

## Prilog promišljanju budućnosti rada

Savo S. Trifunović<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Fakultet za mašinstvo i građevinarstvo u Kraljevu, Univerzitet u Kragujevcu, Kraljevo (Srbija)

*Ljudski rad fundamentalni je društveni odnos koji ima svoju tehničko – tehnološku, društveno – ekonomsku i ljudsku dimenziju. Ima rad i budućnost. Nakon što smo izložili neke prednosti i mane novih tehnologija, mi u ovom radu ukratko izlažemo i dajemo podršku Izveštaju Međunarodne organizacije rada „Rad za svetliju budućnost“. Ukazujemo na našu pozitivnu viziju budućnosti rada i na neke naše slutnje. Na kraju rada nudimo, ovaj put, dva rešenja za humaniju budućnost rada.*

**Ključne reči: Budućnost rada, Izveštaj, Tehnologije, Humanizacija, Rešenja**

### 1. UVOD

Ljudi su, kažemo od uvek, promišljali značaj rada kao fundamentalnog društvenog procesa i projektovali svoje ideje, predloge (ishode), manje ili više uspešne, o realnosti i budućnosti rada. Gotovo da nije bilo, na evropskim prostorima kulture, iole značajnijeg mislioca koji nije participirao i raspravljao (i) o problemu rada. Od Hesioda, Platona i Aristotela, rimskih mislilaca, Augustina i Akvinskog, klasika marksističke misli do danas sociologa rada, filozofa rada. Npr. veliki engleski socijal – utopista Tomas Mor u njegovom delu „Utopija“, štampanoj 1518. godine, predlagao je da „radni dan u Utopiji traje šest časova.“ [1] S pravom je veliki italijanski utopista Tomazo Kampanela u delu „Grad Sunca“, štampanom 1623. godine, tvrdio da „teško siromaštvo čini ljude nevaljalcima, prepredenjacima, varalicama, lopovima, lažljivcima, izgnanicima i huljama, krivokletnicima itd., a bogatstvo – drskim, oholim, nezalnicama, izdajicama, ljudima koji se pretvaraju da znaju što ne znaju, varljivcima, ljudima bez ljubavi, bestidnicima itd.“ [2]. Taj znameniti socijal – utopista predlagao je „četiri časa rada dnevno.“ [2] Karl Marks je u osamnaestom veku predlagao osam časova rada dnevno. I ukazao na značaj razvoja produkcionih snaga i produkcionih odnosa, kojima su u osnovi svojinski odnosi (*auri sacra fames*). Takođe, i na nužnost humanizacije, očovečenja rada, kulture rada, oslobođenja rada i čoveka (dezalijenacije), kako u radnoj sredini, tako i u društvu uopšte, pravilno shvatajući značaj i potencijale materijalnih produkcionih snaga za razvoj procesa rada i društva. I danas je promišljanje i projektovanje budućnosti rada prvorazredna društvena, globalna i lokalna, potreba. [3]

### 2. NEKE PREDNOSTI I MANE NOVIH TEHNOLOGIJA

Nove tehnologije imaju svoje prednosti i mane. Imaju one pozitivan i negativan uticaj na čoveka, na sadašnji i budući društveni razvoj. Srećni smo savremenici popločavanja širokog puta budućnosti za veliki povratak tehnološkoj *techne*, za pretvaranje rasta u (integralni i održivi) razvoj, za humanizaciju i etizaciju čoveka i sveta rada. Globalno, a ne samo lokalno.

Nove tehnologije, kao što je to uvek bio slučaj u istoriji tehnologija i društva, kada su uvedene, imale su svoje prednosti. Kasnije, tokom „eksploatacije“, uočavane su i mane odnosno nedostaci, pa i mogućnosti zloupotrebe tih (i tada) novih tehnologija, kako u tehničko-tehnološkom smislu, tako i u društveno-ekonomskom i političkom smislu. Upravo su, tokom primene uočene mane, bile podsticaj inovatorima da unapređuju te (tada) nove tehnologije i da stvaraju (opet) još novije nove tehnologije. Tako je to i danas sa nama novim tehnologijama.

*Prednosti novih tehnologija* [4] najviše osećaju oni koji ih poseduju, koriste i ulažu u njih. Naravno, i oni koji su „u zoni njihovog delovanja“. Prednosti novih tehnologija daju nam osnov za optimizam i optimistički pogled na budućnost rada i društvenog razvoja.

Nove tehnologije stvaraju društvene uslove za: ukidanje siromaštva, te najteže i najsravnije društvene bolesti (i) ovog veka; moćno širenje ljudskih umnih potencijala, stvaralaštva, novih vrsta i oblika kreativnosti, pobedničke inovativne etike; mogućnosti stvaranja novog društvenog blagostanja i dobrobiti; visok životni standard pojedinca; reviziju etike rada i poslovne etike koja je u osnovi razvijenih (prebogatih) društava. Da postanu ne samo *bogata* već i *dobra* društva.

Nove tehnologije omogućavaju: sve veći „informatički dodir“ među pojedincima i narodima; realnost i *viziju* sveta bez „kuluka“ fizičkog rada; veću demokratizaciju; rasterećenje gradova, naročito *sitija* i razvoj ruralnih i nerazvijenih područja ili zemalja.

U društvenom i ekonomskom smislu nove tehnologije: pomeraju čoveka iz „sfere“ (radne sredine) u kojoj se obavljaju prljavi, zamorni, opasni poslovi; menjaju navike kupaca; omogućavaju skraćivanje radnog vremena, ali i produženje radnog veka zaposlenih.

Svako nabranje koje je ujedno i vrednovanje i predviđanje, ma koliko bilo analitičko i razložno, nikada ne može biti potpuno, jer pati od nedorečenosti. Tako i ovde. *Mane* (nedostatke) novih tehnologija najviše osećaju oni koji ih poseduju, koriste. Naravno, i oni koji su «u zoni njihovog delovanja», da baš ne napišemo – zračnja.

Nove tehnologije na specifičan način ugrožavaju čovekovu životnu sredinu, doprinose globalnom zagrevanju, kiselim kišama i dr.

\* Kontakt adresa autora: Dositejeva 19, Kraljevo, trifunovic.s@mfkv.kg.ac.rs

Kao i prethodne tehnologije, i nove tehnologije se kvare ili loše rade. One produbljuju jaz između sve bogatijih (pre)bogatih zemalja i sve siromašnijih siromašnih zemalja. Vlade su danas sve manje u mogućnosti da uspore zahuktali tehničko – tehnološki privredni rast i uvođenje novih procesa, sistema i zakonodavstva, kako bi dobile na vremenu za postepeno prilagođavanje novim tehnologijama i novim uslovima, jer „će svaka zemlja pokušati upravo pomoću inovacija steći proširena tržišta i održati prednost.“ [4]

Novе tehnologije ugrožavaju, do rušenja, kulturni suverenitet i lokalni kulturni identitet.

Već danas uočavamo u svetu rada sve prisutniji gubitak volje za rad i demoralizaciju; manju fizičku pokretljivost ljudi („čovек koji sedi“); otuđenje (alijenaciju) čovеka u radnoj sredini i društvu; „Već nam je dobro poznata hipnotička moć televizijskog aparata koji satima prikuje ljude u naslonjače i prisiljava decu da uđu u svet razmišljanja odraslih na svoju vlastitu štetu. Koncentracija izvora informacija u jednoj jedinoj sobi, fokus komunikacijskih mogućnosti, od kojih su mnoge bezlične i daleke, gustoća obrazovnih i zabavnih programa i mnogi drugi faktori, mogli bi umrtviti porodicu i izolovati je od drugih ljudi. To bi lako moglo dovesti do sve većeg otuđenja pojedinaca, neaktivnog istupanja protiv društva, što se danas često dešava, već pasivnog i podmuklog otuđenja s gubitkom ljudskog dostojanstva i samopoštovanja. Drugim rečima, da li će automatizacija velikog dela ljudskih aktivnosti konačno dovesti do automatizacije čovečanstva? Vetovatno hoće, ali ako se automatizacija pravilno shvati i dočeka, ona bi mogla učiniti upravo suprotno; [4] sve veći kulturni i kulturološki rascep društvenog i personalnog identiteta; sve značajnije smanjivanje i sužavanje mogućnosti društvenog i ekonomskog izbora „običnom radniku“ i „običnom građaninu“.

Uočljiva je pojava sve većeg broja ergonomskih problema [5] zbog rada pred monitorom, povećane psihičke napetosti, stresa na radu, malaksalosti, specifičnog zamora, slabljenja vida, bola u leđima, glavobolje, do najveće psihičke i društvene opasnosti koju donosi „dodir sa slikom stvarnosti“, a ne sa samom stvarnošću. Mi već danas uočavamo nelagodnosti (do neuroza i psihoza) zbog doživljaja rada kao stalno nadziranog, stalno posmatranog („rad pod prismotrom“). I opasnost od preteranog udubljanja u „virtuelni svet“, od dobrovoljnog auditivnog isključivanja (zvukova, tonova, razgovora) od drugih ljudi pored kojih čovek sedi, radi, ali s kojima zapravo nije. «Kad vidiš da neko radi, ne prilazi da pomažeš (da ne smetaš!).» Koliko god da je ova izreka šeretska, pri radu sa klasičnim poljoprivrednim alatima, toliko je ona ozbiljno upozorenje pri radu sa informatičkim alatima.

Unesite ljudima računar u kuću, isticao je Alvin Tofler, [4] i više neće biti potrebe da se okupljaju. [6] U tišini doma svog, čovek našeg vremena moći će na miru da se druži s „pametnim aparatom“. Da se „individualno individualizuje“, jer kompjuterske tehnologije masovno individualizuju. I da nadomesti nedostajuće, nečim uskraćeno u strukturi ličnosti. Pitanje o uticaju i efektima novih tehnologija na nerazvijene zemlje (danas još uvek tehnološki „tamo nekog sveta“) zahtevalo bi mnogo više prostora nego što mi to u ovom radu želimo.

Slutnje su da će prebogatе i bogate zemlje, posmatrano kroz prizmu novih tehnologija, biti još „prebogatije“ i još više bogate. I biće ih, u tom razredu klasifikacije, sve manje. Nerazvijene zemlje biće sve nerazvijenije i još više siromašne. I biće ih sve više. Tako mi definišemo opšti zakon uticaja novih tehnologija na nacionalne privrede. „Na potrebu i razvoj tehnologije utiče se tako da ona prvenstveno služi interesima i ciljevima moćnih i bogatih. “Matijin efekt (“Ko ima biće mu dato...”) pojavljuje se kao najizraženiji učinak nove informatičke tehnologije koja moćne čini još moćnijima“. [7] U takav scenario mi ne verujemo. Mi želimo verovati da će nove tehnologije upravo doprineti većoj demokratizaciji i shodno dostignutom stepenu razvoja pojedinih društava, većem ostvarenju ljudskih prava. To je, dakle, za nas, akt vere.

### 3. “RAD ZA SVETLIJU BUDUĆNOST”

Naša pozitivna vizija budućnosti rada (koju uvek projektuju „sede glave“), ima uporište i nadu, između ostalog, u saznanjima o Izveštaju MOR-a „Rad za svetliju budućnost.“ Naime, povodom stogodišnjice (1919-2019.) Međunarodne organizacije rada (MOR, specijalizovane agencije OUN), njena, pre dve godine osnovana Globalna komisija za budućnost rada, podnela je Izveštaj pod naslovom „Rad za svetliju budućnost“, koji u originalnoj verziji ima 69, a sa Aneksom 75 stranica. [8] Ukratko ćemo izložiti ključne tačke Izveštaja.

U Izveštaju se pozivaju vlade država članica MOR, odnosno UN, na preduzimenje mera kojima bi odgovorile u savremenoj nam digitalnoj eri, na brojne i velike izazove u svetu rada, do sada, obimom i brzinom promena, bez presedana u ljudskoj istoriji. U kontekstu ipak, još uvek, sumorne slike (npr. „dve milijarde ljudi zarađuje za život u neformalnoj ekonomiji; tri stotine miliona radnika živi u ekstremnom siromaštvu; 2,78 miliona ljudi umre svake godine zbog povreda na radu i od profesionalnih oboljenja; 36,1% globalne radne snage radi prekovremeno (više od 48 sati nedeljno); ... između 1980. i 2016. godine najbogatijih 1% svjetskog stanovništva dobivalo je 27% rasta globalnog dohotka dok 50% najsiromašnijih dobiva samo 12%; žene su plaćene oko 20% manje nego muškarci“, [9] Komisija je u formi tri pilara (stupa) predložila i preporučila program o budućnosti rada.

*Prvo*, povećavanje ulaganja u čoveka (tzv. ljudski faktor rada) i proširenje njegovih sposobnosti, veština, znanja, kompetencija, ali i u povećanje životnog standarda - generalno, blagostanja.

Celoživotno obrazovanje za nove kvalifikacije, prekvalifikacije, dokvalifikacije, dopunsko formalno i neformalno učenje od najranije dobi do obrazovanja odraslih.

Za to vlade, poslodavci i radnici, obrazovne institucije imaju zajedničke odgovornosti u izgradnji primerenog, a to znači i održivog finansijskog sistema za realizaciju koncepta celoživotnog obrazovanja. Potrebno je omogućiti razvoj sistema celoživotnog učenja i ne svoditi obrazovanje samo na usko sticanje veština, već ono mora imati daleko širi okvir, upravo zbog brzih promena koje se dešavaju (razvoj tzv. opštih veština).

Ojačavanje institucija i institucionalnih okvira za olakšavanje sve težeg prelaza mladih iz škola u svet rada; za omogućavanje starijima da rade dokle žele (ka tzv. „celoživotno aktivnom društvu“); davanje različitih potpora

i pogodnosti radnicima zbog sve težeg snalaženja u brzim i obimnim promenama; stvaranje proaktivne politike zapošljavanja.

Sistemske mere omogućavati rodnu ravnopravnost, iskazanu kvalitativno i kvantitativno. Jačati uloge i uticaj žena u procesu rada, rukovođenja, upravljanja. Sprečavati uznemiravanja i nasilja na poslu. Stvarati transparentni sistem nagradjivanja za uloženi rad.

Osiguranje osnovne i celozivotne socijalne zaštite za sve kojima je i kada je potrebna, na načelima solidarnosti, kao i podele rizika, ali i mogućnost dopunskog socijalnog osiguranja.

*Drugo*, jačati, prestrukturirati institucije rada i institucionalne okvire; stvarati nove ili reorganizovati postojeće institucije. Truditi se na povećanju dobrobiti, blagostanja za sve, u cilju smanjenja globalno veoma prisutnog siromaštva i patnje.

Stvarati uslove za dostojanstven i održiv rad koji će omogućiti ekonomsku i socijalnu sigurnost i jednakost šansi (prilika) ... Time se ostaje na pravcu jednog od osnovnih ciljeva MOR-a - stvaranje održivog modela razvoja (koji mora biti inkluzivan) i utemeljen na socijalnoj pravdi!

Generalni i globalni cilj je stvaranje uslova za pravedno društvo – utemeljeno na značaju etičkog principa dobra, i za društvo socijalne pravde – utemeljeno na ideji pravde i pravednosti. Koncept socijalne pravde treba biti ugrađen u sve politike. Zatim, primerena naknada za uloženi rad i normalan život dostojan čoveka. Ograničenje maksimalnog broja radnih sati, povećanje bezbednosti na radu i zaštita zdravlja učesnika u procesu rada, samostalno i slobodno upravljanje vremenom - tzv. fleksibilno radno vreme.

Osiguranje socijalnog dijaloga, kolektivnog pregovaranja, kolektivnih ugovora, za čiju realizaciju država treba da preuzima odgovornost.

U odnosu na veštačku inteligenciju u radnoj sredini primenjivati pristup „čovek odlučuje“.

Ulagati u digitalnu infrastrukturu, ali i u razvoj seljačkih domaćinstava koja se veoma teško uključuju u složene i brze, sveobuhvatne promene.

Države, odnosno vlade sa svim učesnicima u socijalnom dijalogu i praksi sveta rada, trebale bi, navedeno je u drugom pilaru Izveštaja, da osmisle strategije o budućnosti rada.

*Treće*, ulaganja u dostojanstven i održivi rad preko pružanja različitih podsticaja poslovnim subjektima za dodatna ulaganja u ljudski faktor rada koji će i u budućnosti trebati da bude, biti i morati da bude osnovni faktor rada i u središtu sveta rada! Toliko, ukratko, o Izveštaju. Kao kulisa, za poznavaoce savremenih prilika u oblasti rada, nije mudro ne pomenuti sve veće polarizacije u svetu rada nastale u informatičko – informacionom društvu, društvu inovacija koje je sve više globalno društvo, zatim porast nejednakosti i na globalnom nivou, demografske promene, „tromost“ nekih sindikata, klimatske promene, migracije, ugrožavanje podataka, različite „stepene siromaštva“ proizašle iz dostignutih stepena tehničko – tehnološkog razvoja na globalnom, regionalnom i državnom (u konkretnim društvima) nivou.

#### 4. NUDIMO DVA REŠENJA

Jedno rešenje, tako mi to smatramo, jeste da se države maksimalno pridržavaju Konvencija MOR – a i da ih ugrađuju u radno zakonodavstvo, pogotovo predloge iz Izveštaja „Rad za svetliju budućnost“, kako bi se ostalo i „zadržao korak“ na putu izgradnje društva budućnosti utemeljenom na socijalnoj pravdi, i u današnjem informatičko – informacionom društvu, odnosno na putu izgradnje novog globalnog, ne samo ekonomskog, poretka kom čovek, sa svim njegovim ljudskim vrlinama, potencijalima i manama, mora biti u središtu.

Još jedno rešenje koje u ovom kratkom prilogu nudimo jeste i da se ekonomski moćne i bogate kompanije dobrovoljno i dragovoljno odreknu dela svojih prihoda i profita koje bi države, preko razvojnih politika, preusmeravale na smanjenje jaza između bogatih i siromašnih. Za takve razvojne politike, smatramo jer znamo, mogu se odlučivati samo oni koji su sveobuhvatno upućeni ne samo u istoriju rada, filozofiju rada i istoriju društva, generalno, nego i koji su dobrano zagledani u humanističku budućnost rada, a to znači budućnost sveta. Jer, i u eri digitalnih tehnologija i sve veće primene automatizovanih i robotizovanih proizvodnih sistema i procesa, rad jeste, a u informatičko – informacionoj budućnosti koja je već počela, rad će biti, kao što je uvek do sada bio, osnovni društveni proces, uslov progressa, razvoja (održivog) i opstanka u budućnosti. Nove tehnologije upravo nam stvaraju ostvarljive materijalne i proizvodne pretpostavke za realno ostvarenje humanizacije rada, kulture rada, a to znači i etičnosti, odnosno moralnosti rada. Mada se na prvi pogled čini da za takvo rešenje ima vremena i da će vreme, kao i mnogo puta do sada, „odraditi svoje“, zbog brzine promena, smatramo da takvom rešenju treba pristupiti bez odlaganja. Umni Federiko Major, jedan od bivših direktora UNESCO – a, upozorio nas je da „sutra je uvek kasno“. [10]

S pravom, nudimo mi i treće rešenje, a njega čini mnogo potencijalno mogućih rešenja koja imaju mnogi drugi, od nas sposobniji i umniji. Rečju, mogućnosti je i ovaj put mnogo. Želimo da verujemo, zato je to akt vere, da se svet rada neće naći u nezgodi poput, iz poslovice znane, bube u rešetku: „Mnogo rupa, a izlaza niotkud“?!

Ljudi, odnosno deca rađaće se i dalje, a sa aspekta potreba „opsluženja“ novih robotsko-automatizovanih tehnologija, biće sve suvišniji! Prostora za nova zapošljavanja biće i u budućnosti. U industriji radnici će biti sve nepotrebni i sve suvišniji, osim visokokvalifikovanih i onih nužnih, ali veoma osposobljeni, za održavanje. U nekim drugim sektorima, radnici će biti sve potrebni. Npr. u vaspitanju i obrazovanju, turizmu, uslugama generalno, organskoj poljoprivredi, sportu, zabavi i dr. Na vladama i kompanijama je da se „prestrojavaju“, da na vreme uhvate „reformski korak.“

Vreme je i ovaj put prvorazredni resurs. Na svima nama je da se prestrojavamo u vrtlogu brzih i radikalnih promena, da nađemo svoje mesto u njima. Navodimo samo dve kombinacije drevne mudrosti o vremenu. Po jednoj, „sve što možeš uraditi danas, ne ostavljaj za sutra“. Po drugoj, „sve što možeš uraditi sutra, nemoj uraditi danas“.

Razlika je ovde ipak suštinska, mentalitetna. Danas nama i sudbinska. Da li ćemo se, na personalnom nivou i na društveno – političkom nivou opredeliti za prvo ili drugo, to je do nas lično i do svih nas!

#### LITERATURA

- [1] Tomas Mor, “Utopija”, Kultura, Beograd, (1964)
- [2] Tomazo Kampanela, “Grad Sunca”, Kultura, Beograd, (1964)
- [3] Savo Trifunović: “Uvod u sociologiju rada”, Mašinski fakultet, Kraljevo, (1997)
- [4] Aleksander King: “Nova industrijska revolucija ili samo nova tehnologija? ”, Mikroelektronika i društvo, za bolje ili za lošije, (urednici Ginter Fridrihs i Adam Šaf), „Globus“, Zagreb, (1987)
- [5] Džon Evans: “Radnik i radno mesto”; Mikroelektronika i društvo, za bolje ili za lošije, (urednici Ginter Fridrihs i Adam Šaf), Globus, Zagreb, (1987)
- [6] Alvin Tofler: “Treći talas I i II”, Prosveta, Beograd, (1983)
- [7] Klaus Lenk: “Informatička tehnologija i društvo”, u knjizi Gintera Fridrihsa i Adama Šafa.
- [8] [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/-cabinet/documents/publication/wcms\\_662410.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/-cabinet/documents/publication/wcms_662410.pdf)
- [9] [http://www.nhs.hr/novosti/buducnost\\_rada\\_izvjestaj\\_globalne\\_komisije\\_medunarodne\\_organizacije\\_rada\\_60334/](http://www.nhs.hr/novosti/buducnost_rada_izvjestaj_globalne_komisije_medunarodne_organizacije_rada_60334/)
- [10] Federiko Zaragosa Major, “Sutra je uvek kasno“, „Jugoslovenska revija“, Beograd, (1991)

# A Contribution to Deliberation over the Future of Work

Savo S. Trifunović<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Mechanical and Civil Engineering Kraljevo University of Kragujevac, Dositejeva 19, Kraljevo

*Human work is a fundamental social relationship which has its own technological, social, economic and human dimension. It has a future, too. First some advantages and disadvantages of new technologies are outlined, and then The Report of the International Labour Organization "Work for a brighter future" is presented in short and supported by the author of the paper. The author points out his positive vision of the future of work but some doubts are indicated, as well. Finally, two solutions for a more human future of work are offered in the paper.*

**Key words: Future of work, Report, Technologies, Humanization, Solutions**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

From the earliest times people have deliberated over the importance of work as a fundamental social process and projected their ideas, suggestions (outcomes), more or less successful, on reality and future of work. Almost all prominent thinkers who lived on the European regions of culture participated and discussed on the issue of work. Starting with Hesiod, Plato and Aristotle, Roman thinkers, Augustine and Aquinas, classics of Marxist thought, to modern sociologists and philosophers of work. For instance, the great English social utopian Thomas More in his *Utopia*, published in 1518, suggested that "a working day lasts six hours". [1] The great Italian utopian Tommaso Campanella was right when he claimed in his work *The City of the Sun*, published in 1623, that "severe poverty makes people wicked, cunning, cheaters, thieves, liars, exiles and scoundrels, perjurers, etc., while wealth makes people insolent, proud, ignorant, traitors, people pretending to know what they do not know, cheaters, people without love, scoundrels etc".[2] This notable social utopian suggested "four hours of work a day".[2] In 18th century Karl Marx suggested eight hours of work a day. He also pointed to the importance of development of productive forces and productive relations which are based on proprietary relations (*auri sacra fames*). He also noted the necessity of humanization of work, culture of work, liberation of work and man, not only in working environment but in the society as well, with proper understanding of significance and potentials of material productive forces for growth of working process and society. Deliberation and reflection on the future of work today is also a first-class social, global and local necessity. [3]

## 2. SOME ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES

New technologies have both advantages and disadvantages. They have positive and negative effects on man, on present and future development of society. We are lucky to be the contemporaries of paving the wide way of future for the great return of techno to *techne*, for changing the growth in (integral and sustainable) development, for

humanization and ethicization of man and the world of work. Globally, not only locally.

New technologies, as often happens in the history of technologies and societies, had some advantages when they were introduced. Later, during "*exploitation*" some advantages were noticed, and some possibilities of abusing the then new technologies not only in terms of technology but in terms of society, economics and politics. It was the disadvantages noticed during the application which were the impulse to innovators to improve the then new technologies and to make newer new technologies. That is also the case with today's new technologies.

*Advantages* of new technologies [4] are felt most by those who own them, use them and invest in them. Also by those who are "in the zone of action". Advantages of new technologies give us the basis for optimism and optimistic view on the future of work and social progress.

New technologies create social conditions for: the abolition of poverty, the most difficult and disgraceful social disease of this century (as is the case with previous centuries); the powerful widening of intellectual potentials, creativity, new types and shapes of creativity, victorious innovative ethics; the possibility of creating new social welfare and well-being; the high standard of living; the revision of ethics of work and business ethics which are the basis of developed (too rich) societies. So as to become not only *rich* but also *good* societies.

New technologies enable: expanding "information connection" between individuals and nations; reality and *vision* of the world with no "*corvée*" of physical labour; greater democratization; disencumberment of towns, especially *cities* and development of rural and undeveloped areas or countries.

In the light of society and economics, new technologies: move man from the "sphere" (working environment) where dirty, tiresome, dangerous works are done; change the buyers' habits; enable shorter working hours and longer working life of employees.

Every listing, which is evaluation and prediction at the same time, no matter how analytical and reasonable it may be, is never complete because it is afflicted with vague wording. It is the case here, too.

*Disadvantages* of new technologies are felt most by those who own and use them. Also by those who are "in the zone of action", to avoid the term radiation.

New technologies endanger human environment in a specific way, they contribute to global warming, acid rains etc. Just like previous technologies, new technologies break down or malfunction. They deepen the gap between increasingly richer (too) rich countries and increasingly poorer poor countries. Today the authorities are less able to slow down the rapid technological and economic growth and introduction of new processes, systems and legislation, in order to buy time for gradual adjustment to new technologies and new conditions, because "every country will try to achieve wider markets and maintain an advantage by means of innovations". [4]

New technologies threaten, to the total destruction, cultural sovereignty and local cultural identity.

We can see today that in the world of work there is increasing lack of will to work and demoralization; lower physical mobility of people ("a sitting man"); alienation of man in working environment and society; "We are already aware of the hypnotic power a TV set has on people who are glued to their armchairs for hours and it forces children to enter the world of grown-up thinking at their own expense. The concentration of sources of information in a single room, the focus of communication abilities, of which many are impersonal and distant, the density of educational and entertaining programs and many other factors may deaden a family and isolate it from other people. It may easily lead to growing alienation of individuals, inactive speaking out against society, which frequently happens today, and to passive and perfidious alienation with the loss of human dignity and self-esteem. In other words, will the automation of a large part of human activities eventually lead to automation of mankind? It probably will, but if automation is properly understood and accepted, it can do just the opposite; [4] growing cultural split of social and personal identity; rousingly important lowering and narrowing the possibility of social and economic choice to a "common worker" and a "common citizen".

The expanding number of ergonomic problems [5] is noticed due to working in front of a monitor, increased psychic tension, stress at work, exhaustion, specific tiredness, eye strain, backache, headache, and the biggest psychic and social danger caused by the "contact with virtual reality", instead of reality. Today we already experience discomfort (even neuroses and psychoses) because we consider work to be constantly supervised, constantly observed ("work under control"). And danger from excessive deepening into "virtual world", from voluntary auditory exclusion (sounds, tones, conversation) from other people a man is sitting by, working with, but in fact not being with them. «When you see somebody is working, do not join them (so as not to disturb!). » No matter how witty this saying is when related to work with typical agricultural tools, it is a serious warning when related to work with IT tools.

"Bring computers into people's homes", Alvin Toffler [4] used to say, "and there won't be a need for them to gather anymore." [6] In his own sweet home, a man of our time will be able to keep company with a "smart appliance". To "individually individualize" because computer technologies massively individualize. And to compensate for the missing part, something that he is deprived of in his personality

structure. The issue of the impact and effects of new technologies on underdeveloped countries (in terms of technology "some world out there") requires much more space than we want in this paper.

There are some doubts that too rich and rich countries, seen through the prism of new technologies, will become even richer and richer. And in this type of classification their number will decrease. Undeveloped countries will become more undeveloped and poorer. And their number will increase. That is how we define the general law of effects new technologies have on national economies. "The need and development of technology are influenced in a way that it primarily serves the interests and goals of the powerful and rich. Matthew effect ("The rich get richer and the poor get poorer") appears as the most pronounced effect of new information technologies which make the powerful even more powerful".[7] That is the scenario we do not believe in. We want to believe that new technologies will contribute to a greater democratization and to a greater realization of human rights according to achieved level of development of some societies. Therefore, that is, in our opinion, an act of faith.

### 3. "WORK FOR A BRIGHTER FUTURE"

Our positive vision of the future of work (which is always projected by "the grey-haired") has a foothold and hope, among other things, in the ILO's Report titled "Work for a brighter future". Namely, the International Labour Organization (ILO) celebrated its 100th anniversary (1919-2019) and on that occasion its Global Commission on the Future of Work, which was established two years ago, submitted the Report entitled "Work for a brighter future" containing 69 and 75 pages in the original version and Annex, respectively. [8] We will briefly outline the key points of the Report.

The report calls on the governments of the ILO or UN member states to take action to respond to many major challenges of the world of work in the digital age of today, the challenges being unprecedented in the human history because of the scale and speed of change. In the context of gloomy image (e.g., "two billion people make a living in the informal economy; three hundred million workers live in extreme poverty; 2.78 million people die every year due to injuries at work and due to occupational diseases; 36.1% of the global workforce works overtime (more than 48 hours a week); ... between 1980 and 2016, the richest 1% of the world's population received 27% of global income growth, while 50% of the poorest received only 12%; women are paid about 20% less than men) [9] the Commission, however, proposed and recommended the program about the future of work in the form of three pillars.

*First*, to increase the investment in a man (so-called human factor of work) and to expand his abilities, skills, knowledge, competences, but also to increase his standard of living and well-being.

To provide lifelong education for new qualifications, retraining, additional qualifications, supplementary formal and nonformal learning from an early age to education of adults. Thus the governments, employers and employees, educational institutions have a common responsibility for establishing appropriate and sustainable financial system for implementation of the concept of lifelong education. It is necessary to provide the development of a lifelong learning

system without reducing education only to a narrow acquisition of skills, because it must have a much broader framework, due to rapid changes that are taking place (development of so-called general skills).

To strengthen the institutions and institutional frameworks in order to facilitate the increasingly difficult transition of young people from schools to the world of work; to enable the elderly to work as long as they wish (towards a "lifelong active society"); to provide various supports and benefits to workers due to the increasingly difficult managing with rapid and extensive changes; to create a proactive policy of employment.

To ensure gender equality, expressed both qualitatively and quantitatively, by systematic measures. To strengthen the roles and influence of women in the process of work, leadership, management. To prevent harassment and violence at work. To create a transparent system of rewards for the efforts involved.

To ensure basic and lifelong social protection for all who need it and whenever they need it, on the principles of solidarity, as well as risk sharing, but also the possibility of supplementary social insurance.

*Second*, to strengthen and restructure the institutions of work and institutional frameworks; to create new or reorganize present institutions. To strive to increase welfare, well-being for all, in order to reduce globally widespread poverty and suffering.

To create the conditions for dignified and sustainable work which will provide economic and social security and equal chances (opportunities) ... Thus the course of one of the ILO's main goals is maintained: to create a sustainable development model (which must be inclusive) which is based on social justice!

The general and global goal is to create the conditions for a just society - based on the importance of the ethical principle of good, and for a society of social justice - based on the idea of justice and fairness. The concept of social justice should be embedded in all policies. Then, an adequate compensation for work done and a decent life worthy of a person. To limit the maximum number of working hours, to increase safety at work and health protection of participants in the work process, independent and free time management - the so-called flexible working hours.

To ensure the social dialogue, collective negotiation, collective agreements, for the realization of which states should take responsibility.

To apply the approach "man makes decisions" in relation to artificial intelligence in the work environment.

To invest in digital infrastructure, but also in the development of rural households which are hardly integrated into complex and rapid comprehensive changes.

The states and their governments along with all actors in the social dialogue and practice in the world of work, should devise strategies for the future of work as stated in the second pillar of the Report.

*Third*, to invest in dignified and sustainable work through the provision of various incentives to business entities for additional investment in the human factor of work that in the future should be, will be and will have to be the basic factor of work and at the very center of the world of work! These are the outlines of the Report. For connoisseurs of contemporary opportunities in the field of work, it is unwise not to mention the increasing polarizations in the world of work that have emerged in the information society, the society of innovations which is becoming global, then the

rise of inequality on the global level, demographic changes, "sluggishness" of some trade unions, climate changes, migrations, data security, different "poverty rates" stemming from the achieved levels of technical and technological development at global, regional and national levels (in concrete societies).

#### 4. TWO SOLUTIONS ARE OFFERED

One solution, we believe, is for states to comply with the ILO's Conventions to the fullest extent and to incorporate them into labour legislation, especially the proposals within the Report "Work for a brighter Future" in order to keep up with creation of a society of the future based on social justice, and in today's information society, that is, to keep up with creation of a new global, not only economic, order where man, with all his virtues, potentials and shortcomings, must be at the center.

Another solution we offer in this paper is for economically powerful and wealthy companies to voluntarily and willingly give up a portion of their income and profits that the countries would direct, through development policies, to reduce the gap between the rich and poor. We believe, because we know, that such development policies can only be implemented by those who are comprehensively familiar not only with the history of work, philosophy of work and history of society in general, but also by those who are thoroughly acquainted with the humanistic future of work, that is the future of the world. Therefore, in the age of digital technologies and the increasing use of automated and robotized production systems and processes, work is, and in the information future that has already begun work will be, as it has always been, the basic social process, a precondition of progress, (sustainable) development and survival in the future. New technologies are currently creating achievable material and production preconditions for real achievement of humanization of work, culture of work, and thus morality of work. Although at first glance it seems that there is time for such a solution, we believe that such a solution should be addressed without delay because of the rapid changes. Federico Mayor, one of the former directors of UNESCO, wisely warned us that "tomorrow is always late". [10] And he was right.

We also offer a third solution, and it consists of many potentially possible solutions that many others, who are more capable and intelligent than we are, have. In short, there are many possibilities as usual. We want to believe, and that is an act of faith, that the world of work will not find itself in trouble like a bug in a sieve from a popular proverb: "Many holes, but no way out"?!

People and children will still be born, but in terms of the need to "service" new automated and robotized technologies, they will be increasingly redundant! There will be room for new employment in the future. In industry, workers will be increasingly unnecessary and increasingly redundant, except for the highly qualified and necessary ones, but very skilled for maintenance. In some other sectors, workers will be increasingly needed. For example, in education, tourism, and services in general, organic agriculture, sports, entertainment, etc. The governments and companies have to redirect their activities and to catch up with the reforms in time. Time is a first-class resource as usual.

We all have to transform ourselves in a whirlpool of rapid and radical changes and to find our place in them. Here are only two combinations of ancient wisdom about time. The first one is "Don't leave for tomorrow what can be done today". The other one says, "What you can do tomorrow, don't leave for today." However, the difference between them is essential and it is related to mentality. It is a question of our fate. Will we, at the personal level and at the socio-political level, commit ourselves to the first or the second one, is a personal choice and a choice of us all!

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Tomas Mor, "Utopija", Kultura, Beograd, (1964)
- [2] Tomazo Kampanela, "Grad Sunca", Kultura, Beograd, (1964)
- [3] Savo Trifunović: "Uvod u sociologiju rada", Mašinski fakultet, Kraljevo, (1997)
- [4] Aleksander King: "Nova industrijska revolucija ili samo nova tehnologija?", Mikroelektronika i društvo, za bolje ili za lošije, (urednici Ginter Fridrihs i Adam Šaf), „Globus“, Zagreb, (1987)
- [5] Džon Evans: "Radnik i radno mesto"; Mikroelektronika i društvo, za bolje ili za lošije, (urednici Ginter Fridrihs i Adam Šaf), Globus, Zagreb, (1987)
- [6] Alvin Tofler: "Treći talas I i II", Prosveta, Beograd, (1983)
- [7] Klaus Lenk: "Informatička tehnologija i društvo", u knjizi Gintera Fridrihsa i Adama Šafa.
- [8] [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/-cabinet/documents/publication/wcms\\_662410.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/-cabinet/documents/publication/wcms_662410.pdf)
- [9] [http://www.nhs.hr/novosti/buducnost\\_rada\\_izvjestaj\\_globalne\\_komisije\\_medunarodne\\_organizacije\\_rada\\_60334/](http://www.nhs.hr/novosti/buducnost_rada_izvjestaj_globalne_komisije_medunarodne_organizacije_rada_60334/)
- [10] Federiko Zaragosa Major, "Sutra je uvek kasno", „Jugoslovenska revija“, Beograd, (1991)