

THE KEY CHALLENGES FOR MODERN CAPITALISTIC ECONOMY: ECONOMIC-SOCIOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL-ECONOMIC THEORIES

Slavko Sasajkovski

Doctor of Sociological Sciences, Scientific Advisor and Full Professor at the
Institute for Sociological, Political and Juridical Research, “Ss. Cyril and
Methodius” University in Skopje,

sasajkovski@hotmail.com

Ljubica Micanovska

graduated sociologist, freelancer

micanovska@hotmail.com

Abstract

Challenges of the modern capitalist economy, due to their seriousness, depth and longevity, are an extremely attractive and richly creative productive challenge for the contemporary economic-sociological and political-economic thought. The real approach to these challenges cannot actually be divided into strictly disciplinary-economic, economic-sociological, political-economic... The approach that will lead to scientific and professional knowledge that in a real way and at a completely relevant level will enable the establishment of a thematic and conceptual basis for appropriate and optimal functional overcoming of those challenges. The strictly economic approach, i.e. the scientific-theoretical and scientific-methodological approach of economics in its narrower definition as a science, certainly cannot and will definitely not lead to achieving the required quality of scientific and professional knowledge about the nature of modern challenges of capitalist economy and of capitalist social relations as a whole. Thus, as a rule, all the most relevant empirical and theoretical researches on the contemporary challenges of the capitalist economy and capitalist social relations in general are multidisciplinary. At the same time, a common place, more precisely a research subject and research knowledge in those researches, for example the researches of Piketty, Stiglitz, Mazzucato, Saez and many others, is the treatment of the unequal distribution of global and national treasures. This distribution is empirically measured through the Gini coefficient, as the most essential and fundamental challenge of modern capitalist economic and social relations. In a kind of, i.e. almost inevitable communion with the problem of state interventionism. His resuscitation, the resuscitation of his scope, of this power, of his breakthrough through the totality of capitalist economic and social relations.

KEY WORDS: Modern capitalist economy; Unequal distribution of global wealth; Resuscitation of state interventionism and its power

INTRODUCTION

The problems of the unequal distribution of global and national wealth, calculated and exposed through the Gini coefficient, and the revitalization of state interventionism versus the concept of the neoliberal free market, placed in their community are certainly the two key problems of the modern capitalist economy. And these are not just the latest, most pressing global problems of the neoliberal capitalist economy. The global economic and financial-economic problems in the period after August 2008 when the bubble in the US real estate market burst, as problems of very serious stagflation tendencies and conditions, gained their continuity through the global economic and economic-financial problems induced by the pandemic of the SARS-COV-2 virus and the COVID-19 disease and with the Russian-Western, practically Russian-American dramatic and traumatic relations, focused on the events in Ukraine as their direct occasion, but not the cause. More specifically, we are talking about the individual problems of the very serious growth of recessions and inflationary tendencies and conditions. Which means that the previous trend and the previous state of stag-deflation has been replaced by the trend and the state of stagflation. These conditions, first of stag-deflation and then stagflation, not only (daily) political, but structurally and systemically, revitalized the concept of state interventionism, conceptually and practically-politically as the only functional way and mechanism for overcoming the established crisis stag-deflation, i.e. stagflationary conditions. This time of the modern capitalist economy at the level of concreteness is a time of both fast-growing budget deficits and government and public debt.

But despite all the seriousness of these tendencies and conditions, the basic problem of modern capitalist economic and social relations is the problem of the unequal distribution of global wealth and national treasures. This problem gets its appropriate manifestation as a subject of theoretical and empirical research of economists, economic sociologists and political economists who in some way in a way are promoted and confirmed as a professional and scientific elite. This text is dedicated to their research.

“GREAT RESET”

The concept and project of the Great Reset is perhaps the best and most convincing way of showing and arguing that modern capitalist economic relations and the whole of modern capitalist social relations are indeed facing serious problems and challenges. And that is exactly why modern capitalist economy and modern capitalist social relations need a Great Reset. Of course, the concepts of a great new reset are not concepts of alternativeness, but concepts that should enable the overcoming of existing problems and challenges, maybe even cycles of crises, but strictly on the existing foundations, principles and postulates. The strength of the significance of this Great Reset lies in the fact that such a great reset is advocated and such a concept of a great reset has been sponsored by the global corporate and

political elite. The concept and project of the Great Reset, together with the concept of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, is in fact the concept and project of the Global Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, which is the gathering place of that global corporate and political elite, and where the most pressing problems and challenges of modern capitalist economic and social relations are discussed. It is a very strong symbolism of the concept of the Great Reset: if the global corporate and political elite, the elite of the modern capitalist economic and total social order, is concerned about the problems and challenges of that order and therefore advocates its reset, then indeed those problems and challenges are real, and, moreover, are serious and worrying. This fact must be paid full attention to, because it very powerfully illustrates and proves the seriousness of the problems and challenges of the modern capitalist and total social order: the corporate and political elite of that order is not determined and does not advocate for any of its cosmetic changes, adjustments and repairs, but, much more than that, advocates and announces specific organized, systematic and convincing activities for its completely new Great Reset. A great reset of the old, original foundations, principles and postulates that are obviously considered to be essentially and thoroughly undermined, devalued and compromised through the convincingly manifested problems and challenges of modern capitalist economic and social relations. That is why a completely new Great Reset is needed, not partial and palliative solutions to overcome existing problems and challenges.

The Great Reset, along with the challenge of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, the challenge of artificial intelligence, has been the subject of many meetings, not just the annual regular meetings in Davos, officially and formally as meetings of the World Economic Forum in the post-2020 period. The theory and concept of the Great Reset in the most concrete and obvious way are probably contained in the book by Klaus Schwab and Thierry Malleret *COVID-19: The Great Reset*, published in 2020. Moreover, the pandemic was only the most immediate reason for the extremely serious re-examination of the biggest problems and challenges of the modern capitalist economy and of the modern capitalist social relations as a whole, with the starting point and thesis that modern capitalism as a system is no longer appropriate for the new time of the 21st century.

Leading theorists, ideologues, and promoters of the Great Reset theory and concept generally defined them as an appropriate strategy primarily aimed at successfully overcoming the effects of the pandemic on global capitalist economic relations, but with one very important addition. An addition that most realistically theoretically, conceptually and ideologically-politically in the past could by no means be expected from the global capitalist political and economic elite. And who at the same time, in the most plastic and obvious way possible, shows and argues the seriousness of the problem and the challenge of the unequal distribution of global and national wealth. Namely, exactly that problem and challenge is the above-mentioned supplement, with the conclusion that the problem and the challenge of unequal distribution is even deeper in the period of the pandemic.

The theory and concept of the Great Reset has at its core the commitment to the systemic and structural transformation of modern capitalism as stakeholder capitalism. In fact, the Great Reset project would have three fundamental components: the stakeholder economy; building infrastructure in a more resilient, fairer and more sustainable way that would be guided by environmental, social and political criteria and standards; exploiting the innovations of the fourth industrial revolution in favor of achieving and satisfying public needs and goals.

Within these three fundamental components, a number of measures and activities are defined more specifically, such as, for example, the promotion of fiscal policy; tax reform, including fairer wealth taxes; using the experiences of the pandemic health and pharmaceutical response, including the development of coronavirus vaccines in a relatively short time, as a basis for the development of other economic sectors as part of the Fourth Industrial Revolution.

In any case, these completely sublimated representations and analyzes of the theory and concept of the Great Reset can be finalized at the most elementary level possible with the conclusion that for the theoretical, conceptual, ideological and political determinations of the global political and corporate elite, the determination and commitment to certain transformation of modern, (neo-liberal) capitalist economic and social systems and structures, a real and serious turning point is the concrete positioning of the need for interventions in fiscal policies in order to achieve greater social solidarity and justice. And that inevitably implies (s) commitment to raising the quality of competencies and the power of state interventionism. Obviously, reality as an extremely hard determinant, at least in part, breaks through the foundations and frameworks of theoretical, conceptual and ideological-political settings.

“PROGRESSIVE CAPITALISM”

This phrase is just one of the many phrases that in the professional and scientific, as well as in the wider social public, recognize the theoretical and conceptual attempts of the world's most famous economists, economic sociologists and political economists to offer, promote and argue their, primarily theoretical and conceptual, solutions to the essential, fundamental and crucial crisis problems and challenges of the modern capitalist economy and at the same time to the overall social relations of the capitalist systems. It is quite expected and understandable that these theoretical and conceptual attempts, which are set and move along the line of recognizing and accepting the conclusion that the crisis problems and challenges of the modern capitalist economy are not only of an easily transient character and that they, as such, will be overcome through the anti-cyclical and anti-crisis autonomous action of the mechanism of adjusting the laws of the free, (neo)liberal market, in general, those theoretical and conceptual attempts should be based on the Keynesian theoretical and conceptual commitment. A determination that is a theoretical, conceptual and ideological-political essential and fundamental opposition to the (neo)liberal theoretical, conceptual and

ideological-political commitment. In this sense it is quite normal and understandable for Keynesian economic, economic-sociological and political-economic researchers and thinkers their theoretical and conceptual positions regarding the search for the causes of crisis problems and challenges of modern capitalist economic relations, together, quite clearly and normally, by offering answers and solutions to those crisis problems and challenges, critically and negatively to concretize them towards the essential and fundamental determinations of the (neo)liberal economic, economic-sociological and political-economic set-up and positioning. Basically offering an appropriate alternative precisely and purposefully to the (neo)liberal capitalist economic relations, and not in general and thoroughly to the capitalist economic relations, as a system and as a structure of economic and total social relations.

This is the theoretical and conceptual framework in which the theoretical and conceptual economic, economic-sociological and political-economic determination of Progressive capitalism is generated and pulsed. Theoretical and conceptual positioning that is most directly aimed at detecting and identifying the fundamental and crucial weaknesses and negatives of the state-interventionist unlimited modern (neo-liberal) capitalist economy.

The phrase Progressive capitalism, as a theoretical, conceptual and ideological-political syntagm, is primarily personalized through Josef Stiglitz, one of the closest circle of the most renowned and esteemed researchers and theorists of modern capitalist economic, economic-sociological and political-economic relations. He also won the 2001 Nobel Prize in Economics (along with Michael Spence and George Akerlof) for his research on labor markets. Stiglitz elaborates and argues the concept of Progressive Capitalism most fully and clearly in his very famous work "People, Power, and Profits: Progressive Capitalism for an Age of Discontent", from 2019 (Stiglitz, 2019).

Stiglitz starts from the thesis that modern capitalist society needs a better understanding of the true creator of national wealth. That creator is the people, that creator is the social community in its totality, ie the creative interaction of the citizens and their social institutions. The fundamental goal of progressive capitalism should be to achieve a more dynamic economy, which, essential to Stiglitz's theory of progressive capitalism, will provide prosperity and well-being for the whole of society. In this place, however, Stiglitz emphasizes that it is of great importance, perhaps crucial, that this general social prosperity will extend to the capitalist middle class. Exactly that social class that is really the biggest loser in the period after 2008, exactly the period that seriously aggravated the contradictions and weaknesses of the modern capitalist economy and the modern capitalist society as a whole.

Stiglitz calls for the reform of modern capitalism, which theoretically, conceptually and ideologically-politically should be based on foundations that will, at the very least, balance the negative consequences produced by the (neo-liberal) principles and postulates on which the modern capital is based and functioning.

In that context, Stiglitz advocates for strengthening the competencies of state interventionism, especially in terms of strengthening trust between economic entities. Trust that can be primarily strengthened by overcoming the speculative possibilities that are characteristic of the (neo)liberal free market, i. e. (neo)liberal free market economy. In this sense, Stiglitz, placing his elaboration and argumentation, dwells (s) on the field of political economy by emphasizing the power of political factors, of political institutions, to compromise, to corrupt the capitalist-economic market, as a free market, as a market in which its original laws operate quite freely. Such a corrupt market is the main source of inequality in the social community, ie it is the main source of the unequal distribution of national wealth, as the most essential and fundamental problem and challenge of the modern capitalist economy and the modern capitalist society as a whole.

Stiglitz distinguishes between benevolent, positive creation of national wealth as opposed to the predatory extraction of that wealth. Stiglitz sees and defines the rent-seeking of the modern (neo-liberal) capitalist economy as a basic source, as the foundation of the modern-capitalist economy, ie the unequal distribution of the modern-capitalist national wealth. In this sense, it is quite logical to determine the focus of the reforms of the modern, (neo-liberal) capitalist economy to be aimed at achieving the maximum possible competition in the markets as real, as original free markets. This theoretical and conceptual position of Stiglitz further presupposes and means that Stiglitz in a certain, but quite clear way neglects the role and power, for example, of private property and wage labor as sources and foundations of the unequal distribution of national wealth, i. e. the real and original functioning of the free market economy.

Stiglitz theoretically and conceptually does not deny the original systemic and structural foundations of capitalist economic and social relations as a whole. It does not seek or offer an alternative to the capitalist economic and total social order, to its systemic set-up and to its structural construction. Stiglitz sees and focuses on the basic systemic and structural problems of the modern (neo-liberal) theoretical, conceptual and ideological-political conception and performance of capitalist economic and overall social relations. Stiglitz essentially and in reality offers a correction of, according to his theoretical, conceptual and ideological-political view and understanding, the ultimate, most negative consequences for the overall social well-being of the vast majority of citizens. It is the core of his theoretical, conceptual and ideological-political definition and argumentation of Progressive Capitalism, as, in a certain way and with a certain content, a wider humanized economic and overall social order and system.

“ENTREPRENEURIAL STATE“

This concept of an entrepreneurial state is the concept of Mariana Mazzucato, one of the most prominent modern economists, economic sociologists and political

economists. With this concept, in a certain way, the theoretical, conceptual and political-practical tendency for reaffirmation and resuscitation of the general concept of state interventionism within the modern capitalist economy is brought to some final consequence. Of course, this is a concept that does not thoroughly question the established basic principles, postulates and rules of the free market economy, but pushes the boundaries of the competencies and powers of state interventionism in conditions of crisis deformations and dysfunctions of the free market economy. That is, this must be reiterated countless times because it has an essential and exclusive meaning, the economic/socio-economic moment when the modern capitalist economy, as a free market economy, will enter one of the regular cycles of crisis dysfunction. The problem and challenge of state interventionism, more specifically the scope of competencies and powers of the modern (capitalist) state, became especially acute in the period after 2008, i. e. after the bursting of the US real estate bubble and the huge global financial and general economic consequences. For example, the Dodd-Frank Act (Sasajkovski, 2011) and the Volcker Rule (Sasajkovski, 2014) were enacted in the United States.

The essence of the concept of Mazzucato (Mazzucato, 2013) for an entrepreneurial state is that the government should play a major role in directing investments based on economic growth, economic-sociological and overall social development. This is the only way to prevent a recurrence of the financial and economic-financial crisis that escalated in the summer of 2008. According to her, the state should set the great goals of the overall social development and to determine and practically apply the means, mechanisms and all the necessary resources for their successful achievement. And, further, she strives for the state to socialize the risks and rewards. The state should have the right to return the invested capital, of course with an appropriate rate of return. The state, together with private investors, would form and shape new markets, creating supply and demand for new products through public procurement.

Mazzucato does not want to offer and does not offer an alternative to the capitalist economic system, but its theoretical and conceptual intervention is aimed at seeking and answering the question of the origin of economic growth and overall social development, where is the source of innovation as a foundation of growth and development and how to achieve and ensure unity of the private and economic sectors.

Mazzucato argues that in the current economic reality, the fact is the key role of the state in directing and financing thorough research in the field of high technologies, including health, in which private investors are unwilling or unable to invest.

The concept of the Entrepreneurial State, however, does not fundamentally attempt to delegitimize the concept of the modern capitalist economy as a free market economy, but makes a more serious and far-reaching theoretical and conceptual effort to strike a balance between the integrity and dignity of free market law and the integrity and dignity of state interventionism. Its emerging markets are still part of the overall

global or national market. Balancing that in reality presupposes and offers a kind, specific harmonization of the competencies and powers of the free market and state interventionism which in reality, on the one hand, will not substantially and thoroughly undermine the dignity, integrity, real powers of free market laws, on the other hand, at much higher levels such harmonization will rethink and upgrade the integrity, dignity and real powers of state interventionism. And in the field, or in the entrepreneurial zones of the free market economy, field or zones which, at least at first glance and understood quite superficially, do not offer and do not promise high profitability, i. e. a high level of return on capital. As Mariana Mazzucato elaborates and argues. In any case, without crossing the “red line” of structural and systemic questioning of the modern capitalist economy as a free market economy. Mariana Mazzucato, in all its originality, and to extent that it represents in some way a radicalization of the concepts and theories of state interventionism within the modern capitalist economy, however, it remains within the specific further modernization of the modern capitalist economy, by relativizing and reducing its practical improvisations and dysfunctions. The relation of economic, economic-sociological and political-economic theory to Mazzucato’s concept of an entrepreneurial state basically follows the line of separation of the two basic theoretical and conceptual views and attitudes: those (neo)liberal who emphasize the danger of state interventionism on the integrity and dignity of free market laws, accusing Mazzucato of advocating for central planning and marginalization of the free market, and those, including Mazzucato himself, who emphasize the usefulness and even necessity of state interventionism in targeting of investments, especially those investments that are investments in innovations and which should be one of the basic functions of the state in the field of economic growth and economic-sociological development. But Mazzucato constantly emphasize the unity of the state and the private capital for the successful realization of their development economic and social mission.

Mazzucato points out the contradiction between the way value is created, her theory of value is in fact inseparable from her theory of the entrepreneurial state, and the way that value is distributed. Thereby, it directly and obviously emphasizes the imbalance between collectivization and nationalization of risk taking in innovation processes and the narrow, private, corporate distribution of market profits from those innovations. And this is in clear contradiction with the already stated fact that the new value on the basis of investing in innovations is a product of state or state-private investments in innovations. Very often with majority or dominant capital and any other necessary participation of the state. But in any case, the state as an investor in innovation inevitably appears as an investor in the last resort, when an investment in innovation is obviously necessary for economic growth and economic-sociological and overall social development, and, at the same time, at least in the short term is not visible and is not calculated and projected as profitable for the investments of the private, i. e. the corporate sector.

“OPTIMAL TAXATION”

This theory can be and is primarily related to one of the most famous and respected economists and economic sociologists of today, the Frenchman Emmanuel Saez, who is currently a professor in the United States (Saez, 2018). Saez, either alone or in collaboration with other colleagues, including Thomas Piketty and Gabriel Zucman, is strongly focused on the problem of unequal distribution of wealth both globally and nationally (Piketty, 2012). This research is mostly and largely focused on the American economy and American society in general, something that could be theoretically and methodologically significant given that it is an economy that is globally the largest or until recently was the largest national economy, depending on how and with what that size will be measured, and because there is a focus in this research that addresses and points to the importance of empirical and theoretical research on the correlation between tax policy and the unequal distribution of national wealth.

From all these researches, in this narrow context, based on the rich records through a long historical perspective, it can be concluded that the measures of the tax policy play a big role in shaping the income concentration. At the same time, the highest growth rates reduce the deep differences in the incomes of the social strata, which, in turn, have a pronounced negative impact on economic growth. It is noted that in the United States people do not take a strong stand against inequality per se, as long as inequality is fair. It is pointed out that fair in this particular case means that individual income and wealth reflect the value of what people produce or otherwise contribute to the economic system (Saez, 2020).

Income inequality can be measured before and after taxation. Tax rates applied at different levels of income and on expenditure (deductions, exemptions and preferential rates that modify the outcome of the rate structure) primarily affect how market results are redistributed to affect post-tax inequality. Post-tax inequality in the United States has been on the rise since the 1980s, after a more egalitarian period since the end of World War II. In doing so, quite systematically and in detail, all types of taxes are analyzed, of course in terms of their impact on the unequal distribution of national wealth in the United States (Piketty, 2003).

In these researches, especially theoretical and methodological research focus is placed on the upper 0.1% that participate in the distribution of national wealth. This approach leads to the definition of the political-economic theories of the Great Compression and the Great Divergence. Saez is on the theoretical and conceptual position of the ideal distribution of national wealth. Saez, along with Peter Diamond (Diamond, 2011), concludes that the appropriate tax rate for societies like the American is 73%. Saez, along with Raj Chetty and other collaborators, has empirically researched social mobility trends in the United States. They conclude that key factors affecting social mobility are segregation, income inequalities, school quality, social capital and family structure (Chetty, 2014).

In any case, Saez, together with his colleagues, very intensively and through a very high level of theoretical and, above all, empirical research, is involved in researching and thinking about the problem of unequal distribution of national wealth in correlation with tax systems. He sees tax systems as a very relevant factor in reducing economic and sociological inequalities. In that sense, it researches and concludes on the level of economic-sociological inequalities before and after taxation through some specific tax systems. His research focuses primarily on American economic and economic-sociological reality. But Saez, while advocating the theory of using separate tax systems to reduce the inequality of the distribution of national wealth, is not in some way radically left-leaning, but speaks of optimal taxation. That is, taxation that will not have a particularly negative impact on economic growth and overall social development. At the same time, through redistribution, it will affect the reduction of the unequal distribution of the national wealth. So, at the same time to respect the theory of maximum satisfaction of private, corporate interest as a carrier of economic growth, and the theory of the need to optimally or balanced to meet the economic and sociological interests of all participants in the process of economic reproduction. Including the side of labor, the side of human capital. It must also be noted that Saez, although a close and longtime collaborator with Piketty, is not so sharp in his critique of modern capitalist economic-sociological and political-economic relations. Saez, in spite of all his criticism, remains on the theoretical and conceptual position of improvement, of humanizing the original capitalist economic and social relations as a whole. Thus, the concept of Participatory Socialism is a Pickett concept only.

“PARTICIPATORY SOCIALISM“

So, this concept of Participatory Socialism is the concept of Thomas Piketty, certainly one of the most famous and popular economists, economic sociologists and political economists, not only in the narrow professional and scientific circles, but also in the wider intellectual public. Piketty, unlike, for example, Stiglitz, Saez, Mazzucato, Krugman, and the vast majority of the most prominent global economists, economic sociologists, and political economists, theoretically and conceptually defined as leftists, is one of the few of them that theoretically and conceptually breaks through the theoretical, conceptual, ideological and political foundations and frameworks of the modern capitalist economy and modern capitalist social relations in general. It is quite obvious that Piketty theoretically and conceptually does not talk about capitalism, capitalist economy and some of their even more radical reforms, reforms with a “human face”, reforms that should level the current level of unequal redistribution of national wealth, but strictly within the existing capitalist economic and total social order, rather, it speaks, offers and advocates socialism as an economic and total social order. But immediately specifying that it would be participatory socialism, thus clearly distancing itself from the historically known, ie practically applied economic and total social orders, theoretically, conceptually, ideologically

and politically determined, or self-determined as socialist. Although the very general definition of his socialism as participatory socialism points to the historically known socialist-self-governing form of socialism. Theoretically and conceptually, the determination of Participative socialism is quite systematically and precisely presented in its professional, scientific and in general intellectual very famous and popular works *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, 2013, (Piketty, 2013), and *Capital and Ideology*, 2019, (Piketty, 2019).

Piketty is in principle in the position to non-violently build of the system of Participatory Socialism, through appropriate changes in the corpus of the existing modern capitalist system, changes that after their final, comprehensive and profound undertaking will change the nature of the economic and social system as a whole. In this regard, it should be noted that Piketty attaches special importance to progressive taxes and property taxes, which are considered more appropriate and effective in relation to inheritance tax as mechanisms and tools for evolutionary, but also serious and comprehensive undermining the foundations of the existing capitalist order, which is generating a growing new level of unequal distribution of national wealth and of impoverishment and poverty. Thus, thinks and designs Piketty, basic incomes and start-up capital will be financed for all citizens, which are also very important institutes in the concept of Participatory Socialism. Picketti determines and advocates for income tax and property tax rates of the richest of 60-70%, which would make possible the realization of his idea and projection for an egalitarian economy and for the conversion of ownership over capital into temporary ownership. In order to realize these ideas and projections of Pickett, he emphasized that it is necessary to introduce and achieve global social federalism and the introduction of the same taxes in general on a global level. Furthermore, Piketty argues that the economy of Participatory Socialism must be a circular economy of mixed ownership, social and private property, and that the management of economic entities must also be mixed, which means dividing governing power between owners and workers.

Piketty also moves into the field of political economy by advocating and emphasizing the need to strengthen democratic processes, as a fundamental and essential component of his concept of Participatory Socialism, by enabling voters to have equal political and economic influence and power. Piketty also advocates for the regulation of non-governmental organizations, citizens' associations and philanthropic organizations, to which he expresses great doubt in their practical work, that is, their politicization, quite similar or identical to that of the classical political entities-political parties, in comparison with their declared values, determinations and goals.

However, despite all the meaning and exceptional importance that Piketty attaches to his above-mentioned conceptual determinations and efforts, however, he points out that the key, cardinal and crucial solution for the realization of the idea and system of Participatory Socialism is the realization of an egalitarian system of education. Piketty empirically and accurately shows and argues that there is an

extremely large difference, i. e. socially intolerable inequality, in the opportunities for education in higher education. The statistics used by Piketty show that 90% of the descendants of the richest families enroll in universities, while the descendants of the poorest strata with a percentage of 5-10% enroll in universities. Thus, by disrespecting and destroying the principle, criterion and measure of meritocracy, huge damage is done to human capital as one of the most essential, perhaps the most essential factor, of economic growth and overall social development. In this sense, Piketty advocates solidarity higher education as the most basic and important component and factor of social promotion, as a promotion of meritocracy, i.e. as the most essential component of the idea and project of economic-sociological solidarity and empathy and achieving the required level of equality in the distribution of national wealth. Solidarity higher education, according to Piketty, is the basic factor and mechanism for raising the level of economic-sociological well-being to a much higher level of economic-sociological balance and for achieving the required level of social integration and cohesion. And thus, without a doubt, a higher level of functionality of the social community for the benefit of all social strata.

Above, in this elaboration, the basic principles, postulates and premises of the Piketty concept for Participatory Socialism are presented and commented. As a concept that is not defined and is not aimed only at repairing the existing, modern capitalist economic and overall social order, but, even more essentially, is aimed at conceptualizing a complete, systemic, economic and total social alternative to the capitalist order.

CONCLUSIONS

The problems and challenges of the unequal distribution of global and national wealth and the understandings and definitions of the scope of competencies and powers of state interventionism in relation to the laws of the (neo)liberal market, in any case they are points of theoretical and empirical interest of the most respected economists, economic sociologists and political economists of our modern times. This fact itself calls and argues that precisely these problems and challenges are fully relevant to the modern capitalist economic and social system as a whole. Moreover, the concrete theoretical and conceptual attitude towards these problems and challenges, together with the knowledge from the conducted scientifically-methodologically completely relevant researches, show very directly that these are problems and challenges that in a completely clear and relevant way discrete the modern capitalist economic and overall social order. An order that is generally based on (neo)liberal foundations, (neo)liberal principles, postulates, premises and rules. And that is why some of the most prominent economists, economic sociologists and political economists, whose theoretical views and empirical-research knowledge we have chosen to present and comment on, present their professional and scientific engagement to find concrete solutions to overcome the existing indisputable fundamental and essential problems

and challenges of the modern capitalist economy and of the overall capitalist social relations. With Piketty's exception, all others place their solutions on the basis of their theoretical and empirical research within the framework of the capitalist economic and overall social order. So, they do not offer a systemic alternative. Basically and generally offer only a certain level of humanization of the capitalist order. Above all, reducing the level of unequal distribution of global and national wealth. Through the engagement and use of the prerogatives and powers of state interventionism.

REFERENCES (rigorously selected)

1. Chetty R., Hendren N., Kline P. & Saez E. (2014): Where is the land of Opportunity? The Geography of Intergenerational Mobility in the United States, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Volume 129, Issue 4, November 2014, Pages 1553–1623, www.academic.oup.com/qje/article...
2. Diamond P. & Saez E. (2011): The Case for a Progressive Tax: From Basic Research to Policy Recommendations, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, www.eml.berkeley.edu/
3. Mazzucato M.(2013): *The Entrepreneurial State: Debunking Public vs. Private Sector Myths*, Anthem Press, London, www.digamo.free.fr/mazzucato.pdf
4. Piketty T. & Saez E. (2003): INCOME INEQUALITY IN THE UNITED STATES, 1913–1998, *THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS* Vol. CXVIII February 2003 Issue, www.eml.berkeley.edu/
5. Piketty T. (2012): OPTIMAL LABOR INCOME TAXATION, NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES, www.eml.berkeley.edu...
6. Piketty T. (2013): *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, www.dowbor.org/wp-content/uploads/...
7. Piketty T. (2019): *Capital and Ideology*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, www.pse.ens.fr/files/ideology/Piketty/...
8. Saez E. & Stefanie Stantcheva (2018): A simpler theory of optimal capital taxation, *Journal of Public Economics*, www.eml.berkeley.edu...
9. Saez E.& Zucman G.(2020): The Rise of Income and Wealth Inequality in America: Evidence from Distributional Macroeconomic Accounts, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*—Volume 34, Number 4—Fall 2020—Pages 3–26, [The Rise of Income and Wealth Inequality in America: Evidence from Distributional Macroeconomic Accounts \(gabriel-zucman.eu\)](http://The Rise of Income and Wealth Inequality in America: Evidence from Distributional Macroeconomic Accounts (gabriel-zucman.eu))
10. Sasajkovski S. & Micanovska L.(2011): “THE BIG GOVERNMENT” OF B. H. OBAMA AND THE DODD–FRANK ACT“, International Scientific Conference “Identity in the era of globalization and europeanization”, Institute for sociological, political and juridical research – Skopje, Faculty of Philosophy - Skopje, Skopje, 2011.
11. Sasajkovski S. & Micanovska L.(2014): THE VOLCKER RULE AND THE STATE INTERVENTIONISM OF WALL STREET, 2nd International Conference

“Knowledge – Capital of the Future – New Knowledge for the New People” ,
Institut of Knowledge Management, Skopje, Macedonia, Ohrid, 2014.

12. Schwab K. & Malleret T. (2020): COVID-19: the Great Reset, FORUM PUBLISHING 2020, www.reparti.free.fr/schwab_2020.pdf
13. Stiglitz J. E. (2019): People, power, and profits: progressive capitalism for an age of discontent, New York : W.W. Norton & Company, [2019] ©2019