

## Globalisation and the European Identity

Dušan Pajin  
University of Belgrade

*Editor's Note.* With the exception of its middle section, subtitled "The Visionary," Dušan Pajin's article extends an invitation to its readers to take part in constructing its "meaning." Rather than explicitly pointing to similarities between Dimitrije Mitrinović's essays, written before and immediately after World War Two, and some samples of contemporary political thinking, Pajin simply juxtaposes characteristic excerpts from both groups, leaving his readers to fill in the "blanks."

This paper is a resume of the cosmopolitanism, ideas, and actions of Dimitrije Mitrinović (1887–1953), who devoted forty years of his life (1913–1953) to the promotion of a European federation. From 1908–10, when Mitrinović had in mind the union of South Slavs in the Balkans, through his Munich period (1913–14), and later in Britain (1920–53), he developed the idea of unity/federation for Europe, and ultimately for all of humanity. He held that this development is connected with a new, cosmopolitan identity and citizenship of man. For him, that was the ultimate solution to the history of mankind.

For many (especially in Britain, in the 1920s and 1930s), his views amounted to utopianism. Nevertheless, in 1931, Mitrinović organized the New Europe Group with British co-workers in London in order to promote the integration of Europe. In their platform, written by Mitrinović in 1931, one can find principles valid for Europe today, for its multiculturalism and desire to attain unity:

*Europe is a highly complex entity. Its complexity—the rich variety of human life that it comprises—is almost its highest value. Those who face the problem of integration must not be schematic Utopians, aspiring to unify by obliterating all differences in the frame of a ready-made constitution. [...]*

*The very real forces of regional pride and patriotism must be thus diverted from imperialistic exploitation to mutual development. There must be persons who whole-heartedly desire this unity and are con-*

*sciously working for nothing short of it. A number of citizens must be found, in each State, who perceive the necessity of this step towards world-order; who resolve, in advance of their age, that Europe shall become one integrated whole.*

### **Vision (in 1914): Union of European Republics**

(Summary principles of the Aryan Europe in *Aryan Europe, International Yearbook for Culture Politics*, by Dimitrije Mitrinović, spring 1914)

- *The initiative for Aryan Europe believes that the future mankind cannot be created by the blind instinct of history and destiny, through world wars that are being prepared everywhere, or through the world civilization supported by the state unworthy of humanity, with its laws, industry and commerce...*
- *The true solution of culture problems of the overall humanity is not possible until Europe stops its suicide in mutual strife, and permanent danger of war. Europe has to establish through its self-creation the future culture-humanity.*
- *The peoples of Europe should create mutual fraternity, one with another, with Western, and Southern Slavs, as well as Russians. The Aryan Europe should also include non-Aryans: Hungarians, Finns, and Jews.*
- *The movement for Aryan Europe believes that progressive institutions and movements in Europe will take us towards the unity of peoples, and the fraternity of peoples will develop prosperity.*
- *The new humanity can be self-created only in the Union of European republics. The international politics of the Aryan Europe and the internal politics of her nations have to be compatible, as well as her social, and culture policy.*

### **Reality (in 1998): Acceleration of European Integration**

(Communication from the European Commission to the European Parliament, the Council and the Committee of the Regions, at The Cultural Forum of the European Union, Brussels, 29–30 January 1998: [http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/culture/program-2000-part1\\_en.html](http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/culture/program-2000-part1_en.html))

*The in-depth consultations undertaken by the Commission as part of the preparation of the framework programme clarified the role and*

*the place of culture in meeting the great challenges now facing the European Union.*

*A broad consensus emerged between the Member States, Members of the European Parliament, the Commission, international organizations (Council of Europe, UNESCO) and cultural organizations that culture is no longer restricted to “highbrow” culture (fine arts, music, dance, theater, literature). Today the concept also covers popular culture, mass-produced culture, everyday culture.*

*This broadening of the definition is a consequence of the fact that culture is no longer considered a subsidiary activity but a driving force in society, making for creativity, vitality, dialogue and cohesion. It is therefore intrinsic to any response to the **major challenges** that we face today:*

- ***the acceleration of European integration**, with the decision to introduce the euro and the decision taken at the Luxembourg European Council to start the enlargement process which will eventually lead to a 26-country Union. Faced with this prospect, cultural action must help express a European citizenship based on a knowledge and mutual comprehension of European cultures and an awareness of the features common to such cultures...*

### **Vision (in 1920 and 1931): Unity and Individuality**

(Dimitrije Mitrinović, “World Affairs,” *The New Age*, 16 June 1920)

- a) *The final essence of human nature means that the life of humanity on earth is a world of many and different—a common world of essentially incomparable individuals.*

(Dimitrije Mitrinović, “Integration of Europe,” London, 1931)<sup>1</sup>

- b) *Europe is a highly complex entity. Its complexity—the rich variety of human life that it comprises—is almost its highest value. Those who face the problem of integration must not be schematic Utopians, aspiring to unify by obliterating all differences in the frame of a ready-made constitution. [...]*

<sup>1</sup> “Integration of Europe—The way to reconstitute the States of Europe as an organic society in a New World Order” (Disarmament—federation—communal credit), proclamation of the New Europe Group, London 1931. This text—one of the programmatic texts of the New Europe Group—is not signed by Mitrinović, but his ideas (having evolved since 1920 in his writings for *The New Age*) and style are evident.

*The new conception, then is a higher Nationalism. Each nation must be first enabled and then taught to regard its contribution to the Federation as its highest glory as a region. The very real forces of regional pride and patriotism must be thus diverted from imperialistic exploitation to mutual development.*

*There must be persons who whole-heartedly desire this unity and are consciously working for nothing short of it. A number of citizens must be found, in each State, who perceive the necessity of this step towards world-order; who resolve, in advance of their age, that Europe shall become one integrated whole.*

### **Reality (in 1998): Multiculturalism**

(The Cultural Forum of the European Union, Brussels, 29–30 January 1998)

*As a result of migration, most European cities now deal with issues of multiculturalism. Does our society provide the necessary crucible for effective and tolerant social integration, or does it simply constitute the juxtaposition of cultures without any real links? The European Union needs to promote integration on the basis of fundamental values such as human rights, freedom, solidarity and tolerance. [...]*

*Since the Treaty on European Union was signed, the Community has taken a number of initiatives, through which it has shown that, apart from its achievements in the economic and monetary fields, the European project:*

- *extends to the entirety of European society and must involve European citizens to a greater extent;*
- *started to integrate the cultural dimension into those of its decisions which have an impact on culture, and to ensure that Europe's cultural and linguistic creativity and diversity are respected in international forums;*
- *implemented the three programmes encouraging cultural cooperation in the arts (Kaleidoscope), literature (Ariane), and heritage (Raphael); helped develop relations between culture, the culture industries and employment, on the basis of the Commission's work showing the importance of cultural activities in society and the potential for job creation that they represent.*

### **Vision (in 1931–32): Federal Parliament and Senate**

(Dimitrije Mitrinović: “Integration of Europe,” London 1931)

- a) *The true sphere of politics is to balance the rights of the individuals and groups in the State upon general human consideration. The relations between the different States and language areas—the different nationalities of the (European) Federation—therefore come within its authority. The existing parliaments of European States, adequately reformed, will be the natural basis of the Federal Parliament, with the aid, probably, of further devolution by the appointment of smaller councils of more local authority. The General Parliament of the Federation will be elected by all the regional parliaments, so that it can be relied upon to show a full respect for local autonomies.*

(Dimitrije Mitrinović: “Neo-Syndicalism as Atlantic Action,” London 1932)<sup>2</sup>

- b) *The Senate will be the co-ordinating body in the Social State. Its function is neither legislative nor executive, but intermediating. Its members will be chosen for their impartiality, their exceptional ability and the high personal standard they show in their actions and character. Without taking sides in any conflict, the Senate function will be that of ultimate guidance, integrating the three spheres of society.*

### **Reality (in 1979–1999): The European Parliament**

The European Parliament, inaugurated in 1958 as the Assembly, consisted originally of members selected by the respective national parliaments of member nations, and elected by direct universal suffrage at the same time throughout the European Union. The electoral system in each country is determined by national law. The Parliament has 626 members who, since 1979, have been elected by direct universal suffrage, and are apportioned among the

<sup>2</sup> “Mitrinović thought that groups of people, chosen for their impartiality and integrity, should act in an intermediating or coordinating function in the social order. The Senate function would operate at all levels, from international to regional and local. Today, in the various conflicts all over the world, there is a great need for this impartial intermediating factor. Since peace cannot be imposed by force, the Senate would act to try to ensure that the demands of all parties are met in a new and creative solution to their problems” (explanation by Mrs. Violet MacDermot of the New Atlantis Foundation, given in personal communication, July 1999).

member nations. Members are elected every 4 years. Although Parliament members sit in political, rather than national groups, France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and Italy have the most members.

The seat of the European Parliament is in Strasbourg where the plenary sessions are held one week a month. The Parliament also holds mini sessions in Brussels. The Committee meetings also take place in Brussels, while the Secretariat of the European Parliament is divided between Brussels and Luxembourg. The Parliament meets annually for about twelve one-week “part-sessions,” in Brussels, or Strasbourg. It is run by a Bureau headed by a president and 14 vice presidents, elected from among its members to serve for terms of thirty months. There are nineteen specialized standing committees in the Parliament, including ones on political affairs, budgets, agriculture, economic and monetary affairs, energy and research, external economic relations, and social affairs and employment.

Under the treaties, the EU’s Council of Ministers is obliged to consult the European Parliament on various legislative matters, and the Parliament is empowered under its own rules to discuss any matter whatsoever, whether related to the general treaties or not. The Parliament’s other tasks include scrutinizing the EU’s budgets and exercising democratic control over various executive organs of the Union.

### **Vision (in 1931): Federation and Autonomy**

(Dimitrije Mitrinović: “Integration of Europe,” London 1931)

*Thus Europe now confronts this supreme crisis, the very hour of her most glorious potency. Now she must choose to play the part for which all history has made her, in the world that she herself has brought into one sphere. Why is it, then, that this moment finds her most irresolute, most devoid of vision? Her statesmen think only of saving the lives of their separate States. But if they had no fear, not only would they not be lost, but they would gain the larger life. By Federation they would attain their true world-power and their full significance in history. [...]*

*Federation would not involve the renunciation by any nation of its legitimate autonomy, much less its territory, culture, language, or customs. It certainly would, however, involve the abolition of mutual aggression, both military and economic, by these nations now clinging to their dwindling powers of separate sovereignty, and endangering each other by mutual conspiracy.*

### Reality (in 1998): Unity and Diversity

(Prof. Dr. Hans Tietmeyer, President of the Deutsche Bundesbank: “The euro—a new currency in a changing world,” September 1998)

*In August 1930, José Ortega y Gasset, in what is probably his best-known book, The Revolt of the Masses, took Europe severely to task. He wrote that Europe had lost heart, like a large bird beating its powerful wings against the bars of its cage, a cage which is formed by the nations of the continent. Before his call for European integration was heard, however, nearly all Europe had to undergo, yet again, the bitter experience of war.*

*Today, almost 70 years later, we are a good deal closer to his vision of creating better conditions for a united Europe. After World War Two—in the fifties, to be more precise—six countries established the European Community. The Community then expanded in several stages, becoming the Community of the nine, the 12, and now—in the mid-nineties—of the 15. And already negotiations are being held with other countries—particularly in central and eastern Europe—on their accession to the European Union, as the Community is now called.*

*However, even in the future, Europe is unlikely to become a single state. The goal of an “ever closer union” is enshrined in Article A of the Maastricht Treaty, but the European Union is likely always to remain a union of unity containing diversity.*

### Vision (in 1931): Common Predicament

(Dimitrije Mitrinović: “Integration of Europe,” London 1931)

*So united has Europe always been in history, culture, and political origins—and so much more now, by constant interchange of life—that its wars are in the nature of civil war. But bad as the War itself, was the peace which followed it: for it was concluded in the same spirit in which the struggle had begun. It was a jealous re-division of frontiers and powers. It healed no wound, pacified no enemies. And the years that have followed—in spite of much reconstructive effort—have been the darkest that the Continent has known for centuries. [...] And yet the potential power and splendour of this continent is not less than before the War. [...]*

*The nations of Europe have one thing which they have not had for centuries. And that is the **dawning consciousness of a common***

*predicament. They begin to know, in the ruins of their bloodiest rivalry, that the hour has come when, if they cannot live together they must go together to a worse downfall. [...]*

*[For England—Dušan Pajin] a purely Colonial policy is useless as an alternative to a European alliance. [...] If she follows her true interest... England must... take up her responsibility of leading the way to federation of the States of Europe. [...]*

*If she should finally refuse, it is most unlikely that Western Europe can live for long as a chief world-power, and doubtful if the British Empire can long survive. The world will be divided between two dynamic forces of the Soviet States and of America.*

### **Goals (in 1997): Solidarity, Stability, Common Foreign Policy**

(Klaus Hänsch, member and former President of the European Parliament: “On the European Union, Transatlantic Relations and the Challenges Ahead—U.S. Speaking Tour, 18–26 September 1997)

*This is the first and paramount challenge for European politics in the years ahead: helping those who have emerged from a dark era of communist dictatorship in Europe to strengthen democracy and to modernise their economies is a mission of scale. It is an occasion for restating the principle of solidarity on which the European Community was initially founded, and to extend it to the whole continent.*

*The creation of a zone of stability and peace throughout our continent would be a gigantic gain for us all. This will be our opportunity to “make Europe safe for democracy.” If we fail to provide backing for economic and political reform in the new democracies, the consequences will be felt not only in Eastern Europe. A tidal wave of international crime, drug trafficking and clandestine immigration will sweep over us all. It will threaten the security, the stability and ultimately the democracy of the Member States of the Union.*

*Either the European Union exports her stability to Eastern European countries, or she will import their instability. And this would affect our societies on both sides of the Atlantic. [...]*

*The European Union, not the United States, is the world’s largest trader. Twelve million jobs in the European Union depend directly on exports. That is why we shall continue to work for more open markets and better market access. A Fortress Europe is not in our interest. Isolation and nationalism are not the answers to globalisation.*

*The United States and the European Union are strong proponents of free and unfettered world trade. But free trade implies fair trade. Free trade must not mean starvation wages and exploitation for our workforce, nor abandoning high standards of environmental protection. [...]*

*We cannot fight terrorism with warplanes or racism with naval power. The best shield is to build democracy and civil societies, to provide social progress and stability and the respect of human rights. That has to be done on the ground and in the neighbourhood. It needs an open-ended commitment. That is what Europe must do itself. Europe has to make its own specific contribution to our partnership. Europe may still do less than needed and less than we expect ourselves. But I believe that some of the comment on Europe's shortcomings in international affairs is exaggerated.*

*The European Union has, in this respect, made greater efforts than are perceived by the American and European public. We provided the bulk of aid for the new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe. Between 1990 and 1996 the EU and its Member States donated more than 58 billion dollars in assistance to Central European countries (compared with 12 billion dollars given by the US). The EU mobilised more than 80 billion dollars in support of political and economic reforms. That is a modern European equivalent of the Marshall Plan.*

*With a view to future EU membership, the Central and Eastern European nations are firmly committed to model their economies and laws on the blueprint of the European Union.*

*The European Union is, at least for the time being, heading for a common foreign policy, not a single foreign policy. The new Treaty of Amsterdam will bring some improvements and it offers the chance to boost further the EU's contribution as a global partner for the US.*

*The European Union does not seek to be and never will be a superpower with dreams of might and glory and hegemony. But because of the many historical links of its Member States with every part of the globe, its own cultural diversity, and its relative wealth, Europe can make valuable contributions to a new order of peace and prosperity on its own continent and in the world. In European affairs Europe should take the lead.*

### Vision (in 1950): One Anthropos

(Dimitrije Mitrinović, “Proposals Towards a World System of Foreign Policies—Severely Impartial Proposals and Integrally Inclusive,” London 1950)<sup>3</sup>

*I am speaking also as belonging natively to my Yugoslav nation and my Serb people inside it. In fact, you can take it safely that the view I shall expound is essentially the cultural or spiritual view of the, let us call it, INTERMARIUM populations in the East of Europe, between Russia and the Central Europe proper, and stretching from... Finland... down to Turkey... between the Arctic and Baltic seas, and the Black, Aegean and Adriatic Seas.*

*Now my first proposal... is that in no case should the Balkans be divided or split, as is the case now both with Yugoslavia and with Greece. Not that I plead for communism, nor for the inclusion of the whole European East into the Soviet Union... What I propose is... the formation of [an] Eastern European federation, Turkey joining voluntarily together with Finland... In these days of war preparations and Atlantic Charters, of dictatorships of the proletariat and the immense Soviet and American imperialism... It is necessary not to lose ourselves in the fractional issues of the Russo-American conflict, however titanic and fateful this issue is.*

*I propose that the very notion and idea ‘Atlantic’ be modified now, and adapted to the whole reality of the human situation. By ‘Atlantic’ we should mean the specific modern scientific world... But we should also mean with it the culture background of the West. [...] Not in the least do I propose a Euro-American Alliance with the Soviet Socialist Union because we of the West, or at least we Europeans, should fear the great yellow Peril, or provoke it into existence through fear. I only plead for human spiritual and consideration of the culture and genius of... [the] much maltreated and neglected East, demanding liberty for them to organize themselves into the Pacific balance to our Atlantic initiative, forming thus, both of us, the one whole of the two hemispheres of the one Anthropos. [...]*

---

<sup>3</sup> Dimitrije Mitrinović, “Proposals Towards a World System of Foreign Policies—Severely Impartial Proposals and Integrally Inclusive,” a speech at the international meeting organized by the New Europe Group and Atlantic Initiative for the Order of Man, 17 February 1950 in London.

*We need, then, two world-initiatives... we need a triune Eastern Alliance of the Pacific (China, Japan, India), and a triune Western Alliance of the Atlantic (America, Europe, Russia), and there shall be peace, and humanity, and culture...*

### The Visionary

(Dimitrije Mitrinović, “Proposals Towards a World System of Foreign Policies...” London 1950)

*The mighty men and mighty nations prefer their might, and they need their guarantees and protectorates, but we ordinary humanity nevertheless deserve human survival, and with the help of Providence, and our own enduring in freewill—human fulfillment.*

One of the most consistent visionaries of the federation of Europe, or the “union” of Europe (the terminology used in the first half of this century), was Dimitrije Mitrinović, who developed his ideas and initiated actions toward this goal for forty years (1913–53), in particular during the time he spent in Britain.

Mitrinović came from Bosnia<sup>4</sup> to Munich to study art history and modern art under the leading art historian, Heinrich Wölfflin. In the beginning, he was

---

<sup>4</sup> Dimitrije Mitrinović (born in Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1887) became one of the key figures in the ‘Young Bosnia’ movement, a nationalist grouping of South Slavs (mostly Serbs) who sought a cultural and moral renaissance as part of the struggle to create a state of South Slavs (Yugoslavia) at the expense of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. At the Congress of Berlin in 1878, although Bosnia-Herzegovina remained under nominal Turkish sovereignty, control over the provinces passed to Austria-Hungary, and in 1908, Bosnia-Herzegovina was annexed to Austria-Hungary. The *Mlada Bosna* (Young Bosnia) group was especially active among university and high school students. It had its radical wing, inculcating immediate action (which came to the front with actions by Gaćinović in 1910 and by Princip in 1914), and the universalist, cultural wing, whose actions were on the culture front, represented by Mitrinović. (Serbian readers can find an explanation of these developments in the introduction to the Serbian edition of Mitrinović’s *Collected Works*, Sarajevo, 1990, pp. 32–52, by P. Palavestra.) In May 1913, Oskar Potiorek, head of the provincial government in Sarajevo, closed various Serb societies, urging the adoption of more stringent measures. Potiorek and Archduke Francis Ferdinand decided that the latter should attend the military maneuvers in Bosnia in June 1914. To these circumstances must be ascribed the June 28 assassination of the archduke and his consort Sophia during their visit to Sarajevo by a Bosnian Serb, the student Gavrilo Princip. (The date of the visit and maneuvers were provoking—June 28 is a Serbian holy day in memory of the Kosovo Battle). This was followed by an ultimatum from Austria-Hungary to Serbia (which Serbia could not fulfil—similar to the Rambouillet accords) and the Empire

involved with the modern art group *Der Blaue Reiter* (The Blue Rider), led by Franz Marc and Wassily Kandinsky. He became an active member and propagator of the group. Beside other activities, he delivered the lecture “Kandinsky and the New Art: or ‘Taking Tomorrow by Storm’” in the Great Hall of the Museum of Munich, on 27 February 1914. In his lecture he fore-saw the violence that was soon to erupt (although Mitrinović had in mind a positive, culture “storm” for his “tomorrow,” rather than the storm of World War I that broke upon the scene during the same year). Many contemporary thinkers had also been deeply disturbed by what they saw as a major world crisis. Mitrinović saw the political upheavals as the symptoms of a profound change that was taking place on all levels of human life. Therefore, in the first half of 1914, Mitrinović became more and more involved with another project and, with W. Kandinsky and E. Gutkind, he initiated an international movement the goal of which was to move “Towards the Mankind of the Future through an Aryan Europe.” In this, the movement attempted to establish a network with many other European intellectuals, in addition to those already gathered round *Der Blaue Reiter*. The program and gathering was to be promoted in a Yearbook *Aryan Europe*,<sup>5</sup> with contributors such as: Peter

---

commenced aggression on Serbia, which included other countries into the conflict, and started World War I.

<sup>5</sup> Since the notions “Aryan” and “Blood and Soil” a bit later became part of the racist vocabulary with the Nazi ideology, we should warn against the possible misreading of “Aryan Europe” and “Blood Union” in the context of what Mitrinović *et al.* had in mind. Speaking about “Aryan Europe,” Mitrinović had no inclination either to racism or to Eurocentrism. Mitrinović developed a truly multicultural perspective from 1920 onwards. For example, in his texts in the “World Affairs” column in *The New Age* and in *New Britain*, he underlined the following:

- The final essence of human nature means that the life of humanity on earth is a world of many and different—a common world of essentially incomparable individuals (*The New Age*, 16 June 1920);
- European relationships with the Far East were until recently an endless story of maltreatment (*The New Age*, 30 Sept. 1920);
- Europe as a cultural and Aryan entity is still nonexistent, and therefore its relationship with Asia and Africa has been instinctual, and aggressive, defined by power, instead of being intelligent and cooperative (*The New Age*, 21 Oct. 1920);
- It can be said that China will be permanent as the human race, and from its peace will emerge actions immensely important for the future of humankind (*The New Age*, 9 Dec. 1920);
- Is not the internationality of Israel, is not the Jewish race a spiritual internationality, capable to initiate the reconciliation of West and East (*New Britain*, 1933);

Kropotkin, Thomas Masaryk, Knut Hamsun, Maurice Maeterlinck, Emile Verhaeren, Anatole France, Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, Henri Bergson, Erich Gutkind, Franc Oppenheimer, Frederik van Eeden, Jean Jaures, Upton Sinclair, Martin Buber, Gustav Landauer, Pablo Picasso, etc. They intended to form the *Blut-Bund* (Blood Union), a group of people with dignity and credibility, willing to encourage the public in their countries toward peace instead of war. This initiative was supposed to transform and unify Europe, creating a “pan-European culture,” as Europe should initiate a worldwide renaissance of culture. In its perspective, a gathering of such leaders of thought would initiate a worldwide union. The Blood Union served as a model for the erasure of all divisions between people in the world in hopes of attaining world fellowship. From his “Young Bosnian” period (1908–10), when Mitrinović wanted the union of South Slavs in the Balkans, through his “Aryan” period (1913–14), and onward, he developed the idea of unity and federation for Europe, and, ultimately, for the whole of humanity. For him, that was the ultimate solution to the history of mankind.

Being a Serb (with a Serbian passport), on the eve of the Great War, he understood that he must leave Germany. Unable to cross the border to return to Serbia or Bosnia, he took a westward course, reached the Channel, and managed to enter Great Britain in the summer of 1914. During the war years he took part in various actions of the Serbian Embassy in London that were calculated to draw public attention to the Serbian/Yugoslav cause and to bring about the unification of the South Slavs or, in other words, to create Yugoslavia.

After the war, he continued his efforts in London to recruit “big names” for the proposed network, and in the process he was introduced to Alfred Orage, the editor of *The New Age*, a leading weekly of that period and the most important journal for radical political thought in Britain. In August 1920, Mitrinović began contributing a series of articles to *The New Age* in his column “World Affairs” (the column with the same title he will also write in the periodical *New Britain*, May–July 1933). The overall theme was the portrayal of the world as a complex, evolving organism, consisting of different races and nations, each having its own character relating to its proper function

- 
- Japan can be the reconciliation of the West with East, for Japan is the principle of the West in the Eastern hemisphere, its ground-intuition is pan-human (*New Britain*, June 1933).

At the same time, Mitrinović was aware of the impending danger in Europe of the possibility that Germany will exterminate “Israel,” and Europe, and Germany itself; that Europe could destroy itself through the “titanic madness” of Germany; that West will shake in its foundations (*New Britain*, 1933).

in the context of the world as a whole. For example (in *New Age*, 2 September 1920), he says that the term “a good European” lost its meaning during the War, but he further asserts that it should be reaffirmed, that Europe should create a universal European culture—not in order to impose it on other parts of the world, rather it would serve as a comparative, positive model. For Mitrinović, history was evolving in the direction of the conscious realization of individuals of their membership in this unified whole—the world was like an organism evolving towards self-consciousness.

Mitrinović met many of the leading contributors of *The New Age*, and in 1926 became associated himself with some of them, who were known as the Chandos Group, and he influenced their thinking. In 1931, he created with them the New Europe Group, the first president of which was the sociologist Sir Patrick Geddes. The primary goal of this organization was the creation of a European federation.

The New Britain Movement emerged in 1932. It proposed a national renaissance, based on the need to re-order society, so that economic prosperity would bring the maximum individual freedom. Its program advocated a radical change of the financial system, devolution, and federation on national, European, Commonwealth, and worldwide scales. Groups were started all over Great Britain, and the movement was supported by the weekly paper *New Britain*, and later by the *Eleventh Hour*.

The New Britain Movement came to an end in 1935–36. However, the New Europe Group carried on, and its activities included the publication of the quarterly *New Atlantis* and numerous pamphlets. The group remained in touch with the *Ordre Nouveau* movement in France, which, like the New Europe Group, advocated a European federation. After the war, from 1946 onward, the New Europe Group sponsored regular lectures and discussions on aspects of religion, philosophy, the arts, and education. After the death of Mitrinović in 1953, the New Atlantis Foundation<sup>6</sup> initiated a number of cul-

<sup>6</sup> “One of the leading seventeenth-century Renaissance figures, Francis Bacon, wrote his *New Atlantis* about an imaginary utopia, where the House of Solomon was a centre for the study of all knowledge to the benefit of society. His proposal implies that the realm of wisdom and culture—religion, philosophy, science, and art—should influence the conduct of human affairs, and find its main application in the sphere of daily life. This, in fact, could only be effective if culture were free of economic and political control. The name “New Atlantis” was also given by Dimitrije Mitrinović... to the renaissance of culture which he was proposing for the modern world. This would actually be the transformation of the myth of Atlantis into reality. At this stage of human development people will either have to find a way to live together in harmony with one another and with the planet earth, or face unimaginable disaster.” See Program of the New Atlantis Foundation: <http://www.mmu.ac.uk/h-ss/pap/naf2.htm>. A survey of Mitrinović’s life and ideas can be found in Andrew Rigby, *Initiation and Initiative: An Exploration of the Life and Ideas of Dimitrije Mitrinović* (Boulder, Co: East European Monographs, 1984). The

tural activities. This program continued until recently, when priority was given to publishing, in an expectation that today the ideas of Mitrinović will be found to be even more relevant than they were during his lifetime.

(Andrew Rigby: “Training for Cosmopolitan Citizenship in the 1930s: The Project of Dimitrije Mitrinović”)<sup>7</sup>

*Long before the emergence of the contemporary ecology movements, Mitrinović was advocating the model of the organism as the only paradigm which could embrace the dynamic tensions of unity in and through diversity. [...] Mitrinović talked, wrote and acted as if humanity actually was an organism, and that the world really was one great mind in the process of becoming self-conscious. This was not because he had some esoteric insight... His reasons were more pragmatic. At one level, the notion of humanity as a developing organism was a ‘creative fiction,’ a source of insight into the inter-relatedness of all humanity. But, if the immanent potential within this conception of humanity was to be realized, then it was necessary for people to act as if it were real and realizable. [...]*

*Therefore, true self-consciousness entailed awareness of oneself as a unique individual within the whole of humanity—past, present and future. Hence, if the world was to change, individuals must change. ‘Self-change for world change’ was the maxim. Like many others before and since, Mitrinović believed that the competitive individualism and egotism of the contemporary age had reached its limit. It had to be transcended. The key transformative process was the assumption by individuals of responsibility to live their lives in association with others, in full consciousness of their commitments as fellow members of a common humanity. [...]*

*This was to become the dominant motif in Mitrinović’s life—the preparation of groups of individuals for a new world-transforming initiative, to which he gave the name Senate. Their function would be to work in and through all levels of society, helping people and groups to relate to each other as constituent members of a common humanity.*

---

Serbian reader can see Predrag Palavestra, *Dogma i utopija Dimitrija Mitrinovića* (Belgrade, 1977) and Dušan Pajin, “Povest o dobrom Evropljaninu,” *Književnost* 1 (1984).

<sup>7</sup> Andrew Rigby, “Training for Cosmopolitan Citizenship in the 1930s: The Project of Dimitrije Mitrinović,” *Peace & Change* 24, no. 2 (1999).

*Their key resource would be the ability to view all human problems from the perspective of the world as a whole... permeated by alliances of individuals who were committed to humanity and to one another, who were equipped with what we might now call a global or cosmopolitan consciousness.*

### **Vision (in 1920–33): World Affairs and Ecology**

During the summer of 1920, Mitrinović presented his ideas in his column “World Affairs” in *The New Age* (we quote from his texts published on 19 and 26 August and 9 September 1920):

a) *Why should the world, meaning all of us, seek peace? The answer is that world-peace is the absolute condition of individual happiness, and will become more and more demonstrably so as the world becomes more and more demonstrably one. The assertion that Mankind is a single species needs to be supplemented by the assertion that Mankind is One Man; and this again must be particularized in the assertion that every man is that man. [...] Every man is at one and the same time individual and universal, both Man and Mankind. [...] Beneath the individual... lie... deeper levels of consciousness in which each of us lives and moves. It is true that our little bubble of self-consciousness, floating on this ocean of world-consciousness, is unaware for the most of the common life to which it belongs; it does not self-consciously realize that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth within it. [...] it is no longer religion but science that announces the interrelation and interdependence of all forms of life, past, present and future.*

We see that for Mitrinović deep ecology and Gaia hypothesis were “in the air” in the 1920s.

*We conceive the world as one great mind in process of becoming self-conscious, and from this point of view the various races and nations may be regarded as rudimentary organs in course of development within the great world-embryo. If such a view is correct—and any other seems sooner or later to involve itself in tragic contradictions—not only would it follow that there must be a natural world process which it is the duty of the most advanced individuals to discover, and the duty of all, individuals, nations and races alike, to assist, but it would also follow that there cannot be any real antagonism between*

*the proper functions assigned by the world process to its various developing organs. [...] Where there is war there is, therefore, something wrong—a misunderstanding or ignorance...*

Mitrinović was also aware of the necessity to create a new science, governed by values and spiritual aims.

*The intelligent aim of science is the discovery of the intelligence of Nature. Coleridge long ago defined the “highest perfections of natural philosophy” as “the perfect spiritualization of all the laws of nature into laws of intuition and intellect”; and it is in that service, apart from its mere utility values, that true science can be said to labour: to reveal the mind of God in the mind of Man.*

He was also aware that man must create a partnership with nature; however, various groupings of mankind (states, races, cultures) must create the same conscious relationship with each other, as they are all part of a wider whole—the world, nature, planet. Otherwise the issues will be abandoned to mere force.

*Unless there is and can consciously be conceived a non-arbitrary common world-responsibility, resting equally, according to their respective genius, situation and history, upon every race and nation, nothing remains but to abandon every issue to mere force. That then would be right that succeeded in establishing itself; and every effort to survive and to dominate would become justified.*

War, population, waste, misuse of resources and genetics—all of these wrongdoings were identified and “on the list” back in the 1930s.

*Certain problems, such as those of population, of regional and racial deterioration, of the waste or misuse of natural and human resources and of genetics, will be no longer left to the blind decision of fate. The time has come when the human race not only may, but must take more intelligent control of its destiny. Such control implies co-ordination, as yet unheard of, of cultural workers in many departments.*

(Dimitrije Mitrinović, “Integration of Europe,” London 1931)

b) In 1933, Mitrinović published a new series of articles in his column “World Affairs” in the journal *New Britain Weekly* (similar in spirit and general title to his contributions to *The New Age* in 1920). The following passages

are selections from these articles (May–July 1933). They converge toward the idea that our world has become “one world,” of common concern and predicament:

- *It is necessary to reform our human environment, our civilization, to make it a world for humanity, a civilization which concerns [itself] with the immortal essence of its component individuals.*
- *Our planet must be ordered as our human home. Making of the order in the home, establishing home, in the individual life means ripeness, it means fullness. In the racial progress of the world it means preparing for the organization of the leisure for the sake of common spiritualization of all the members of the species. A world-movement for spiritualization of individuals is abysmally, infinitely necessary.*
- *Unless the imperialism of Science and the dictatorship of Technology are subdued and brought to organic and human function the future of humanity will become imperiled and the lot of Adam very grave and perhaps monstrous.*
- *But Cognizance of the Whole is necessary. Now that Cognizance of the Whole, its principle and system, cannot be classed as one among the functional sciences...*
- *Western civilization will destroy itself and will bring the whole of humanity to a gruesome catastrophe and indignity unless its guidance, its senate, its leadership... bethink themselves and repent from the pride of ignorance.*
- *Without world-love and the responsible and noble depth-feeling of human unity and common human majesty and greatness, it is not possible to behold nor to grasp the wonder and the divineness of the human whole.*
- *Our world has become, historically, one world. We are discovering that our world is our common human household and truly one species only. Our kingdom is becoming a commonwealth and a family; a republic and a common cause. Organization and fair squaring are necessary for our spiritual worth and our material existence. Therefore must patriotism pass away. Therefore we ought to stop adoring what is only temporary and instrumental: sovereignty and tribal spirits.<sup>8</sup>*

---

<sup>8</sup> J. Ortega y Gasset said in 1930: “I refer to the gravest danger now threatening European civilization. Like all other dangers that threaten it, this one is born of civilization itself. More than that, it constitutes one of its glories: it is the State as we know it today. We are confronted

### The Earth Charter (1992–2000)

The Earth Charter was one of the expected outcomes of the Earth Summit, held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. It formed the ethical foundation upon which Agenda 21 and the other Rio documents were based. Following the Earth Summit, two international NGOs, the Earth Council and the Green Cross International, with the support of the Dutch Government, joined forces with others to pursue the development of an Earth Charter. In May 1995, they co-sponsored a meeting in the Hague where some 60 representatives from various groups met and proposed a broad consultation process that would lead to a universally acceptable Charter. Over a two-year period, consultations were held worldwide among international organizations. In early 1997, the Earth Charter Commission, composed of 23 distinguished individuals from every continent, was formed to oversee the drafting and consultation processes. During the Rio+5 Forum in March 1997, the Commission proposed a “Benchmark Draft” based on the initial consultation and a review of previous efforts since 1972. This was to serve as a guide for further consultation, the end goal being the development of a people’s Earth Charter. It is hoped that a final version can be approved by the United Nations General Assembly by the year 2000.

### Earth Charter Benchmark Draft

*Earth is our home and home to all living beings. Earth itself is alive. We are part of an evolving universe. Human beings are members of an interdependent community of life with a magnificent diversity of life forms and cultures. We are humbled before the beauty of Earth and share a reverence for life and the sources of our being. We give thanks for the heritage that we have received from past generations and embrace our responsibilities to present and future generations.*

*The Earth Community stands at a defining moment. The biosphere is governed by laws that we ignore at our own peril. Human beings have acquired the ability to radically alter the environment and evolutionary processes. Lack of foresight and misuse of knowledge and power threaten the fabric of life and the foundations*

---

with a replica of what we said in the previous chapter about science: the fertility of its principles brings about a fabulous progress, but this inevitably imposes specialization, and specialization threatens to strangle science. The same thing is happening with the State” (José Ortega y Gasset, *The Revolt of the Masses* [W. W. Norton & Co., 1932]; ch. XIII, “The greatest danger, the state”).

*of local and global security. There is great violence, poverty, and suffering in our world. A fundamental change of course is needed.*

*The choice is before us: to care for Earth or to participate in the destruction of ourselves and the diversity of life. We must reinvent industrial- technological civilization, finding new ways to balance self and community, having and being, diversity and unity, short-term and long-term, using and nurturing.*

*In the midst of all our diversity, we are one humanity and one Earth family with a shared destiny. The challenges before us require an inclusive ethical vision. Partnerships must be forged and cooperation fostered at local, bioregional, national and international levels. In solidarity with one another and the community of life, we the peoples of the world commit ourselves to action guided by the following interrelated principles:*

- 1. Respect Earth and all life. Earth, each life form, and all living beings possess intrinsic value and warrant respect independently of their utilitarian value to humanity.*
- 2. Care for Earth, protecting and restoring the diversity, integrity, and beauty of the planet's ecosystems. Where there is risk of irreversible or serious damage to the environment, precautionary action must be taken to prevent harm.*
- 3. Live sustainably, promoting and adopting modes of consumption, production and reproduction that respect and safeguard human rights and the regenerative capacities of Earth.*
- 4. Establish justice, and defend without discrimination the right of all people to life, liberty, and security of person within an environment adequate for human health and spiritual well-being. People have a right to potable water, clean air, uncontaminated soil, and food security.*
- 5. Share equitably the benefits of natural resource use and a healthy environment among the nations, between rich and poor, between males and females, between present and future generations, and internalize all environmental, social and economic costs.*
- 6. Promote social development and financial systems that create and maintain sustainable livelihoods, eradicate poverty, and strengthen local communities.*
- 7. Practice non-violence, recognizing that peace is the wholeness created by harmonious and balanced relationships with oneself, other persons, other life forms, and Earth.*

## **Vision (in 1932): Personal Freedom**

### **European Tradition and the Future**

(Dimitrije Mitrinović, “Atlantic Action—Neo-Syndicalism as Atlantic Action: Blue Print for the Times,” New Europe Group, London 1932)

*Personal freedom is a social impossibility unless it is based on the actual fact of our political and economic inter-dependence. Such inter-dependence has so far been the norm of European civilization. The rise of dictatorships, based on isolated self-sufficiency, contradicts the norm. It is against personal freedom, not only because politically speaking individuals are denied the right to formulate their own laws, but because the fulfillment of the individual is impossible except in co-operation with others within a devolved social order.*

*Atlantic action is founded on the three aspects of personal life: the economic, social and cultural. An Alliance of such organically ordered States would be the basis of the new Economic World Planning, the new Political World Federation, and the new racial and individual Liberty.*

### **Globalism Versus Tribalism**

(Dimitrije Mitrinović “Atlantic Action—Neo-Syndicalism as Atlantic Action: Blue Print for the Times,” New Europe Group, London 1932)

- a) *Only a total, an inclusive action, is possible for western mankind, and is worthy of Atlantic mankind. For the fulfillment of the principle of personality, we must act higher than the mass forces, Fascism, Communism and mob demands, whose inhuman mechanical institutions crush and regiment the individual. They are inhuman, both cruel in their power, and unfitting to the greatness and dignity of the person. Atlantic action is for the freedom of each unique individual, to whose ultimate attainment all else is rightly instrumental. The conflicts of races, of nations and of men make it seem as if a harmony of world functions were impossible. Doctrines of hatred and of destruction, attempts to maintain the useless and wicked, the false solutions and the supremacy of institutions: these are offered to the now desperate men and women who know that a new conception of human order and of planetary planning is needed.*

(Dimitrije Mitrinović, “World Affairs,” *The New Britain*, July 1933)

- *Our world has become, historically, one world. We are discovering that our world is our common human household and truly one species only. Our kingdom is becoming a commonwealth and a family; a republic and a common cause. Organization and fair squaring are necessary for our spiritual worth and our material existence. Therefore must patriotism pass away. Therefore we ought to stop adoring what is only temporary and instrumental: sovereignty and tribal spirits.*

(The Cultural Forum of the European Union, Brussels, 29–30 January 1998)

- b) **Globalisation...** *raises important questions on the future of every culture. Will globalisation be a source of mutual enrichment or of homogenization? Will it rob the individual cultures of their individuality, or expand the range of possibilities for cultural expression? The powers conferred on the European Union mean that it acts on behalf of its citizens and the various European cultures in international forums, including those international bodies where the relationship between globalisation and respect for cultural diversity is being played out. The European Union preserves the identities and the cultural rights of each community; the public need not consider the Union as something which dilutes their cultural identities, but rather as something which guarantees the existence and flowering of their cultures; the information society.*

(Thomas Friedman, in *New York Times*, 28 March 1999)

- c) *For globalization to work, America can't be afraid to act like the almighty superpower that it is... The hidden hand of the market will never work without a hidden fist—McDonalds cannot flourish without McDonnell Douglas, the designer of the F-15. And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley's technologies is called the United States Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps.*

(“In Defense of Europe,” *Washington Post*, Editorial, 25 July 1999)

- d) *Humbled by their dependence on American might in Kosovo, Europeans are pressing ahead to develop their own defense*

*structure. Last month's European Union summit promised closer military ties. On Tuesday, an Anglo-Italian summit urged their arms makers to pursue closer integration. The Europeans want the muscle to deal with future Kosovos by themselves; they also want this muscle to be supplied by their own arms makers. These ambitions worry some people in Washington. But why? One way or another, Europe will remain dependent on America, because its dual ambitions are incompatible.*

*Europe's defense industry does not make cruise missiles, top-of-the-range satellites, AWACS surveillance aircraft or long-range military transport aircraft. In the short term, Europe has to choose. If it wants the equipment to fight a Kosovo-style war, it must shop in America—and accept dependence on Uncle Sam for maintenance and spare parts. But if Europe wants to nurture its own arms makers, it will buy plenty of guns and tanks, but not much of the high-tech gear that makes America militarily indispensable.*

*The issue is not whether Europe will outgrow dependence on America. It is whether Europe can become a more vigorous ally. At present, Europe's competing military establishments waste millions on expensive gear from dozens of tiny firms; mergers would create economies of scale and free up money to plug high-tech gaps. At the same time, the profusion of suppliers makes for incompatible equipment and battlefield inefficiency.*

## References

- Aryan Europe*, International Yearbook for Culture Politics—draft of the first announcement, written in German by D. Mitrinović, spring 1914; manuscript in the Archives of the New Atlantis Foundation
- Barber, B. R., *Jihad vs. McWorld: How Globalism and Tribalism are Reshaping the World*. Ballantine Books, New York, 1995.
- The Cultural Forum of the European Union, Brussels, 29–30 January 1998; [http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/culture/program-2000-part1\\_en.html](http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/culture/program-2000-part1_en.html)
- The Ideas of Dimitrije Mitrinović: Selected writings*, by H.C.Rutherford, New Atlantis Foundation & J.B. Priestley Library, University of Bradford, 1996.
- Mitrinović, D., “Integration of Europe—The way to reconstitute the States of Europe as an organic society in a New World Order” (Disarmament—

- federation—communal credit), proclamation of the New Europe Group, London, 1931.
- Mitrinović, D and the New Europe Group, “Atlantic Action—Neo-Syndicalism as Atlantic Action: Blue Print for the Times”; leaflet issued by the New Europe Group, London, circa 1932. Copy in archives of New Atlantis Foundation, Sussex, England.
- Mitrinović, D., *Sabrana djela* (I–III), Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1990; with an introduction by P. Palavestra, “Sudbina i delo D. Mitrinovića” (in volume I).
- Mitrinović, D., articles in his column “World Affairs,” journal *New Britain Weekly*, London, May–July 1933, and 1934; later, articles from this column were compiled and printed for the New Europe Group, by Lund Humphries, London and Bradford, and still later included in *The New Europe Group and New Britain Movement: Collected Publications, 1932–1957*, Bradford, 1997.
- Mitrinović, D., “Proposals Towards a World System of Foreign Policies—Severely Impartial Proposals and Integrally Inclusive,” speech at the international meeting, organized by the New Europe Group and Atlantic Initiative for the Order of Man, 17 February 1950, London.
- Mitrinović, D., *Lectures 1926–1950*, New Atlantis Foundation in association with J.B. Priestley Library, University of Bradford, 1995.
- The New Europe Group and New Britain Movement: Collected Publications, 1932–1957*, edited by V. MacDermot, New Atlantis Foundation, Bradford, 1997.
- Ortega y Gasset, J., *The Revolt of the Masses*, W. W. Norton & Co., 1932.
- Ortega y Gasset, J., *Obras Completas*—tomo IX (Meditación de Europa), Alianza Editorial-Revista de Occidente, Madrid, 1983.
- Rigby, R., *Initiation and Initiative: An Exploration of the Life and Ideas of Dimitrije Mitrinović*, East European Monographs, Boulder, 1984.
- Rigby, A., “Training for Cosmopolitan Citizenship in the 1930s: The Project of Dimitrije Mitrinović,” *Peace & Change* 24, no. 2 (1999), Department of History, University at Albany (SUNY), New York.
- Tietmeyer, H., “The Euro—A New Currency in a Changing World,” September 1998; <http://www.unitel.net/ramontamames/rm3.html>