

GEOPOLITICS, GLOBALIZATION, AND TOTALITARIANISM

Mihail Ungheanu¹⁷²

ABSTRACT

*One of the key texts to understand modern international relations and geopolitics can be found in Zbigniew Brzezinski's book *Between Two Ages. The Role of America in the Technotronic Age*. He outlines a kind of sketch of what the global world will look like, affirming the necessity of its birth due to technological development and historical progress. Globalization leads to the instauration of a global city, the result of the necessary progress of mankind. This process will make it possible to fulfill the promises Marxism failed to make true. Globalization and its tool, which is geopolitics, is a utopian rebuilding of the world according to the view of a technocratic elite, a transnational elite, which brings about planetary consciousness. Geopolitics is in the contemporary world an effort to establish a worldwide, freedom-stifling tyranny.*

Keywords: geopolitics, globalization, Brzezinski, Marxism, totalitarianism.

INTRODUCTION

If one is to understand present-day global politics and also what is called geopolitics, one has to understand the past and the assumption upon which geopolitics and international relationships are built, even if those assumptions are not acknowledged by the actors. Those assumptions pertain to the way modernity sees itself and understand itself. The modern worldviews and the modern understanding of man are the pillars that once determined and brought to the light will make the intelligible what drives the contemporary geopolitics. Conceptually modernity can be understood by examining concepts such as sovereignty, emancipation, and progress. These concepts express the worldview that gives meaning to the specific modern understanding of the world.

The concept of sovereignty plays an important in this process. It is a concept that originates in the theological realm, describing a power and an attribute of God. Later it was transferred to the realm of politics. A state, a community, or the individual could pretend to be sovereign. The concept expresses the idea of a self-subsisting entity that is supreme, and which acts according to its own plans, and intentions, and that formulate laws (for other to follow). No one and nothing are above that entity. Such a concept when applied to the world becomes relative.

¹⁷² PhD in Philosophy (Catholic University Eichstaett-Ingolstadt), Scientific researcher at The European Centre for Ethnic Studies, Romania; E-mail contact: mihail_li@yahoo.com

Nobody possesses such a feature but God, the only self-sustaining self-existing being, the being whose source of existence is in itself. The sovereign is the one who gives laws and has nobody above him. This description does not fit the social and political reality. Human beings are despite everything dependent beings. Theoretically, the prince as Jean Bodin put it, is sovereign but has to acknowledge God and act according to the laws that God established, though in the state of exception he can act disregarding the laws of the land. Sovereignty, just as emancipation can be seen as a reality or as something that can be achieved through human effort. This is the place to start understanding modernity and contemporary geopolitics. Sovereignty expresses a set or more sets of assumptions about the world, about society, about man. Therefore, when a new social and political system build according to these concepts is established, it will produce changes in society and in man, even in man's inner life. Sovereignty had to do with self-determination, to the ability to act, think, et, as one pleases without external interference and inner barriers. The idea of sovereignty used as a central value of the organization of the human community will enshrine into the minds of me, even when not consciously done so, the idea of a self-sustaining, self-sustaining being, an absolute being, an independent, an ontological agent that is its own cause. This is God, the absolute ontological center of existence. Who is the sovereign?

“The sovereign exerts not only a derivative godly right to dominion, but he is an appearance of the godly”¹⁷³.

The concept of sovereignty is religious, and it can be seen as a holdover, if one believes the false notion that religion is a thing of the past (Halterm 2007). According to Ulrich Halterm, sovereignty is bound to the realm of the sacred.

“The religious concept of sovereignty transfers to the realm of politics; in both areas, the concept of sovereignty means participation in the sacred”¹⁷⁴.

The concept and what it nowadays expresses belongs to the kernel of the democratic activity of modern states. It is a concept that can't be replaced since there is no other one that can describe the reality to which it pertains. The idea of sovereignty defines and structures the way even now the state, politics, society is conceived¹⁷⁵. The history of the concept sovereignty and its appearance in the realm of political thought and activity could be described as a kind of “migration of the holy”¹⁷⁶. The State, or then political community, the individual, or minorities become sacred. Sovereignty, just like emancipation, can be situated on different levels, and

¹⁷³ “Der Souverän übt nicht nur ein derivatives göttliches Recht zur Herrschaft aus, sondern er ist eine Erscheinung des Göttlichen”, in Ulrich Halterm, *Was bedeutet Souveränität? [What does Sovereignty mean?]*, Tübingen, Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Mohr und Siebeck, 2007, p. 36.

¹⁷⁴ “Das religiöse Konzept der Souveränität wandert zum politischen; in beiden Sphären bezeichnet Souveränität die Teilhabe am Heilige”, in *Ibid.*, p. 31.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁷⁶ William T. Cavanaugh, *Migrations of The Holy*, Grand Rapids, United States of America, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2011.

sometimes, just like in the case of the process of supposed emancipation, the sovereignty of a people might come in conflict with that of individuals within it, etc. Sovereignty has a double meaning. It is both postulated as given and is understood as something that must be accomplished. In this sense the project of modernity is to be understood as accomplishing the sovereignty of man over nature, and over human nature, too. For Gerard Mairret, the concept of sovereignty is modern. It is modern I argue, in so far as it is applied to the realm of politics and in as much as it expresses that the only sovereign being is man. Its use is modern because it replaces God as the source of sovereignty and source of the law by which human existence is organized. Neither God nor nature are the source of the norms but man himself. The modern use of the concept entails that politics is not a matter of virtue but power. The sovereign is someone that has and exercises power¹⁷⁷. Sovereignty, in this sense, is the elimination of every extra-human (and of virtue in classical and Christian sense) grounding of the human community:

“In fact, the principle of sovereignty and the theory of the republic which proceeds from it eliminate any Christian foundation of authority. Sovereignty, in its origins, is this very elimination”¹⁷⁸.

Sovereignty is the principle of the state, and its purpose is the maintaining of the state/of the human community¹⁷⁹. Sovereignty, according to him, is bound to the modern conception of man, conceptions that define man as a self-man being, as the main or only agent of history, as the exclusive source of the rules and laws upon which the community is based¹⁸⁰. The relationship that the modern political notion of sovereignty entails is expressed in Cartesian terms. Nature is something that has to be conquered and subdued, nature is an enemy¹⁸¹. It is a relationship of domination. Without this relationship of domination, there is no *res publica*, no state in the modern sense of the term. This includes the nature of man and society. Modernity is the supposed age wherein man becomes the master of his destiny, of his history. Mankind breaks its ties with nature, with its embodiment in the universe, and elevates itself to the rank of the ground/principle of its existence. What this ground is, what man is not set from advance. It is the subject matter of a continuous debate. What the ground is, what humanity is, and what man is can't be established without power, without its use. Humanity has no essence but what power makes out of humanity. Humanity is what the sovereign says humanity is. Sovereignty as a task that has to be accomplished is another way to say that self-deification is the task at hand, which means that man has to take control of the whole of nature – man's nature

¹⁷⁷ Mairret Gérard, *Le principe de souveraineté. Histoire et fondements du pouvoir moderne [The Principle of Sovereignty, The History and Basis of Modern Power]*, Paris, Gallimard, 1997, p. 28.

¹⁷⁸ “En fait, le principe de souveraineté et la théorie de la république qui en procède éliminent tout fondation chrétienne de l'autorité. La souveraineté, en ses origines, est cette élimination même”, in *Ibid.*, p. 30.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 205.

included – and become the ontological center of existence; and endeavors as transhumanism express the tendency. This implies a transformation of society, of man, of nature. The human community is considered to be completely artificial. This view is projected onto the past itself and therefore all human societies are considered as such. The conception that man has no nature that can be molded however the social engineers see fit is the theoretical expression of this modern view, of the modern doctrine of sovereignty. Ant the whole world. This is the framework in which contemporary geopolitics should be understood. One example of this can be found in Zbigniew Brzezinski's work *Between Two Ages. The Role of America in the Technotronic Age*.

THE TECHNOCRATIC AGE

Zbigniew Brzezinski is a well-known name in the world of politics, international relations, geopolitics, etc. The former security adviser of Jimmy Carter is one of the people that made a serious contribution to the development of the new world order known under the name of globalization (he also contributed to the war against the USSR in Afghanistan and thus to the rise of Islamism). He was also a scholar and a member of the think-tank known as the Commission for External Relations and the Trilateral Commission, which he grounded together with David Rockefeller Wood 2015-6. His theoretical contribution to the establishment of the present-day world order can be found in his afore mentioned *Between Two Ages. The Role of America in the Technotronic Age*, published in the earlier seventies.

Between Two Ages can be considered a kind of blueprint of what globalization came to be. It predicts some things, including genetic modification, and describes the – then a possibility – way in which the mode of government of the world will change. The focus of the book is what can be called technocracy, although the word he used was technotronic. The new era of humanity is the era of technocracy. This age brings many changes on a global scale, forging new connections between far places, while producing fragmentation on the local level. These transformations are brought about by the development of the means of communications and if computers. The United States represents the model of the nascent global society, and the place from whence it would spread out.

The concept of geopolitics pertains to the distribution of power in a given territory, to the relationship between politics and the geography of the country and the natural resources, but also includes the relationship to the human resources as well. According to Ezzatollah Ezzati, geopolitics researches the relationship with the natural and geographical surroundings, trying to obtain and maintain power so it can play a significant role at the highest levels of global politics. Also, it does this in order to protect and promote the national interest of that country¹⁸². But the account of the order

¹⁸² Ezzatollah Ezzati, *Geopolitica în secolul XXI [Geopolitics in the XX century]*, translation by Cristina Ciovarnache and Luminița Spânu, Bucharest, Top Form Publishing House, 2009, p. 14.

of the world that Brzezinski presents us, geopolitics is more than that. It is a tool to use power to remodel the whole world according to its march towards progress and globalization. Even when not stated explicitly, geopolitics is a spiritual endeavor, too. The way Brzezinski understands it is typical of the Western Faustian spirituality lest we call it demonic. Reality can't be accepted as such, but it must be made anew.

According to the Polish American author, the history of mankind can be ordered into four ages or stages of development. The present-day world, characterized by globalization and the spread of technocracy, is the fourth one. The third one is the era of industrialization and of the rise of Marxism, an ideology or a doctrine that is the best instrument to analyze and understand society and its problems. From Brzezinski's book can man deduce that the fourth era and its new mode of doing things – government by unelected experts – will solve what Marxism could not. Marxism and its global reach are therefore held in high regard by him – a so-called defender of the (former) free world, the West. He considers it to be a humanistic enterprise and also a universalist one, though in practice it failed. Marxism is humanism, that is its main concern¹⁸³. Brzezinski does not think that the states from the Eastern Block, and especially the Soviet Union, did apply a true Marxist policy. Instead, they practiced a nationalist and tribal policy in the guise of communism. He recognizes that they achieved something, albeit they robbed the revolutionary potential of that promising ideology. He observes that the best qualities of Marxism come to light when it is not in a place of power. When applied Marxism generates Nationalism and fails to change reality meaning that it does not fulfill its function as an ideology, namely, to transform and mold reality to fit the wishes and needs of man. In the best case, the countries governed by Marxist forces do modernize, but that is all. The murderous ways of applied Marxist ideology are not consequences of the ideology but of the way it was applied in the Eastern Block. A Western approach would have fared better.

“Thus, even if one is not a Marxist, it is not necessarily a cause for rejoicing to note that communism – which helped to enlarge the collective consciousness of mankind and to mobilize the masses for social progress – has failed in its original objective of linking humanism with internationalism”¹⁸⁴.

Clearly, he sees in a good light a highly centralized authoritarian ideology that separates humanity into opposing categories, which are the oppressors and the oppressed. This is an ideology that demonizes whole categories of people, denying their humanity. The Gulags are a direct expression of this attitude. The disregard for reality is astonishing. Social justice and equality are the main passions of this new era we are believing in, an era that expresses the main aim of modernity:

“Man is the subject-author of his own destiny”¹⁸⁵.

¹⁸³ Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Between Two Ages*, New York, United States of America, The Viking Press, 1970, p. 142.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 192–193.

¹⁸⁵ “L'homme est sujet-auteur – de son propre destin”, in Mairret Gérard, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

This development, which is progress will change the way society and man are to be understood. The government will change. A new paradigm is therefore required. The national state must be overcome. Brzezinski states:

“Tension is unavoidable as man strives to assimilate the new into the framework of the old. For a time, the established framework resiliently integrates the new by adapting it in a more familiar shape. But at some point, the old framework becomes overloaded. The new input can no longer be redefined into traditional forms, and eventually, it asserts itself with compelling force. Today, though the old framework of international politics – with their spheres of influence, military alliances between nation-states, doctrinal conflicts arising from nineteenth-century crises – is clearly no longer with reality”¹⁸⁶.

This fourth age, which he describes as technotronic is something entirely new. It is a spatio-temporal revolution¹⁸⁷. The beginnings of the new type of society that this spatio-temporal revolution is the United States. Its peculiar structure offers a model for the whole globe. History is dynamic and based on evolution. From the industrial society man arrives in the post-industrial one, which will go away and will be replaced by the technotronic one, or in other words, by the technological society (Jacques Ellul):

“The post-industrial society is becoming a ‘technotronic’ society: a society that is shaped culturally, psychologically, socially, and economically by the impact of technology and electronics – particularly in the area of computers and communications”¹⁸⁸.

This revolution and the technological system will spread over in all areas of life. Nothing will escape it. Besides the technological advancement, these dynamics fed themselves from the passion for equality, which during this process becomes a self-conscious force. The passion for equality becomes omnipresent, being spread by the development of the means of communication. The development of the means of communication leads to a greater interconnection between different areas of the world, thus making it possible to go beyond the local or national level and combat inequality at a planetary level. This development leads to the increase of the potential magnitude of human control upon society, environment, etc., increasing the pressure of changing and imposing certain lines on the development of society¹⁸⁹. A new society emerges from these changes and this new society will differ in many ways in its social, economic, or political dimensions from the previous one. The economic power will become inseparable from the political one (or indistinguishable), becoming more invisible. There will be a partnership between the public/governmental sectors and the private ones. On a more personal level, the social binds tend to fragment, the communities too and so do the ties between generations. On

¹⁸⁶ Zbigniew Brzezinski, *op. cit.*, p. 274.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

another level, the individuals will be integrated in a global structure. This is the result of developing electronic communications and computer networks – global intimacy. The individual will be absorbed by this new global reality¹⁹⁰. But the final product is not the global village. It is a global city, a fragmented reality, a web of tense and nervous interdependent relationships that do not possess the stability, personal intimacy, or implicitly shared values that characterize life in a real village¹⁹¹.

Progress and globalization will lead to the demise of the role of the nation-state and of the nationally elected government. The way politics will be understood will no longer be within the framework of the nation-state but in a global, transnational framework. As he says, the new framework, whatever it might be or might have been from the point of view of the twentieth century, will not be the form of government embraced by the national states. It will not be the expression of the national will (a view that in reality is utopian) but something different¹⁹². It might be, as has been suggested in the early twentieth century, a kind of soviet of engineers (Wood 2015-6). According to the globalist view Brzezinski espouses, national government will or are not able to solve the big problems that confront humanity as a whole, for example, the ecological problems or social inequity all over the world. The most important challenge would be to integrate technological and scientific advances into a reference frame that gives them humane ends (as defined by whom?). This is not avoidable since this goes in the same direction as history. He dubs this supposed future state of the world large-scale cooperation:

“Under the pressure of economics, science, and technology, mankind is moving steadily towards large-scale cooperation. Despite periodic reverses, all human history clearly indicates progress in that direction. The question is whether a spontaneous movement will suffice to counterbalance the dangers already noted. And since the answer is probably no, it follows that a realistic response calls for deliberate efforts to accelerate the process of international cooperation among the advanced nations”¹⁹³.

He does say that this process should not be accomplished by the building of a global state, which is, in his view, the same thing as a nation-state but extended on a global scale. The development of mass communications and of computers – later cybernetics changes the way the political community is understood and run. Due to this extended communication and due to a certain transnational elite, which entertains another view on the world as elected representants or ordinary citizens, a new type of community emerges. This is connected to the rise of a planetary consciousness. Even national-minded elites are aware of the fact that accomplishing national gospels require nowadays more international cooperation. Whatever balance the national state struck between different factors such as security, economics, spiritual, etc. had been affected by the modern-day developments,

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 215.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 296.

especially between the transnational cooperation that integrate much smaller units into larger ones by the use of computers, cybernetics, etc. The ideal of this framework would be the functional integration of entire regions or even continents¹⁹⁴. This would be the response to the desire of getting a more defined sense of personality in a world that becomes more and more impersonal and to the changed function of the existing state structures. The new political activity that inevitably arises in compliance to these new developments will bring about changes in the way the things are run and by whom. The things are going to be run by the new emerging transnational, globalist elites, both in spirit and outlook. These elite are not bound so much to their countries but are tied to other elites across the borders, with perspectives that transcend the national ones, their interests being “more functional than national”. They are comprised into a process that will make them more and more globalist¹⁹⁵. Those elite were made up out of “international businessmen, scholars, professional men, and public man.” They will tend progressively to the world and the problems therein according to their global perspective. This was facilitated by the creation of the global information grid – what might be called now internet (which was basically a counterinsurgency tool) that will facilitate and make possible a permanent scientific change and pooling of knowledge. It is fair to recognize that he admits that these developments will or might produce a disconnectedness between these elites and the masses that are native oriented. These process of globalization of the elites and political organization is related to the way problems are identified and defines. These would be the need to overcome the lack of technological backwardness, the eliminate poverty, and now days universalizing sex perversion, promoting gender dementia, destroying national cultures and identities because they do not square with the globalist ideology, as it is now visible. The condition of thereof is the technotronic revolution, which is supposed to be a humane answer to humane needs, “to human suffering in general”¹⁹⁶. Globalism, or geopolitics in the view here presented is another form of the political messianism – false religion that Marxism represented. Only now it is advocated by a supposed defender of the former free world. The procedure to tackle human suffering in general is clearly technocratic in its outlook. Problems are not the result of evil or of active and intentional evil, but of ignorance and complexity. It is a kind of naturalistic approach:

“Social problems are seen less as the consequences of deliberate evil and more as the unintended by-products of both complexity and ignorance; solutions are not sought in emotional simplifications but in the use of man’s accumulated social and scientific knowledge”¹⁹⁷.

Being a technotronic way of governing the world, these new planetary community will imply planification. This is illustrated by the problems that ecology

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

present humanity, but also overpopulation, famine, radiation, exploring space and the oceans. The development of technology will make that more effective. The national state has lost his main role as the principal creative force in the world if Brzezinski is to be believed. Who or what is going to replace it? Multinational corporations and banks are because they are more technocratic savvy than the national governments, more advanced in their endeavors pertaining to planning and acting in more advanced ways than the state¹⁹⁸. The establishment of this new framework of governance is not a free one, is planned, directed. It is a totalitarian one, run by the aforementioned transnational elites.

“More directly linked to the impact of technology, it involves the gradual appearance of a more controlled and directed society. Such a society would be dominated by an elite whose claim to political power would rest on allegedly superior scientific know-how. Unhindered by the restraints of traditional liberal values, this elite would not hesitate to achieve its political ends by using the latest modern techniques for influencing public behavior and keeping society under surveillance and control. Under such circumstances, the scientific and technological momentum of the country would not be reversed but would actually feed on the situation its exploits”¹⁹⁹.

CONCLUSIONS

This remaking of human reality has an ideological ancestor, that is Marxism. Marxism was the best analytical tool to understand social and political reality in the view of the former U.S. national security adviser. So, at least in his view, the new remodeling and establishing of the global more humane society can't ignore this tremendous intellectual tool. The age of Marxism precedes the age of globalization being also the expression of what might be called in Hegelian and Marxist terms the historic necessity that governs the world. It a further development which goes beyond religious development, although the great religions formed the notion of equality of man, because it gives priority to the exterior man over the inner man. Another big step toward an universal vision of man. Giving priority to the inner man as Christianity supposedly does, is not in advantage of mankind. Man has to take over, control and modify his external living condition – so as Mairer says nature is the enemy of man and must be conquered and molded to fit mankind needs and wishes. Marxism provides the view that man has and absolute understanding of reality, and this makes possible the molding the reality according to man's will²⁰⁰.

Marxism offers

“a unique intellectual too for understanding and harnessing the fundamental forces of our time. As both a product and a response to a particularly traumatic phase of man's history, it supplied the best available insight into contemporary reality”²⁰¹.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 253.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 123.

Marxism in his concrete form has nevertheless failed, just as nationalism fails because it raised only in part man's self-awareness, it mobilized man actively, but somehow it failed to represent a challenge for their critical faculties. Nationalism does not represent, according to him, a conceptual framework, but more a vehicle of human passion and fantasizing. The role of a conceptual framework – the one nationalism and religion didn't prove is to dissect and make possible the active, intentional reassembling or remolding of reality²⁰². This is, of course, an expressing of the all-power fantasy, or of the infantile all-power fantasy in Freudian parlance. This view is just another expression of the modern paradigm of sovereignty as G. Mairé described, and as we see it runs against democratic principle, leading into tyranny.

Though usually, basic concepts are defined at the beginning of a paper, the concept of technocracy has to be explained or defined. There is the etymological understanding, which equates technocracy with the power of technology, and there is also a larger definition, that relates technocracy to the governing of society by a body of unelected experts – would be infallible wise-men – or as the sociologist Thorstein Veblen (Wood 2015-6: 15) puts it by “a soviet of engineers”.

“Technocracy is the science of social engineering, the scientific operation of the entire social mechanism to produce and distribute goods and services to the entire population of this continent. For the first time in human history, it will be done as a scientific, technical, engineering problem”²⁰³.

This conception of a new way of governing society and rebuilding the economy was formulated in the early twentieth century the fundamental idea being that the problems that society meets are caused solely by mankind and that the economic system must be completely changed. It needed a comprehensive surveillance apparatus that wasn't possible to build them. Society is considered a holistic system and surveillance will be applied to all domains of life. Since the basic idea is that society and nature are more important than the individuals that made them up, those have to relinquish their freedom and rights. Technicians are supposed to run and rule this system and no politicians since those are a problem (incompetent and corrupt while the technocrats are pure and dedicated to the good of the world). This new economic system would be based on energy-value not on money whereby precluding the accumulation of wealth and property. Thus, freedom and autonomy become impossible. Profit would no longer be a motivator. And there will be no money but energy certificates, based upon on how much an individual has consumed and well-behaved he or she was, and they will have only a limited time validity. Total control and tyranny are the result of the technocratic mindset as the present reality is starting to show. Geopolitics is therefore the discipline of establishing a totalitarian technocratic despotic system upon the whole world.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 72.

²⁰³ ***, “What is Technocracy”, in *The Technocrat*, Los Angeles, Vol. III, no. 4/1937, p. 3.

REFERENCES

- ***, “What is Technocracy”, in *The Technocrat*, Los Angeles, Vol. III, no. 4/1937.
- Bodin Jean, *On Sovereignty. Four Chapters from The Six Books of the Commonwealth*, New York, United States of America, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Brzezinski Zbigniew, *Between Two Ages*, New York, United States of America, The Viking Press, 1970.
- Carabine Deirdre, *The Unknown God*, Eugene, Wipf and Stock, 2015.
- Cavanaugh, T. William, *Migrations of The Holy*, Grand Rapids, United States of America, Wm.B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2011.
- Ellul Jacques, *La technique ou l'enjeux du siècle [The technique or the Stake of the Century]*, Paris, Economica, 1990.
- Ellul Jacques, *Les nouveaux possédés [The new demons]*, Paris, Mille et une nuits, 2003.
- Ellul Jacques, *Théologie et technique [Theology and Technique]*, Genève, Switzerland, Labor et fides, 2014.
- Ezzati Ezzatolah, *Geopolitica în secolul XXI [Geopolitics in the XX century]*, translation by Ciovarnache Cristina and Spânu Luminița, Bucharest, Top Form Publishing House, 2009.
- Halterm Ulrich, *Was bedeutet Souveränität? [What does Sovereignty mean?]*, Tübingen, Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Mohr und Siebeck, 2007.
- Mairet Gérard, *Le principe de souveraineté. Histoire et fondements du pouvoir moderne [The Principle of Sovereignty, The History and Basis of Modern Power]*, Paris, Gallimard, 1997.
- Mumford Lewis, “Utopia, The City, and The Machine”, in *Daedalus Journal*, Cambridge, Massaschutes, Vol. 94/1965, no. 2, pp. 271-292.
- Noble F. David, *The Religion of Technology*, New York, United States of America, Alfred A. Knopf, 1997.
- Taguieff Pierre-André, *Le sens du progrès. Une approche historique et philosophique [The meaning of progress. A historical and philosophical approach]*, Paris, Flammarion, 2004.
- Taguieff Pierre-André, *L'émancipation promise [The promised emancipation]*, Paris, Cerf, 2019.

