
Biotechnology, Digitalization, and Immigration: New Challenges for the Theory and Practice of International Relations

Miša Djurković

Institute of European Studies, Belgrade

Article Information*

Review Article • UDC: 314.742:327

Volume: 19 Issue: 3, pages: 22–43

Received: July 8, 2022 • Accepted: August 4, 2022

<https://doi.org/10.51738/Kpolisa2022.19.3r.22mdj>

Author Note

Miša Djurković  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4305-8184>

I have no known conflict of interest to disclose.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Miša Djurković,
Institute of European Studies, Trg Nikole Pašića 11, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia.

Email: mdjurkov@gmail.com

* Cite (APA):

Djurković, M. (2022). Biotechnology, Digitalization, and Immigration: New Challenges for the Theory and Practice of International Relations. *Kultura polisa*, 19(3), 22–43.

<https://doi.org/10.51738/Kpolisa2022.19.3r.22mdj>

Abstract

The author deals with the problems of re-examining the theoretical paradigms of international relations in the light of several current practical challenges. The text starts with the presentation of the European continent as a scene of continuous crisis, which means that from the perspective of the theory it must focus on those paradigms that have the best potential for classical crisis management. Then, the problems of biotechnology, digitalization and immigration are examined, which reaffirm the dominant importance of realism in an interesting way. The author illustrates with a series of examples how immigration can become a tool of mass engineering and mutual confrontation between states and other centres of power. Or how the digital sphere and the Internet can be used to undermine the security of states, and what states do to preserve sovereignty over cyberspace in their domain. Finally, what do biological warfare, nanotechnology and drones bring to the practice of international relations? However, it turns out that the theory of realism must also undergo adequate adaptation in order to understand and incorporate the needs of solving new current problems.

Keywords: international relations, theory, biotechnology, digitalization, immigration

Biotechnology, Digitalization, and Immigration: New Challenges for the Theory and Practice of International Relations

The whole cycle of crises that have shaken the European continent for a long period of time, requires a reconsideration of the paradigm of understanding the theory and practice of international relations. It is necessary to examine whether the classical paradigms of the theory of international relations help us to understand the transformation of the modern world. Therefore, we will examine three areas (digitalization, biotechnology, and immigration) that encourage reflection on the significance and evolution of the theory of international relations. The goal is to explore which paradigm helps us the most, as well as the extent to which it must adapt to new challenges.

The Continuous Crisis

The European area has become a space of permanent crises since 2005; in fact, we are already in the eighteenth year of a prolonged crisis situation. It all began with the failure of the draft European Constitution, in 2005, after the citizens of the Netherlands and France rejected the already adopted and signed document in referendums. At the same time, Angela Merkel, whose seventeen years of rule were marked by crisis management, became the head of the German government, and in fact of the entire European Union project, which provided Europe with a very high level of stability in these times of crisis.

The first significant project, pushed forward by Merkel, was the repackaging of the failed Constitution into a new document, the Lisbon Treaty, which amended the basic European treaty. One of the important innovations was the strengthening of the importance of national parliaments, which has become especially important for the political enlargement of the EU (Jančić, 2017, part I). As soon as that was over, a great financial crisis began, and then the economic crisis, which threatened to deeply endanger the very survival of the EU. The European Union has created a significant aid package, saving the systems of Greece, Italy, Ireland, Spain and Portugal, together with the

World Bank. The most significant challenge was the struggle for the survival of the Euro as a currency, which far exceeds only the economic level and is considered an important geopolitical symbol and the instrument of the EU. Despite terrible pressures and incentives from American financial experts and geoeconomic players such as Paul Krugman (Krugman, 2011) or George Soros, the Euro survived and, moreover, began to spread to some other countries in the meantime.

The next big crisis, which has culminated this year, is the Ukrainian Maidan and the opening of the conflict between Ukraine and Russia. After the change of the government in Kyiv, which one side calls a democratic revolution and the other a coup, Russia encouraged the annexation of the strategically important Crimean peninsula, as well as the armed uprising of the Russian population in eastern Ukraine, which led to the formation of two Donetsk and Luhansk republics. Since then they have functioned as separate parts, which are in a constant war of greater or lesser intensity with the Kyiv authorities.

Again, Merkel, along with French President Hollande, did a great job of pacifying this conflict by forming the so-called Minsk Process, which stopped the war and opened negotiations on a possible solution to the crisis. It should be reminded that the foreplay of this event was a failed attempt to bring Ukraine and Georgia into NATO in 2008, which was again stopped by Germany and France, acknowledging Russia's strong opposition. The year 2008 is also important because Priština, with the support of Western powers, and against the will of Serbia, declared its independence, which 5 countries of the European Union did not recognize. Putin then made the famous statement that someone drew a sword that has two ends, and for which it is not known on whose heads it may fall. That same year, Russia intervened, protecting the separatist areas located on the territory of Georgia, and waged a short-lived war with the Georgian army. Thus, the NATO intervention in Yugoslavia and the seizure of Kosovo in 1999 set a precedent for violations of international law on the territory of Europe, which Russia has been using since 2008 in the post-Soviet countries.

Only a year after the Ukraine war, the migrant crisis exploded (Đerić, 2016),

which we will deal with later in more detail. It arose as a result of the so-called Arab Spring, a chain of instability caused by the Americans, British and French as well as the Turks by inciting insurgency, and then by illegal military interventions in Libya, Syria and earlier Afghanistan and Iraq. This caused tectonic shifts of the population toward Turkey, Greece, Italy, Spain, France, and especially toward Germany and Sweden. European asylum and immigration policy has disintegrated, and the rise of the populist right has been fueled, even in the Western European countries.

The next big crisis came in 2016 when Britain decided to leave the Union. This painful process lasted for three years and finally ended in 2019 with the final withdrawal of the first great power from the EU. On the one hand, this brought relief because the British presence was often considered the biggest obstacle to further deepening and strengthening the Union. But on the other hand, it further undermined its credibility, reducing its military importance, GDP, territory and international position. The UK soon after entered into a new military alliance – AUCUS built on the foundations of the Commonwealth.

The UK's exit from the Union came at a time when the first signs of a future pandemic had begun in China. Over the next two years, the EU was dramatically affected by the economic consequences of the health crisis, but at the same time it underwent a huge transformation due to the introduction of new technologies, monitoring, increasing the importance of social networks, the emergence of things like the Cancel Culture etc. Again, the Schengen system of freedom of movement has been seriously called into question, but new things have emerged, such as the geopolitics of vaccination (Raucent, 2021).

Two years later, at the beginning of this spring, the war in Ukraine escalated, which has led to serious frontal battles, sieges of different cities, massive suffering of people and the destruction of buildings and cities. All of this meant that European people are getting used to living in a permanent state of emergency, in which emergency measures, laws, economic solutions

and even the suspension of basic constitutional and international rights are slowly being accepted as necessary. In this article, I will focus on the three aspects highlighted above to show how the theory and practice have had to adapt to new challenges. Constructivist theory of international relations and the theory of liberal institutionalism have recently gone through difficult times and offensive realism seems to offer the most as a paradigm of understanding contemporary world.

German economist Max Otte has been talking about the new Cold War since 2019 – the year that he published a voluminous book *The Breakdown of the World System* (Otte, 2019). Two years earlier, Harvard professor Graham Allison had opened a major controversy with his book *Destined for War: Can China and the United States Avoid Thucydides' Trap?* (Allison, 2017). The current year has brought just that, to the extent that a number of theorists talk about the war in Ukraine as the first proxy war between the United States and China through countries that are on the line of the new Iron Curtain.

In such a situation, global institutions are slowly becoming paralyzed, and everything depends on the direct confrontation and negotiations of the great powers. An interesting example of institutional paralysis is the behaviour of the World Health Organization during the pandemic. Contrary to their recommendations, in fact, each state individually, completely sovereignly adopted measures, and implemented its own regime and policy of lockdown, virus control and vaccination. Moreover, when at one point the Trump administration suspended funding for the WHO, it was taken over by private corporations such as Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, for example, so more than half of the funding of the nominally major international health institution came from private corporations, mostly producers of vaccines and similar pharmacological substances.

Wendt's article (Wendt, 2003) on the inevitability of the creation of a world state clearly indicates the actual irrelevance of constructivism. It seems that in these times we have never been further from that. Brutal realism

based on the long-suppressed terms of war, power, sovereignty, balance of power, geopolitics, struggle for raw materials, etc., emerged as the most relevant framework for understanding international relations, and even European studies at the moment. However, which is also my basic thesis, it must also undergo a serious transformation due to the growing influence of big tech companies, whose products are being transformed from the position of public space into the instruments of political struggle, then the increased influence of biotechnology, including biological weapons, but also the demands of transhumanism and finally issues of uneven fertile development of humanity, which by the force of logic must lead to population overflow and mass immigration.

Digitalization

Let's start with the current war in Ukraine. The decision of Facebook and Meta Corporation to remove from its digital space all posts, attitudes, memes and symbols that are considered pro-Russian or pro-Russian propaganda, and to tolerate the most radical pro-Ukrainian symbols and posts (including controversial symbols of the Azov Battalion which openly uses the swastika symbol), shows the direct alignment of this company on one side of the conflict and the rejection of any community standards other than those that follow the logic of Carl Schmidt, friend-foe. The power of social networks and digital companies like Twitter was felt two years ago by the president of the most powerful country in the world, the United States, Donald Trump, whose Twitter accounts have been suspended.

Digitalization has brought fears of changes in domestic politics, but also in international relations. A few years ago, in the obvious preparations for what is happening in 2022, Russia started experimenting with the so-called closed or unplugged Internet. It is about the possibility that the internal internet traffic becomes completely based on domestic servers and, if necessary, isolated from external communication. Given that a diversion within a country's cyber and digital system can do enormous damage today, each country is taking serious steps toward counterintelligence protection of its own digital, Internet, and cyber systems and space. Hence, other countries are following the Russian example.

Sometime around 2010, the United States formed the Cyber Command as the fourth type of warfare (Savin, 2014, 101). It is assumed that this system has already played a major role in the implementation of the actions of the Arab Spring in the years that followed, operating through Facebook and other social networks. Therefore, non-Western powers began treating Google, Facebook and Twitter as the instruments of American (NATO) intelligence and military action, so they acted accordingly by building protective systems against this type of undermining, which leads to so-called color revolutions and often civil wars. Recent book of Zuboff clearly displayed obvious links of Google and CIA which even had joint ventures (Zuboff, 2022, 130, 132). During my stay in Iran in 2020, I had the opportunity to see photos of cyber warfare centers located in Albania, where hundreds of bots, financed by the USA and France, are waging internet wars on Iranian social networks, leaving comments, etc.

For ten years, therefore, there has been a practice for certain countries that are in conflict with the American administration to temporarily or permanently suspend the work of certain social networks and companies, mostly of American origin, on their territory. China and Turkey are the best-known examples of this practice. But due to the technological progress of China and other countries, the opposite practice was introduced: the ban on TikTok and other Chinese applications in the United States. Amazingly, Americans began to use the discourse that others had been previously using against their companies, especially after Snowden's publications and the Arab Spring. That discourse is based on the claims that the citizens' and consumers' data are also being used for espionage, not only for the needs of business companies, but also for the needs of political and security services.

The most famous recent example is the decision of the Indian authorities to ban dozens of Chinese applications from operating on their territory precisely on the charge of collecting data on their citizens. This year a list expanded, so now it includes 224 apps.

This also raises the question of the relationship between the corporate system, intelligence systems and political and military institutions in the world of cognitive capitalism, about which Shoshana Zuboff recently published a great book.

As it is known, Google, today the most powerful corporation in the world, survived the great dot com crisis in 2000 by starting to sell customer data to large companies (instead of its services to citizens), which then use them to form and adapt their products and their advertising strategy. This opened a new process in which we became goods, while freely leaving information about ourselves, our desires, needs, habits, on social networks and other parts of the Internet, which is all related to the market needs of corporations to adapt the goods to those same users.

Here is just the definition of supervisory capitalism that Zuboff gives at the beginning of her book: „1. A new economic order that claims human experience as free raw material for hidden commercial practices of extraction, prediction, and sales; 2. A parasitic economic logic in which production of goods and services is subordinated to a new global architecture of behavioral modification; 3. A rogue mutation of capitalism marked by concentration of wealth, knowledge and power unprecedented in human history; 4. The foundational framework of a surveillance economy; 5. As significant a threat to human nature in the 21st century as much as industrial capitalism was to the natural world in the 19th and 20th; 6. The origin of a new instrumental power that asserts dominance over society and presents startling challenges to market democracy; 7. A movement that aims to impose a new collective order based on total certainty; 8. An expropriation of critical human rights that is best understood as a coup from above: an overthrow of the people’s sovereignty.” (Zuboff, 2022)

The affair with Cambridge Analytica and Facebook have showed that big companies collect everything about us without our knowledge, violating privacy as much as possible, and then sell those reports to the corporations, but also to political entities and intelligence systems that have additional tools and instruments for collecting and processing such data. All this, of course, happens without the knowledge or consent of people who are treated as a commodity and subject to various types of market manipulation. That is why states and courts additionally began to deal with the issue of protecting the privacy of their citizens from this type of predatory and dangerous behavior by external entities, regardless of which sphere or country they come from.

In several recent works, I have thematized these types of social change, starting with the great British TV series Black Mirror (Đurković 2020, Đurković 2021). For example, one of the basic problems that has opened up today is the fight for the right to forget and to delete data about us or those that concern us. There are already generations of children whose every moment of life is immortalized on Facebook or some other social network, and all that is often preserved on some eternal clouds without our intention or knowledge. There are countless ways that even the things we post by ourselves can be used against us later on. Many people today are already losing their jobs or are unable to get them because of some photo or post on social media, many are being blackmailed or extorted money, data, services, and the best evidence of this is the fact that according to official textbooks 95% of espionage (including industrial espionage) is performed through publicly available sources.

Let's just mention the fact that the screens of all the devices we use, as well as the cameras with face recognition technology, can be used as tools for spying, surveillance, control, blackmail, etc. What to say about artificial intelligence technologies such as the Alexa device, which will soon be a standard part of the equipment of apartments and houses...

The good old state, if set on the right foundations, remains the best mechanism for the protection of individuals from such attacks, both from the country itself and from outside spheres. The question is how long it will have enough power or mechanisms – and even technological possibilities to deal with the powerful corporations and other external agents.

Biotechnology

Another interesting phenomenon related to the Ukrainian war is the accusation of the Russians, supported by the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a claim that 26 military laboratories have been operating in Ukraine since 2014, experimenting with plague, anthrax and SARS viruses for US companies and the military sector. The Chinese claimed that the Americans allegedly have over 300 such laboratories around the world, and that the

US president's son Hunter Biden is connected with these in Ukraine. Russia mentioned that the Germans were also involved in the whole affair. Allegedly, these laboratories also experimented with so-called ethnic weapons, which is something we saw in the last James Bond movie, *No time to die*. Allegedly, genetic material was taken from Ukrainian citizens from the east, which are of the same genotype as in Russia, and based on that, viruses were made that could spread through drones and cause serious diseases and even deaths in entire groups of citizens in Russia.

So far we have not seen physical evidence of these allegations and therefore all this should be taken with a grain of salt. There are claims by American entities that there were some laboratories there, but they refute claims that experiments with such illicit agents have been performed. But in technical terms such things are absolutely possible. Biological weapons are extremely cheap and dangerous, and therefore much greater interest in them can be expected in the future. If it turns out that some country is really doing it near the border of another country, it could really be a *casus belli* from the standpoint of international law, much stronger than the US accusations of producing weapons of mass destruction in Iraq or other cases of preventive war known from recent history.

When we talk about the impact of modern technologies on the change in the paradigm of international relations, we cannot avoid the issue of drones and robots that are being introduced into the war system (Korać, 2019). The last example of the changed nature of the war was in 2021 in the Nagorno-Karabakh region. It is a disputed part of Azerbaijan, inhabited by Armenians, which separated from this state during the collapse of the USSR and has been functioning as a separate entity ever since. In earlier attempts to regain control of the area by military force, Azerbaijani leaders have failed because of an inaccessible terrain where the regular army could not have succeeded. This time, however, Baku's military strategists based their entire strategy on new generation military drones, primarily Turkish *Bayraktar*s and Israeli suicide drones. They managed to bypass and

deceive the outdated anti-aircraft weapons of the Armenians, and thus neutralize the manpower, so after that the Azerbaijani troops advanced without any resistance. Thanks to new technology, the war was resolved in less than two months.

This case was closely followed by everyone in the region, and since then, mass purchases of the latest generation of military drones have started in Europe and especially in that region, as well as a serious update of anti-aircraft systems so that they can spot and neutralize drones.

As is well known, Americans have been using this type of war in the Middle East for more than two decades. Drones that sow death in Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, are controlled from command rooms in Washington, Langley and other American cities. Interestingly, they are not run by the Pentagon but by the CIA and private outsourced security corporations. This turns war into video games, and raises a number of ethical and even security issues. Namely, if a drone that e.g. in Afghanistan attacks some military positions is controlled by a man located in an office in some American city, doesn't that make it somewhat legitimate to carry out a terrorist attack on the headquarters where that man is located, because the neutralization of the drone itself is not the same as the elimination of the man who controls it?

This is already introducing a new series of issues of military ethics and the very philosophy of human survival, because it is well known that very soon semi-autonomous or completely autonomous robots such as the army of Star Wars clones will be introduced into military operations. Artificial intelligence in itself opens up horrendous problems, and with its use in the military sphere, the question arises as to whether we are really coming to the brink of survival as a species.

The issue of enhancement or improvement of healthy people as the basis of modern transhumanism is mostly related to military needs and thinking. There are two directions of development in this field. One refers to the physical improvement of physical performance, such as the installation of infrared lenses for soldiers to better see at night and at a longer distance, or enhancement

of their strength and endurance in various ways. The second level of intervention is the design of chemical and similar substances that enable soldiers to function for longer time without sleep, for example, or the suppression of their fear, panic and other forms of natural reactions that often lead to premature reactions and even war crimes. The famous London School of Economics has a special Ideas program for a few years now, which is focused on international relations, and part of the research are issues of biotechnological control of soldiers' behavior in a war environment.

All of this takes on an additional dimension when placed in the context of international relations. States and cultures that refuse to pursue such controversial policies and mechanisms will do worse than those that engage in them. Hence, there will be security pressure for everyone to submit to efficiency orders. Therefore, the Technology Development Division of the Defense Intelligence Agency asked the National Research Council to conduct a special study on the technologies that are being developed and that could potentially endanger the security of the United States. It was published in the publication *Avoiding Surprise in the Era of Global Technology Advances*, issued back in 2005. The focus is on nanotechnologies, brain technologies, techniques that improve the way of communication and the dangers of biological warfare.

The Chinese National Strategy for Military-Civil Fusion from 2019 (Kania, Laskai, 2021) puts the emphasis on biology: they talk about biomaterials, biological weapons, brain-controlling weapons, ethnic-based genetic attacks, and so on. It is indisputable, therefore, that biotechnology is given great importance in military issues today, which changes the focus of technological research and the organization of military forces, and especially national defense.

Finally, it should be reminded that with all the advances in technology in the world, we still do not know whether the Covid 19 virus, which took at least two years of our life, is of natural or artificial origin.

Immigrations

The third important issue that has been re-examining the theory and practice of international relations over the last ten years is the problem of mass immigration. There have been talks before about the problems of biopolitics as challenges for political theory and the theory of international relations. But after the Arab Spring, a huge number of people set out for Europe and Turkey. With a series of wars, almost fifteen million people left their homes. Turkey alone has accepted millions of people on its territory. But the movement of these people across several migrant routes during 2015 caused great political, social, and ideological upheavals. That year, more than a million people entered Germany alone, of which over 90% were young men between the ages of 16 and 30. Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Italy, Spain have also become the ultimate destinations for many of these people.

The appearance of mass immigration at the gates of Europe caused the disintegration of the complete system of Dublin agreements and agreements on asylum and reception of immigrants. Suddenly, there were too many of them, so the European Commission adopted quotas in an attempt to distribute the burden of immigration and asylum seekers. Countries from Eastern Europe, primarily Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic, have refused to apply this system, and we have seen a number of states (Bulgaria, Hungary, Croatia) build real barbed wire walls to protect their borders from large numbers of illegal immigrants trying to enter without documents, avoiding procedures and official border crossings. Many blamed Angela Merkel for the crisis, since she was the one to declare an open door policy for immigrants, asylum seekers and refugees, prompted by the demands of the German Chamber of Commerce to accept about 800,000 people a year due to low fertility. But on the other hand, it was discovered that almost all the Twitter accounts that relentlessly called and enticed the immigrants to go to Europe were located in the United States.

Large public debates have opened between those who believe that European nations still have all the rights, including legal ones, to control who

enters the country, how and under what conditions, and those who believe that states are obliged to accept anyone who comes from endangered war affected areas. Hungarian Prime Minister Orban and Polish leaders led the defense of the sovereign law of states, but an anti-immigrant wave rose within Western Europe as well which was called the new radical right or populists. They were part of the government in Finland, Denmark, Bulgaria, Austria and Italy, so there was a lot of talk about the wave of the new populist right (Bakić, 2019).

Namely, the resistance of Europeans was noticed, in which the traditional resistance of the working class against the reduction of wages played an important role, but the dimension of the resistance of Europeans towards the new corporate totalitarianism of nomadization was also significant. In Europe, there is a struggle for everything that draws on the roots of man for home, family, village, cooperative, parish, country, nation and state. Namely, while in the USA the whole system is built on the idea that children at the age of 18 leave home to study, work or start their own families, in Europe people are still much more attached to their environment, family and specific community. The arguments of this broad movement claim that the basis of any totalitarianism, as Franz Neumann (Neumann, 1974, p. 208) said, is the destruction of the community and the individualization of a man who, when left alone, becomes less brave, less secure and less motivated to fight for his rights and the rights of his children, family and community.

Within these debates, the hypothesis that immigration movements can be used as a mass weapon was opened. A frequent argument was that even the Arab Spring was initiated precisely with the aim to move the population and bring new inhabitants to aging Europe, inhabitants who will be able to work tomorrow, to give birth, but also to change the composition of the European space. On December 17, 2008, French President Sarkozy said: „What is our goal? The goal is to mix races. Mixing races from different nations is a major challenge for the 21st century. It is not a choice, but an obligation... We will all change at the same time – economic leaders, governments, political parties, we will all be committed to that goal. If people do not agree to this

voluntarily, then governments will have to impose this change by force” (Gottfried, 2021, p. 150). In 2008, two years before the Arab Spring, Kelly McGreenhill of Harvard University published an article entitled „Strategically Engineered Migration as a Weapon of War” (McGreenhill, 2008).

Let us also show a recent concrete example of the use of migrants as weapons in the fight between the two countries. After the attempt of the so-called colored revolution in Belarus failed last year, after the presidential elections, when the opposition, with the help of Western structures and great assistance from Poland, tried to protest and forcibly overthrow Lukashenko, he took revenge by organizing massive coming of migrants to the Polish border and encouraged them in November to attack and illegally invade the territory of that country. They were mostly Kurds who came from Egypt by direct airline to Minsk: their voyage was organized by a travel agency that promised to bring them directly to the EU border, thus making it much easier for them to reach Germany as their main destination. These people were brought to the Polish border in an organized manner, spent their nights outdoors in the cold and fought with Polish border forces and even the army in an effort to enter the country by force.

A few years ago, there was a similar case with Egypt and Israel, when the Palestinians dug tunnels in an organized manner and moved between Egypt and the Gaza Strip. The most interesting was the position of Turkish President Erdogan, who on several occasions threatened Europe by stating that he would unlock his doors, that is, encourage people from the camps to move towards Europe and flood it. It was a kind of blackmail that enabled him to get significant funds from the EU on a couple of occasions, as well as other benefits for his country. One of his most famous statements is the one when he told his citizens: “Go to Europe, have children and it will be yours” (Goldman, 2017).

But the very nature of different fertility rates and the average age of the population call for a mass influx of people from one part of the world to another. The fertility rate in Italy is 1.1, and the average age of the population

is 44 years. Apart from Europe, the situation is similar in the Far East. In Japan, the median age is 48, and among women it is 50. South Korea has a population of about 50 million people with the fertility rate that is currently around 0.7 and decreasing, which means that children are almost never born. Eastern Europe is emptying, and most Muslim countries have entered a process of demographic transition too. Iran dropped to 1.7, which is slightly higher than the European average.

On the other hand, the median age in Africa and some Asian countries where children are still being born in big numbers is astonishingly low: Angola 16, Afghanistan 19, Cameroon 18, Congo 16, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal all under 20, etc. Economic crises, war conflicts and natural disasters are the traditional triggers that make large masses of this young population move to richer and less populated parts of the world. As we have seen, some subjects have reasons to encourage and direct these processes.

Conclusion

These few examples have shown how even the classical paradigms of the theory of international relations are forced to adapt to new phenomena that threaten to change the essence of the human being. All this is happening within the framework of the transformation of the world into a multipolar one, so the paradigms of Cold War thinking based on the balance of fear are also returning (the new anti-Chinese alliance AUCUS). Many interpret the current war between Russia and Ukraine as the first proxy war between two future blocs, the Chinese and the American.

However, the fact that the greatest representative of the theory of offensive realism, Chicago professor John Mearsheimer, whose approach we use here as the most reliable model of the realistic theory of international relations (Mearsheimer, 2001) experienced terrible attacks from the so-called Cancel Culture because of his clear, logic-based views on the causes of war in Ukraine is really indicative for the state of science and free speech nowadays. This went so far that the students of the University of Chicago

where he teaches organized petitions to deny him the right to public speech and lectures and to expel him from the university. A similar thing happened during the Covid19 pandemic to the famous Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben, who rebelled against the idea of forced vaccination and turning the world into the dystopia he has been writing about for the past few decades. The label of anti-vaxer, conspiracy theorist, etc. was instantly attached to him. The situation is not much better in Russia and Ukraine due to the war. China, which is at the forefront of technological uses of surveillance systems, non-cash payments, and very controversial ideas such as social credit, also does not provide a model of academic and public free society.

So the most frightening thing is that we are once again forced to defend, above all, the basic freedom to be able to talk about problems, and to investigate, without being threatened with punishment, cancellations or even imprisonment. In Swedish schools, for example, it is no longer allowed to teach children the difference between truth and false, beautiful and ugly, etc., so you must not use objective categories. So what's the point of science if one is not allowed to talk about the search for truth or wisdom?

References

- Allison, G. (2017). *Destined for war: Can China and the United States avoid thucydides' Trap?*. Mariner Books.
- National Research Council. (2005). *Avoiding surprise in the era of global technology advances*. The National Academies Press.
<https://doi.org/10.17226/11286>
- Bakić, J. (2019). *Evropska krajnja desnica*. [European radical right]. Clio.
- Despotović, Lj. (2016). *Geopolitički i demografski aspekti aktuelne migrantske krize* [Geopolitical and Demographic Aspects of the Current Migrant Crisis]. *Kultura polisa*, 13(31), 11–28.
- Djerić, G. (Ed.). (2016). *Spatial demarcation: Between the politics of fear and effect on a purse*. Institute of European Studies, Belgrade.
- Djurković, M. (2020). 'Black mirror' and Covid 19: Biotechnological challenges for intercultural thinking. *Filosofskii polilog*, 1(7), 39–54.
- Djurković, M. (2021). Black mirror, enhancement and the impossibility of forgetting. *Disputatio Philosophica*, 23(1), 23–41.
- Goldman, R. (2017, March 18). 'You are the future of EU,' Erdogan tells Turks. *The New York Times*.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/17/world/europe/erdogan-turkey-future-of-europe.html>
- Gottfried, P. (2021). *Antifascism – the course of a crusade*. Northern Illinois University Press.
- Greenhill, K. M. (2008). Strategic engineered migration as a weapon of war. *Civil Wars*, 10(1), 6–21.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13698240701835425>
- Jančić, D. (Ed.). (2017). *National parliaments after the Lisbon treaty and*

the Euro crisis. Oxford University Press

- Kania, E., & Laskai, L. (2021). *Myths and realities of China's military –civil fusion strategy*. Center for a New American Security.
<https://www.cnas.org/publications/reports/myths-and-realities-of-chinas-military-civil-fusion-strategy>
- Korać, S. (2019). *Disciplinsko ratovanje u doba dronova i robota* [Disciplinary warfare in the age of drones and robots]. Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade.
- Krugman, P. (2011, January 12). Can Europe be saved? *The New York Times Magazine*.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/16/magazine/16Europe-t.html>
- Mearsheimer, J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. W. W. Norton & Company
- Neumann, F. (1974). *Demokratska i autoritarna država* [Democratic and authoritarian state]. Naprijed.
- Raucent, E. (2021, August 6). La géopolitique des vaccins, attention chasse gardée! [Vaccine geopolitics, beware!]. Centre Permanent pour la Citoyenneté la Participation (CPCP).
<http://www.cpcp.be/publications/geopolitique-vaccins>
- Rustamzade, A., & Valiyev, A. (2021). Drones and special forces. *Baku dialogue*, 5(2), 90–109.
- Otte, M. (2019). *Der Weltsystemcrash, Krisen, Unruhen und die Geburt einer neuen Weltordnung* [Crash of the world system, crises, unrest and a New world order birth]. Finanzbuch.
- Savin, L. V. (2014). *Od šerifa do teroriste* [From sheriff to terrorist], MIR Publishing.
- Wendt, A. (2003). Why a world state is inevitable?. *European Journal of*

International Relations, 9(4), 491–542.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/135406610394001>

Zubof, Š. (2021). *Doba nadzornog kapitalizma* [The age of surveillance capitalism], Clio.

Biotehnologija, digitalizacija i imigracija: novi izazovi za teoriju i praksu međunarodnih odnosa

Miša Đurković

Institut za evropske studije, Beograd

Sažetak

Autor se bavi problemima preispitavanja teorijskih paradigmi međunarodnih odnosa u svetlu nekoliko aktuelnih praktičnih izazova. Počinje se od prikaza evropskog kontinenta kao poprišta kontinuirane krize, što znači da se i iz perspektive teorije mora usmeriti na one paradigme koje imaju najbolji potencijal za klasični krizni menadžment. Zatim se istražuju problemi biotehnologije, digitalizacije i imigracije koji na zanimljiv način reafirmišu dominantni značaj realizma. Autor nizom primera ilustruje kako imigracije mogu postati oruđe masovnog inženjeringa i međusobnih obračuna država kao i drugih centara moći. Ili kako se digitalna sfera i internet mogu koristiti za podrivnje bezbednosti država, te šta države rade da bi sačuvale suverenitet nad sajber prostorom u svom domenu. Konačno, šta praksi međunarodnih odnosa donose biološki ratovi, nanotehnologije i dronovi. Pokazuje se međutim da i teorija realizma mora da doživi adekvatnu adaptaciju da bi razumela i inkorporirala potrebe rešavanja novih aktuelnih problema.

Ključne reči: međunarodni odnosi, teorija, biotehnologija, digitalizacija, imigracija