kosovization

of Greece, Spain, Ireland, Portugal, and Italy, i.e. their turning into protectorates which use the Euro, are ruled by European commissioners and local kleptocrats, and whose youth is their only relevant export asset.”

[12]

HOFBAUER: EXPERIMENT KOSOVO – THE RETURN OF COLONIALISM

Hannes Hofbauer’s book *Experiment Kosovo: The Return of Colonialism* (*Experiment Kosovo: Die Rückkehr des Kolonialismus*

) [Hofbauer 2008, henceforth referred to as EK] is an intellectually honest attempt to understand the current Kosovo situation within a wider historical and international context. The author is not siding with any party to the conflict, nor is he favoring the current “international” rule, neither whose

Weltanschauung

does he share. He rightfully perceives it not as a genuine ideological belief, but as a cover for extremely pragmatic and aggressive goals. To understand what has led to the creation of the current state of affairs in Kosovo and Metohia – a Mafia state thriving under the thin layer of a colonial, military, police, and political administration – it is necessary to understand its background, i.e. the historical and political context of the Kosovo region and of its immediate surroundings, while not neglecting the wider, geopolitical context [Павић 2009].

