

SAMIR AMIN

SOCIALISM IN THE XXIst CENTURY

1. My purpose here is not to formulate what XXIst century socialism “will” or “should” be. Any such formulation would go against the reading of Marxism, to which I am committed: socialism (or even better, communism) can only be the result of the struggle of exploited and dominated classes, not the implementation of a ready-made “intellectual” project

One needs however to formulate some broad principles which constitute the initial basis of a thinking on the analysis of the challenges and impacts (inseparable one from the other) of struggles. Principles formulated in the Bamako Appeal (January 2006), which I remind here the broad lines, constitute for me an adequate basis for that:

- (i) Build a world based on human beings and peoples’ solidarity
- (ii) Build a world based on full and total assertion of citizenship and gender equality
- (iii) Build a universal civilisation which offers diversity to all areas of life for their full potential of creative development
- (iv) Build socialisation through democracy
- (iv) Build a world based on the recognition of the non merchant status of nature and the resources of the Planet and agricultural land, capable of facing major environmental and climatic challenges.
- (v) Build a world based on the recognition of the non merchant status of cultural products and scientific knowledge, education and health
- (vi) promote policies which closely associate full democratisation, social progress and assertion of the nations and peoples’ autonomy
- (vii) Assert solidarity of the peoples of the North and South in the construction of an internationalism on an anti-imperialist basis

The reader will find in the Bamako Appeal, edited in many websites, the arguments relating to its principles to which, besides, are adopted by many struggling movements.

No doubt, some will express towards the Appeal that its principles are not up to the requirement of communism which, in the Marxist tradition, imply the complete emancipation from mercantile alienation. Continuing the debate on that ground is certainly necessary, but should not be an obstacle to the will to construct shared strategies of struggle.

Others, even less compromising, will assert their fear those principles will only inspire a perspective giving credibility to the possible advent of a “capitalism with a human face”. As a counter point, my view is progress in their direction can only be the product of victories

gained against the deployment of the logic immanent to capital accumulation. In that sense, they give substance to unavoidable stages on the long march of socialism; unless now, one clings to the “everything now” illusion and the myth of the Revolution (in lieu of revolutionary advances) which, by magic trick, makes communism possible.

2. Present times are characterised for about the past thirty years by an offensive of capitalism (as always “liberal” by nature), and imperialist (also by nature) which hits all dominated classes, both in the North and the South, but more singularly all the peoples of the South (the periphery of the global capitalist system). That offensive is multi-dimensional and attempts imposing an economic management of deregulated markets in favour of capitalism, the dismantling of gained social rights, the stifling through violence of popular resistance, and the conduct of “preventive wars” against rebellious nations. The offensive is led by all imperialist centres (“the Triad”: United States, Europe and Japan), partners of Washington’s leadership.

The moment of euphoria of capitalism and imperialism – on the offensive move under the banner of neo-liberalism and globalisation – has been short-lived (1990-95). Popular classes entered very rapidly into a resistance struggle against that offensive.

Yes, from a general point view, the first tide of resistance was on the battlefields of defensive counter-attack of the offensive on its entire multidimensionality mentioned higher up. The chain of those battlefields is continuous and; according to the circumstances in specific locations, struggles were led on the major ground of the immediate challenges confronting the peoples. In that sense, claims for market deregulations here, promotion of women’s rights, the protection of the environment, the defence of public services, of democracy, as well as armed resistance to the United States and their allies aggression in the Middle East (Iraq, Palestine, Lebanon) are indissociable the ones from the others.

In these resistance struggles the peoples have innovated.

Indeed, the left-wing dominant political culture was marked in the XIXth and XXth centuries by practices based on a vertical hierarchical structure of political parties, trade unions and associations. In the circumstances of that period, the movements they led – radical and reformist social transformations, revolutions, national liberations – transformed the world in a direction generally favourable to popular masses and oppressed people.

Nevertheless, limitations and contradictions characteristic to those forms of actions appeared in full force in the 1980-1990’s. Democratic deficit of those structures, going as far as self-proclamation as being “vanguards” armed with “scientific” knowledge and “efficient” strategy, are at the origin of subsequent deceptions: reforms and revolutions placed in power regimes about which the least one can say is; they frequently badly kept their promises, often degenerated and sometimes in murderous direction. Those failures have facilitated resumption of the offensive of dominant capital and imperialism, from the 1980-1990’s.

Many of the political left-wing forces of the past stayed aloof of the initial struggles, timid in front of the aggression, sometimes joining liberal and imperialist options. The movement was triggered by “new forces”, sometimes in quasi “spontaneously”. In their deployment, these forces have promoted the fundamental principle of democratic practice: rejection of vertical

hierarchy, promoting horizontal forms of cooperation in action. That progress of democratic awareness must be considered as “civilisational” progress.

3. Resistance struggles have recorded undoubted victories. They have kick started (but only so) failure of the capital and imperialism. That failure is visible in all dimensions of that offensive.

The United States project of military control of the planet which is essential to guarantee “success” of present globalisation, “preventive” wars waged to ensure its effectiveness (invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, occupation of Palestine, aggression against Lebanon) are already visibly put into political failure.

The economic and social project said to be neo-liberal and designed to provide strong and stable position to capital accumulation – ensure maximal profit rate at all cost – is, to the own point of view of its own designers (World Bank, IMF, WTO, European Union), incapable of imposing such conditions. It has “broken down”: the WTO Doha round is in a deadlock, the IMF is in financial bankruptcy, etc. The threat of a brutal economic and financial crisis is on the agenda.

4. Nevertheless, there are no grounds for belly-grazing about these successes. They will remain insufficient to transform social and political balances of force in favour of popular classes and, consequently, remain vulnerable as long as the movement will not switch from resistance stand to the offensive. Only that option can open they way to the construction of the positive alternative – “another world is possible” and, a better one of course.

The challenge that peoples in struggle face is entirely contained in the response they will give to this issue: in wordings formulated by François Houtard; moving from the collective awareness of challenges to the construction of active social agents of transformation.

The way forward is and will be difficult because it implies radicalisation of the struggles and their convergence in diversity (to use the formulation of the World Forum of alternatives) i common action plans, which imply a strategic political vision, the definition of immediate and longer term objectives (the “perspective” which define the alternative, for us the alternative of XXIst century socialism).

Radicalisation of struggles does not mean radicalisation of their discourse but their articulation to alternative projects they propose substituting to the system of the prevailing social power: constructing social hegemonies (social classes alliances and compromise) which impose themselves as alternatives to the social hegemonies in power (the ones of alliances constructed by the capital, imperialism and its servile local comprador classes). Beyond a vague “coordination” of struggles (or even simply exchanges of view points) which does not enable transcending their fragmentation (and their related weaknesses), convergence can only be the product of a “politisation” (in the positive sense of the word) of fragmented movements. That requirement is fought by the discourse of “civil society”, an ideology directly imported from the United States, and which continues to exercise devastation.

Convergence in diversity and radicalisation of struggles will find their expressions in the construction of necessary “stages” (some do not even want to here the term invoked, so much

this means to them compromise and opportunism) enabling (i) progress in democratisation associated with social progress, and not dissociated from it and; (ii) the claim of States' nations' and peoples' sovereignty which impose negotiated forms of globalisation and not unilaterally imposed ones by the capital and imperialism.

These definitions of the contents of the alternative construction are certainly not accepted by everyone.

Some think political democracy, were it disassociated from the "social issue" (subjected to market requirements) is "better than nothing". It remains that the peoples of Asia and Africa do not seem in their vast majority ready to fight for that form of democracy disassociated from social progress (and even, in fact, associated in present times to social regression). They often prefer to join very little democratic para religious/ethnic movements. This can be deplored; it would have been better asking oneself the reason for such attitude. "Democracy can neither be exported (by Europe), nor imposed (by the USA). It can only be the product of the victories of the Peoples of the South, through their struggles for social progress, as was (and is) the case in Europe.

All this implies deepening of the debates on the democratisation of societies. I speak of "democratisation", referring thereby to its nature of continuous process in its progression, and not "democracy" which inspire adhesion to ready-made formula proposed by the model of Western representative democracy, which is in fact democracy in regression as we will say the same about the European construction. In the socialist perspective, formula associating social progress and authentic practice of democracy in the conduct of struggles and the management of alternative powers they enable setting in place will be invented by the peoples themselves.

The only reference to the nation, national independence and sovereignty triggers in some an acute urticaria attack. "Sovereignism" is almost view as a "weirdness of the past". The idea of the nation is cast into the rubbish bin; globalisation has supposedly already made it obsolete. Being popular among European middle classes (for evident reasons linked to the issue of the EU construction), that thesis finds no echo in the South (or even in the United States and Japan for that purpose!).

This "non national" (or "post national") vision stems from the idea that globalisation (or regionalisation) is, from now, the decisive level of possible transformations, the national level has already lost that capacity. In other words, continuation of progress in "a single nation" is illusory. The idea is less recent than it would seem and; partly joins the criticism then addressed to the construction of socialism in a single country".

I do not share that point of view (even if I agree with the critical point of view of "socialism in a single country", although progress in that direction could be made in a single country). I do not believe that prior progress at global and regional levels are possible because of the inequality of conditions which enable here and not there.

We will, of course encounter that issue again as regards Europe.

Stage after stage transformation does not exclude affirmation of the long-term perspective.

For some like the author of these lines, it is the one of the “XXIst century socialism”; other reject “socialism” which, for them, is now forever polluted by its praxis of the past century.

But would even the principle of convergence be admitted, its implementation will remain difficult because it means conciliating (i) progress gained during and through struggles (necessarily renouncing the nostalgia of “vanguard led” movements) (ii) necessities of unity in action, modest or ambitious depending on local contexts (national).

The principle of necessary convergence is not accepted by “all”. Some trends of thought said to be “autonomist”, inspired by more or less “post-modernist” formulations reject it. The movements they inspired should be respected as such; they are part of the struggle fronts. Some go as far as pretending the movement, even fragmented, constructs by itself the alternative, pushing their position up to advocating “the individual subject” is already underway to becoming the agent of the transformation (the theoretical vision of Negri). Thinkers of the autonomist trend state their capacity to transform the world without taking power. Time will tell if this is possible or illusory. One can of course not share that theoretical thesis. This is probably the case of many powerful popular movements involved in important struggles. One can also think (hope?) that organisations inherited from the past – political parties, trade unions, etc. – are capable of adjusting in the sense of the required democratic practice.

In all cases, whether “large organisations” or “small ones”, the conflict opposes the “logic of struggle” (which put forward its requirements) to the “logics of organisation” (which give priority to the interests at stake for the “leaderships” in place or waiting to be in place, participation to the dominant power in place, and consequently, favours “opportunism”).

5. progress in directions lead to the path of the construction of the alternative are taking place at this very moment in Latin America, making a contrast with their absence, or almost, elsewhere in Europe, Asia and Africa.

Those progresses (Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Venezuela, Bolivia, Equator) and their visible future successes elsewhere (Mexico, Peru, Nicaragua) are precisely the product of the radicalisation of movements which have reach the efficient level of critical mass and their political convergence. These are “revolutionary progresses” in the sense that they have initiated the reversal of the social and political balance of forces to the advantage of popular classes. They owe their success to their actual practical response which combine democracy in the management of movements and political crystallisation of their projects; overcoming fragmentation which is dominant elsewhere. Where States regimes those progresses have produced are “problematic”, where they run the risk of being bogged under the pressure of external constraints and the ones of local privileged classes, who would deny that? Would we for that reason down grade the possibilities these changes (of regime!) open to popular movements? Those regimes enable other progresses, based on the association (and not the dissociation) of the assertion of national independence (vis à vis the United States), democratisation and social progress. The experience of Latin America concretely shows that progresses are first and foremost the product of national struggles.

These progresses can then, when they multiply within a region, change its environment for the potential advantage of the consolidation of their gains. The example of the Mercosur is a good

illustration. Being created as a project of common market pegged to the capitalist globalisation (in spite of its contradiction with the objectives of the dominant power, the United States), that organisation can take a new direction, attached to the budding of new perspectives offered since the election of Lula, then the emergence of the Bolivarian anti imperialist political project of the ALBA.

Convergence cannot be constructed at global and regional levels if it is not first implemented at the level of nations because, whether we want it or not, nations define and manage concrete challenges and; it is at those levels that changes in the social and political balance of forces to the advantages of popular classes will or will not occur. Regional and global level may reflect national advances, certainly facilitate them (or, at least not stand as a handicap), but nothing more.

Reality elsewhere, in spite of the struggles, is less favourable.

In Europe, priority given to the “construction of the European Union” encourages shift towards social liberalism, illusions fostered by the rhetoric of the “third option” and the one advocating “capitalism with a human face”. Will the “movement” succeed with its own means overcome those handicaps? I personally have serious doubts about that and; believe that decisive changes of direction of the political power is a prerequisite, in particular, breakaway with atlanticism (NATO is the enemy of European peoples). Others do not share that view. In Eastern Europe, underway of becoming in its actual relationships with Germany and Western Europe a Xerox copy of what was (and still is) Latin America in its relationships with the United States, illusions are even bigger.

-European opinion – I am thinking of the one which is critical of the system in place – is split up in “Europeists” and “non Europeists”. The ones and the others could at most agree on the “advantage” that a united Europe would represent, give different contents to that advantage: the one of becoming a new economic super power, or the base of a social Europe. That debate will remain abstract as long as some prior questions would not have been answered. Do conditions which characterise the various partners in Europe.- which I do not only define in terms of unequal levels of material development but also in terms of diversity of political cultures – enable achievable advances made together in the region? My answer is no. The European project was designed, from its origin (by Jean Monnet, a known adversary of democracy) as non democratic, with the purpose of substituting non democratic powers of decision (disguised in technocratic powers, in fact under domination of the requirements of dominant capital) with powers normally stemming from the polls. The European Union has not gone out of that vision; the expression of “democratic deficit’ attached to it is well below the reality of facts as everything is done to have the edifice armoured against any “democratic assault”. Under such conditions, social Europe is only a lure. Its potential construction is conditioned to the deconstruction of the Brussels institutions, not their “reform”. That deconstruction must, in turn, be done in places where there are conditions of its achievement, subsequently dragging behind it the other places and creating the conditions of a different and alternative construction. If the “left” does not take initiatives in that direction, then par-national demagogies have high chances of finding themselves in power!

The debate on that issue cannot be eluded. It must be addressed in a spirit open to the arguments of the ones and the others.

-in Asia and Africa, we are witnessing drifts that we will qualify as “culturalist” which maintain the illusion of supposedly “civilisational” projects based on para ethnical or para religious gatherings.

I do not mean by culturalism banal renaissance of cultural diversity, or even the duty to respect it but the thesis according to which these would trans-historic invariants, what they are not, and; that, on that basis, response strategies to the devastation caused by capitalist imperialist globalisation through recoiling on “cultural authenticity” (vested under flashy para religious or para ethnic rags) would be legitimate and efficient. Being constructed to the detriment of others dimensions of “identity” (the social class, the nation), those strategies are perfectly convenient to the deployment of the imperialist capitalist project, because regimes constructed on that basis do not question the principled of the globalised market. They limit themselves to transferring the conflicts from the grounds of social realities to the abstract height of “culture”. The “clash of civilisation” is indeed and fully a strategy, the one of imperialism and its local compradore allies. In that sense also, discourse on “cultural diversity” comes often to the rescue of that confinement into dead ends. This discourse is, as a fact, totally tolerated (if not promoted) by the leaders of capitalism and imperialism.

The question is to know why a thesis of that kind has the apparent successes we are witnessing. My answer to that question points a finger to the short-comings of radical left-wing forces which have largely aligned the popular national project of the regimes in place during the Bandung period (1955-80). The erosion, followed by the collapse of those regimes – predictable for who could decipher their contradictions and limitations – dragged down in their falls the left-wing forces under discussion. The radical alternative capable of filling the deficiencies of the regime in place having lost credibility, a political vacuum was created, which culturalism filled. To that major reason, I will add systematic support granted by Washington to culturalist movements. This being said, it is not true that culturalist dictatorships benefit from unconditional support of their populations. Signs of resistance and revolt are not lacking. But here, as elsewhere, those revolts can line the perspective of popular reconstruction, opening the way to the progress of socialism, or only produce another chaos, or even be recuperated by a liberal “democratic” project acceptable to imperialist capitalism.

Parallel between the evolution described here for the third world and the challenge facing European people today is imperative. We will come back to the danger of “another possible world”, still more ruthless than the one we know.

6. The reconstruction of a “front of the countries and peoples of the South” is one of the fundamental conditions for the emergence of “another world”, which will not be based on imperial domination.

Without underestimating the least the importance of the transformations of all kinds which found their origin in the societies of the North in the past and present, these have remained up to now pegged to the wagon of imperialism. We should not then be surprised that great transformations at global scale found their origins in the revolt of the peoples of the peripheries, from the Russian Revolution (the “weak link” of that time) to the Chinese Revolution and the front of the Non Aligned (Bandung) which have forced, for a time, imperialism to “adjust” itself to requirement in contradiction with the logics of its expansion.

That period, the one of Bandung and the Tricontinental (1955-1980), of a multi-polar globalisation is gone.

The conditions of present time globalisation do not enable a Bandung “remake”. Classes in power in the countries of the South, at the moment, are trying to integrate that globalisation, which they hope they can redirect to their advantage, but they do not fight it. They consist of two groups of “countries”: those which have a “national” project (the nature of which – is mainly capitalist but shaded by concessions or their absence in favour of popular classes, but nevertheless in open or soft conflict with the strategies of imperialism – is to be discussed on a case by case basis) like China or the emerging countries of Asia and Latin America; and those with no project and which accept to unilaterally “adjust” to the conditions of imperialist expansion (these are therefore compradore ruling classes).

Alliances of variable geometry are on the way of construction between the States (governments) of which we have seen the emergence within the WTO. We should not look down upon the possibilities those rapprochements may give to the movements of popular classes (without giving in to illusion).

Is a front of the “peoples of the South” going well beyond the rapprochement among ruling classes possible? Handicapped by “culturalist” drifts mentioned earlier and the conflicts they generate among peoples of the South (on pseudo religious or pseudo ethnical bases) the construction of that front remains difficult. It will be less problematic if and to the extent which the States “which have a project” could – under the pressure of their peoples – move in a resolutely anti imperialist direction. This implies their project would go out of the swamps of illusion that resolutely and exclusively “capitalist nationalist” regimes are capable of redirecting to their advantage and enable their countries to become active actors in imperialist globalisation; participating to the shaping of the global system (and not unilaterally adjusting to it). Those illusions are still strong and strengthen by national rhetoric as the ones flattering “emergent countries” (on the “catching up” trail) developed by the institutions at the service of imperialism. But, as facts will prove those illusions wrong, new popular and anti imperialist blocks will be capable of finding their way through and facilitate peoples’ internationalism. It must be hoped progressist forces of the North will understand and support this.

7. Two projects of “another world” are in construction at the moment, and of course, in conflict, violent here, soft elsewhere. Liberal globalisation which has already visibly failed will necessarily be overthrown but, will it fall right or left? This is the decisive question.

Capitalism is already an obsolete social system. Perpetuation of class privilege attached to “property” which defines it necessitates from now on renunciation of the principles of its conduct through means said to be “liberal”. “Apartheid at Global scale” is the only response imperialist capitalism can give to that contradiction.

Continuation of capital accumulation to the advantage of a declining minority of the population of the globe requires both the acceleration of the destruction of peasants's worlds (still half the population of humanity), a more and more unequal sharing of the natural resources of the planet (necessary for the preservation of the wastage life style of the North), dependency of the new industries of the South through the control of production technologies,

their confinement into exploiting the “advantage” of their cheap labour.

The hegemonic social bloc holder of that project is composed of the globalised financial oligopolistic capital (which leads the alliance), the (compradorised) bourgeoisies of the South and can benefit from support of large segments of the populations of the North (their middle classes in particular). But it bumps and will always bump ever more against the resistance of the “excluded”: the majority of the peoples of the South, minorities in possible progression in the North. The South – which is meant to remain the “cyclone zone” – can then only be controlled by means of continuous deployment of threats and military interventions of imperialist powers associated to these enterprises. Such is the (murderous) rationality of the Washington’s project of military control of the planet and the support in last analysis of its European and Japanese partners in that project.

Capitalism was inaugurated, at its birth, by a gigantic ethno-genocide, the one of pre-Columbian civilisations. It is compelled today to envisage another systematic mass-murder of the same kind against the peoples of Asia and Africa. And the will to preserve the monopoly of nuclear weapons to the advantage of the powers of the imperialist Triad is not the most trivial of the necessary means for the continuation of that project.

Implementation of that project is in progress. The “European project” locks the choices of the the peoples of that continent and irreversibly submits them to the necessities of perpetuation of capitalist accumulation and Atlantic alignment. The deployment of para ethnic and para religious culturalist options in the South perpetuates the domination of comprador blocs. This “new world” (also “other”!) already has its ideological expression, based on priority assertion not of “the individual’s rights”, but an individualism without frontiers, substitution of the consumer – merchant and political client – to the citizen. A kind of “pale” fascism (without parades and Heil! salutes), in apparently respectful, in some places, of a “representative democracy” deprived of all renovating aspect, and, in other places, bloody dictatorships legitimised by “religious specificities”.

This is not “capitalism with a human face” but, on the contrary, a new stage of the capitalist-imperialist deployment in it full bloody horror.

Fortunately enough, this project is not the only “possible” one. As a fact, contradictions which undermine it are such that, its opposed project – XXIst century socialism – is far from being a “utopia” (in the banal understanding of unrealistic wish).

Socialism has a history. In its early moment, it conceived the overthrowing of capitalism from its “developed” centres, through proletarian reform or revolution. There is not much difficulty understanding this was so: socialism was – “naturally” – born within the new labour class exploited by the industrial capitalism of XIXth century Europe. The reality of its globalised imperialist dimension, underestimated at first, imposed itself in the course of the XXth century. As “revolution” was vanishing from the horizon within the centres of the system, it was materialising in its peripheries, from Russia to China. But this was then only “another revolution” associating in all their contradictions of socialist aspirations and others of capitalist nature, necessities of national liberation and universalism. Maoism attempted to give coherent efficacy to that set of aspirations, each legitimate in its own way.

National liberation struggles in Asia and Africa, diluted forms of revolts of the same nature against the imperialist order, have attempted in their way and within their limitations to ground their legitimacy through new theoretical propositions in break away with historic Marxism, which Frantz Fanon, among others, was an advocate (“the damned of the Earth”), finding an echo even in the West (through the Marcuse style formulation of the roles of the vanguards of “the excluded”). Those issues are style up-to-date and find their renewed expression within present day “alterglobalisms”.

The challenge remains total and still the same, in spite of major objective transformations achieved elsewhere through victories gained by the peoples in the XXth century, and present conjunctions. Obsolete capitalism (I say “senile”) has become the enemy of the entire humankind and not only the one of working classes it directly exploits. Humankind can and must challenge its pretended “perpetuity” and engage in the construction of XXIst century socialism(s).

That construction, owing to the reality shaped by the imperialist deployment, and the diversity of contexts of present struggles, can only be gradual and even diverse. That is why I prefer speaking about revolutionary advances in the agenda rather than “revolutions” (which term supposes solutions they bring are “definite” and “complete”).

These advances imply of course that alternative hegemonic social blocs they enable the advent (and the power) integrate the vast popular majorities of the South (peasants in particular).

Other advances, of probably different nature, are possible in imperialist centres themselves. The “European issue” finds here its pertinence. The possible conflict between the aspirations of the peoples of Europe and Washington and Brussels’ Atlantist project does not, in my view, find its origin on the conflict on interests of dominant capital (the latter, in spite of its secondary conflicts, remains strategically united in a shared vision of the necessity to rule the Planet), but in the divergences that oppose European political cultures to the ones of the United States, an issue on view I gave my view elsewhere (ref, Samir Amin, *The Liberal Virus*, Pluto).

XXIst century socialism will be the product of the convergence of these advances in the South and in the North, simultaneously enabling the overthrow of the exclusive logics of accumulation and the construction of a negotiated multi-polar globalisation. I will not come back, here either, on the questions I raised on those perspectives, in particular, those relating to the association (and not the dissociation) of democratic aspirations and social progress. That option excludes adhesion to the model of “representative democracy” – which, itself is in crisis in the capitalist Western countries, and which, in fact, the project of the “other world” in construction endeavours to annihilate the renovating potential - , as it implies radical criticism of the discourses which attempt to impose it: the discourse on human rights (and the practices of double standards within interventions which take them as an excuse), the discourse of non political civil society, the discourse which legitimises “the exportation of democracy”, similar to those which, in the past, in the name of christening of the American Indians, then, in the name of “civilisation”, served as justifications for colonisations, the discourse on “totalitarianism”, the function of which is to exclude any perspective superior to “liberal democracy”.

The construction of the convergence in the diversity of the struggle which can be in the perspective of XXIst socialism gives back its place to universalism, which itself is negated by post-modernist culturalist discourses which objectively join the perspective of globalised apartheid. Affirmation of that universalism is not synonymous of “Westernisation of the world” or the rejection of specificities. But it replaces the latter in their true context, the one of products of diversified historic itineraries generator of political cultures both different and in permanent transformation.

The struggle for XXIst century socialism must also take the exact importance of the immediate major challenge represented by the project of military control of the Planet by the United States, either alone or, by collective imperialism of the Triad (United States, Europe, and Japan). That challenge places geopolitics at the front lights; because, as long as that project will not be defeated, all possible advances here, or there, will remain extremely vulnerable.

March 2007