

Marxism and Theories of Global Justice

Julien Rajaoson

► **To cite this version:**

Julien Rajaoson. Marxism and Theories of Global Justice. International Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, 2016, 10.20469/ijhss . halshs-02969990

HAL Id: halshs-02969990

<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-02969990>

Submitted on 17 Oct 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Marxism and Theories of Global Justice

Dr Julien Rajaoson

Researcher associate, UMR 5194 PACTE/CNRS/Sciences Po Grenoble

ABSTRACT : *We shall see that as the Master of suspicion, Marx rejects capitalism, which he considers to be a system of bourgeois oppression, absurd and decadent. The latter eludes the importance of the social question in the historical future of a society. Trampling on the lyrical illusions of practical rationality, he insists on the rigidity of economic and social determinisms, to which he confers an overdeterminant role in sub-estimating the impact of cognitive and/or psychological mechanisms on the exercise of state power. We will explain how dialectical materialism in Marx joins in many respects the methodological revolution initiated by Nietzsche, particularly as regards its requirement to contextualize a real understood as a fabric of forces, in order to understand the origin of the dominant values and that of the capitalist system. Moreover, it will be important to develop the idea that within a civil society, itself prey to a crisis of the *sittlichkeit* (the ethical life), history tends to separate the interests in favor of imperceptible cowards perverse become legion, while insidiously affecting a social body incapable of escaping from material contingencies. We will then have the right to question the way in which revolutions occur?*

KEYWORDS : Marxism, Nietzscheism, political and moral philosophy, post-colonial studies, the enlightenment (10 Italic)

INTRODUCTION

As the Master of suspicion, working to uncover underground forces at work upstream of what is considered a theory of modernisation¹, Marx rejects capitalism, which he considers to be a system of bourgeois oppression², absurd and decadent. The latter eludes the importance of the social question in the historical future of a society. Trampling on the lyrical illusions of practical rationality, he insists on the rigidity of economic and social determinisms, to which he confers an overdeterminant role in sub-estimating the impact of cognitive and/or psychological mechanisms³ on the exercise of state power. Marx's dialectical materialism joins in many ways the methodological revolution initiated by Nietzsche, especially in its requirement to contextualize a real understood as a fabric of forces, in order to understand the origin of the dominant values and that of the capitalist system. To do this, Marx bases his observation on a phenomenon of generalized pauperization, which endures despite the egalitarian proclamations resulting from the revolution of 1789, whose defenders claim that all individuals are born free and equal in rights. However, it turns out that one of the social conditions on which this freedom of claim is based – namely, access to private property or capital – is not accessible to the entire population, and the political equality proclaimed by the 1789 Declaration seems to be contradicted by ever more damaging socio-economic conditions for national cohesion⁴. Moreover, the censitaire suffrage confirms, in fact, these inequalities by granting the right to vote to citizens who are able to pay their tax burdens: the cens.

Within a *civil society*, itself in the grip of a crisis of the *sittlichkeit* (ethical life), history tends to disfigure interests in favor of imperceptible cowards who have become perverted, while

¹ Francis Fukuyama, *La fin de l'histoire et le dernier homme*, éd. Flammarion, Paris, 1993, p. 238 : « Marxisme, théorie de la modernisation ou toute autre théorie de l'histoire fondée essentiellement sur l'économie sera radicalement incomplète tant qu'elle ne tiendra pas compte de la composante 'thymotique' de l'âme, et de la lutte pour la reconnaissance comme moteur principal de l'histoire. »

² As a pure product of the democratic-liberal universe, the bourgeois is the figure of the possessor who holds the means of production. The seizure of power by this social class is linked to capitalism. They are those who obey the logic of the market and adhere to the system of individualistic, possessive and calculating values; the bourgeois belongs neither to the aristocracy nor to the proletariat.

³ We are all the fruit of billions of years of evolution, which brings us back to a much older biological monodeterminism of which we are necessarily the heirs.

⁴ The patrimonial rents held by these revolutionary elites violate the circumstances of justice that should allow the principle of equality to be applied.

insidiously affecting a social body incapable of escaping from material contingencies. Private property is seen as a support for economic domination exercised over one another, insofar as the holders of capital can employ the majority of the members of a social body for their own account⁵, and, later, detach themselves from it, thus sheltering themselves from possible revolts – in order to enrich themselves beyond imagination. What would be likely to cause the fall of such a regime [based on the democratic-liberal model] both nationally⁶ and internationally? The triumph of its opponents or the decadence of this regime?

In a certain way, a privileged and possessing minority class exercises undivided power over the majority of society, by pre-empting the use of time by this social majority. Indeed, the hold on time that flows and the accumulation of capital in the hands of a few participate in an instituted political order whose particularity is to maintain itself from one generation to another⁷, to concentrate the power in the hands of a handful of individuals, and never stop reproducing. Moreover, the egalitarian proclamations issued from the French Revolution of 1789 and relayed by the champions of modernity constitute a denial or a betrayal of modern ideals (especially the republican ideal, which states the principle that our origins do not define us)⁸, and ultimately, the promise made to the Third State by elites. We are then entitled to question ourselves on how revolutions occur?

5 Alain Renaut, Histoire de la philosophie politique. Les critiques de la modernité politique, tome IV, éd. Calmann-Lévy, Paris, 1999, p. 82 : « En clair : le droit comme moyen de perpétuer un certain état des rapports de forces, au bénéfice de ceux qui en bénéficient, à savoir les forts. Le droit serait donc, par essence, droit du plus fort. L'inspiration nietzschéenne pourrait dès lors apparaître, à partir des présupposés qui lui sont propres, retrouver ainsi, au moins jusqu'à un certain point, l'essentiel d'une conception du droit qu'avait aussi illustrée la tradition marxiste : celle du droit comme simple reflet de rapports de forces et comme appareil idéologique destiné à mystifier les dominés en dissimulant des relations historiques de puissance sous des apparences de respectabilité et d'éternité. »

6 Stanguennec, André. « L'État et la guerre chez Hegel et Nietzsche », Les Études philosophiques, vol. 77, no. 2, 2006, pp. 251-260 : « **Avant Nietzsche et d'une manière semblable à lui, Hegel avait contesté que l'État soit seulement un moyen de satisfaire les besoins – au demeurant contradictoires – de la société civile moderne** : Si l'État est confondu avec la société et si sa destination est située dans la sécurité et la protection de la propriété personnelle, l'intérêt des individus singuliers comme tels est alors la fin dernière en vue de laquelle ils sont réunis et il s'ensuit également que c'est quelque chose qui relève du bon plaisir que d'être membre de l'État. **Hegel récusait donc la conception artificialiste et utilitariste du libéralisme dans des termes fort proches de ceux de Nietzsche. D'où leur commune critique de tous les contractualismes politiques, notamment de ceux de Hobbes et de Rousseau.** La dignité éthique de l'État selon le penseur de Berlin réside en ce qu'il effectue l'objectivation de l'esprit social en le maîtrisant par des lois aux moyen d'un gouvernement et d'un prince.»

7 Here, it is a question of underlining the idea of the process of social reproduction developed by Bourdieu, which, as we shall see, is just as valid to account for a political order at national as at international level.

8 The Athenian republic embodied in a way this ideal that existed in the eighteenth century. The betrayal of the republican ideal evoked above constitutes in this a subversion of a utopia already existing in history.

1. Political modernisation and sittlichkeit crisis

1.1 System of needs and mediation according to Hegel

« Le temps homogène et vide est le temps du capital. Et, au sein de son domaine, le capital ne permet aucune résistance à son libre mouvement. Lorsqu'il rencontre un obstacle, il croit rencontrer un autre temps, qui relèverait du précapitalisme ou de la prémodernité. Ces résistances au capital (ou à la modernité) sont donc considérées comme émanant du passé de l'humanité, d'un monde que les populations auraient dû abandonner – ce qu'elles n'ont pas fait. Mais en concevant le capital (ou la modernité) comme un attribut du temps lui-même, cette perspective ne réussit pas seulement à définir toute résistance comme un archaïsme ou une arriération : elle assure également le triomphe ultime du capital et de la modernité, en dépit de ce que certains peuvent croire ou espérer – puisque, après tout, le temps ne peut être immobile. »⁹

For Marxism, the state has nothing of a neutral structure intended to impose the common good, because it is nothing more than the emanation of the powers in presence, or the alibi, coming to legitimize the particular interests as well as the egalitarian ideology of a dominant class. The latter invested him in order to make him wear the veil of the general interest, behind which hides a domination as unilateral as brutal, although underlying an egalitarian ideology, masking at the same time the relations of force that underlie the trend to civil society.

« L'État, c'est alors avant tout ce que les classiques marxistes ont appelé l'appareil d'État. On comprend sous ce terme : non seulement l'appareil spécialisé (au sens étroit) dont nous avons reconnu l'existence et la nécessité à partir des exigences de la pratique juridique, à savoir la police - les tribunaux - les prisons ; mais aussi l'armée, qui, outre sa fonction de « défense nationale » (le prolétariat a payé de son sang cette expérience) intervient directement comme force répressive d'appoint en dernière instance quand la police (et ses corps spécialisés : CRS, etc.) sont « débordés

⁹ Partha Chatterjee, traduit par Christophe Jacquet (2004), Politique des gouvernés. Réflexions sur la politique populaire dans la majeure partie du monde, éd. Éditions d'Amsterdam, Paris, 2009, p. 17

par les événements » ; et au-dessus de cet ensemble le chef de l'État, le gouvernement et l'administration. Présentée sous cette forme, la « théorie » de l'État marxiste-léniniste touche à l'essentiel, et il n'est pas question un seul instant de ne pas prendre conscience que c'est bien là l'essentiel. L'appareil d'État, qui définit l'État comme force d'exécution et d'intervention répressive, « au service des classes dominantes », dans la lutte de classe menée par la bourgeoisie et ses alliés contre le prolétariat, est bel et bien l'État, et définit bel et bien sa « fonction » fondamentale. »¹⁰

If we take the example of work, understood as a whole of remunerated activities rhythming the temporality of a given social body, in the Marxist perspective, all these low needs become synonymous with dispossession of self: the task of the workers being crude, alienating and forced, the proletariat¹¹ accepts the fate reserved for it by the bourgeoisie, with a view to obtaining a certain rate of remuneration, which is adjusted by the State so as to be sufficient to survive. By increasing this rate of pay from time to time, which has the collateral effect of calming the anger of the proletarian momentarily, the said salary appears only for what it is, namely: a simple adjustment variable to respond to international circumstances. This maneuver allows him to temporarily support some of his social needs. The fact remains, however, that this type of manoeuvre is of no interest to a proletariat which, day after day, mechanically alienates its labour force in the context of a blind production process which not only escapes it¹² and the domestic worker is riddled with paradoxical injunctions¹³.

10 Louis Althusser, « L'État et ses appareils », Sur la reproduction. Sous la direction de Althusser Louis. Presses Universitaires de France, 2011, pp. 106-129

11 Christian Godin, Dictionnaire de philosophie, éd. Fayard, Paris, 2004, p. 1059 : « (...) Chez Marx (1818-1883), classe unissant tous ceux qui ne disposent pour tout bien que de leur force de travail pour survivre. Le prolétariat en tant que classe est opposé à la bourgeoisie, qui est la classe propriétaire des moyens de production en régime capitaliste. L'aliénation et l'exploitation sont pour le prolétariat un destin auquel la révolution doit mettre fin. »

12 Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, traduit par Jérôme Vidal (1988), Les subalternes peuvent-elles parler ? éd. Éditions d'Amsterdam, Paris, 2009, p. 32 : « Selon Marx, dans le système capitaliste, la valeur, en tant qu'elle est produite dans le travail nécessaire et le surtravail, est évalué comme la représentation/signe du travail objectivé (qui est rigoureusement distinct de l'activité humaine). En revanche, en l'absence d'une théorie de l'exploitation comme extraction (production), appropriation et réalisation de la (sur-) valeur en tant que représentation de la force de travail, l'exploitation capitaliste doit être vue comme un certain type de domination (la mécanique du pouvoir en tant que tel). Le marxisme a déterminé le problème [que le pouvoir est plus diffus que la structure de formation d'exploitation et d'État] en termes d'intérêts (le pouvoir est détenu par une classe dominante définie par ses intérêts). »

13 Notion discovered by the School of Palo Alto and Gregory Bateson.

Let us come to the history of the French word *travail* (work), which is far from being trivial, of sorting, *tri*, three and *palius*, pious, evokes at the same time the instrument used to maintain and to constrain firmly the horses and other beasts of burden that one would make, then to torture men. At first, this term clearly evoked all the mechanical phenomena of childbirth: the labor of childbirth then human activity requiring a sustained effort, in order to meet the needs of physiological order.

« (...) *un tel travail constitue la meilleure des polices, maintient chacun en bride et s'entend à entraver puissamment le développement de la raison, des désirs, d'un goût de l'indépendance. Car il consume une extraordinaire quantité de force et la soustrait à la réflexion, à la méditation, à la rêverie, aux soucis, à l'amour et à la haine.* »¹⁴

Constraint, effort and pain seem intrinsic to the use of this word and must give rise to reflection. Genesis saw in work the rigorous application of the divine curse that condemned Adam and Eve to see themselves fallen from the Garden of Eden, after they had « deliberately » committed original sin: « You will earn your bread by the sweat of your forehead ». Transposed to the symbolic level, the analysis of capitalism – understood as a world system of exploitation of man by man – seems to perpetuate this divine sanction, which is empirically translated by an oblivious bourgeoisie of its own finitude which clearly considers itself free from it. The proletariat is thus condemned to draw its subsistence from its working power alone, to endure a life that is at least demanding and paved with shame, suffering and pain until death ensues; thus resulting from this condemnation foreseen by God, then legitimized here in the best of political regimes, it also tends to reproduce from generation to generation. Moreover, the control of the civil order thus maintained by the bourgeoisie does not allow any social change to be achieved, because the only political demands emanating from the proletariat are at best concerned with wage increases, on breaches of labour law (or more specifically collective agreements), the defence of hard-won social gains and not on the terms of a radical change in society. Using with skill all that the technical progress and the resulting system of value make possible, there is every reason to think that the present bourgeoisie tends neither more nor less to replace God himself, or another interlocutor: “I am but a banker doing the

¹⁴ Paul-Laurent Assoun, Freud et Nietzsche, éd. PUF, Paris, 1980, p. 249

work of God.”¹⁵ Moreover, the domination of the bourgeoisie is inevitably accompanied by an ideological legitimation of social inequalities in the name of an inevitable difference based on the intrinsic merit of each.¹⁶

According to Marx, as man being ultimately only what his material conditions allow him to be, it is therefore real life itself that determines the most submerged part of the psyche, namely – consciousness - the biological body and the social environment maintain interdependent relations, particularly when they both participate in the so-called subsistence economy. As soon as the proletarians internalize this cynical ideology cleverly inoculated by the bourgeoisie, the working classes overwhelm themselves with a resignation imprinted with so-called common sense, before they come to accept themselves the terms of a domination of which they are the first to suffer the prejudices. Because of this surrender, a capitalist oligarchy can entrench an illegitimate power (what Peter Dale Scott calls the *Deep State*) at the heart of a liberal democracy whose only presence dispossesses the people of its sovereign power, by converting their particular economic interests into so-called universal rights. Moreover, the pettiness, the weariness, bring the conflicts on a strictly horizontal plane and the different impulses [the most irrational part of our being] are literally inhibited. Because of this social delimitation, everything goes as if proletarians, subject to a form of depersonalization, were programmed to lose.

For Marx, only class consciousness gives the proletariat a more lucid representation of its own interests and of the various mechanisms of capitalism where modern technology¹⁷ and capital seem manifestly soluble; it also makes it possible to detect the material conditions of bourgeois domination that is exerted on their lives, while giving a glimpse of possible objective alliances and

¹⁵ Comments from Lloyd Blankfein, CEO of Goldman Sachs, during an interview with the Sunday Times in November 2009. By hypostasis of self, the dominant discourse create a God in his image (to paraphrase Feuerbach), in order to recover himself, putting God in the foreground.

¹⁶ This concept of merit is mainly based on the individual's ability to win prestigious degrees, to occupy an enviable social rank and/or to acquire skills, but it deliberately ignores the notion of equal opportunities.

¹⁷ Dastur, Françoise. « Heidegger, penseur de la modernité, de la technique et de l'éthique », *Poésie*, vol. 115, no. 1, 2006, pp. 34-41 : « Cette réflexion sur l'essence de la technique, Heidegger la poursuit dans les autres conférences faites en 1949 sous le titre commun de « Regard dans ce qui est », et en particulier dans celle qui s'intitule « Das Ge-stell », que Heidegger reprendra dans une version modifiée en 1953 sous le titre « La question de la technique ». Il y montre en effet que dans l'horizon de la technique moderne, les rapports de l'homme et de l'objet ne se laissent plus cerner à la manière classique : car rien ne se présente plus sous la figure de l'ob-jet (Gegenstand), c'est-à-dire d'un vis-à-vis du sujet, mais tout apparaît au contraire comme fonds et réserve de puissance (Bestand) pour le sujet. Cette disparition de l'objet dans la calculabilité intégrale va d'ailleurs de pair avec la disparition du sujet lui-même, puisque le « sujet » moderne, la société industrielle dans son ensemble, est soumise elle aussi à la puissance provocante de ce que Heidegger nomme le Gestell, ce mode du dévoilement qui nous livre tout étant comme susceptible d'être interpellé, arraisonné, commandé en vue de la production d'énergie. »

the fact that a finite being can only generate a necessarily imperfect system: whether it's national or international¹⁸.

1.2 Marxist criticism of the second moment of Hegel's philosophy of law

Among Marxists, revolutions occur, certainly with the support of the proletarians, but above all thanks to the help of an elite at the same time literate, dandy and proletarian - originally from the seraglio - having a dual class origin: both proletarian and bourgeois. From this double social belonging, this elite can make a discourse as critical as scientific of capitalism, which finds itself scandalized by the unfair condition of the proletarians and calls for a revolt against the civil order established by the unproductive bourgeoisie. Following a sudden downgrade phenomenon, a part of the erudite bourgeois elite witnesses the deterioration of its socio-economic condition by the new *establishment* and in turn experiences a slow mutilation of its most instinctive forces;

« *Au fond, ce qu'on sent aujourd'hui, à la vue du travail – on vise toujours sous ce nom le dur labeur du matin au soir –, qu'un tel travail constitue la meilleure des polices, qu'il tient chacun en bride et s'entend à entraver puissamment le développement de la raison, des désirs, du goût de l'indépendance. Car il consume une extraordinaire quantité de force nerveuse et la soustrait à la réflexion, à la méditation, à la rêverie, aux soucis, à l'amour et à la haine, il présente constamment à la vue un but mesquin et assure des satisfactions faciles et régulières. Ainsi une société où l'on travaille dur en permanence aura davantage de sécurité : et l'on adore aujourd'hui la sécurité comme la divinité suprême.* »¹⁹

When mobilized for absurd ends, these powerful inner forces are literally alienated *a fortiori* in precarious activity or chain work, making the proletarian classes sufficiently exhausted not to be able to be offended, even when its rights would be violated; not to mention the fact that sometimes the body expresses a suffering that is inflicted on it by somatizing its effects, especially when the

¹⁸ Even if the room for maneuver is minimal, a system of domination always has flaws. The art of exercising power lies in maintaining the illusion of omnipotence, in particular by mobilizing all available means to preserve it sustainably.

¹⁹ Nietzsche, *Aurore* (1881), Livre III, § 173

consciousness is incapable of expressing it by itself. However, The aim of such a socioeconomic order is to feed the life cycle sufficiently so that it can be perpetuated. In Marxism, without the assistance of this minority, both active and aware of the most glaring socioeconomic inequalities, the proletarian revolution hardly seems possible. Indeed, this sudden economic downgrading, violating the deterministic reading of the class struggle, accidentally leads a minority, initially occupying a comfortable social rank, towards a social universe where exploitation reigns. This educated elite can then conduct an ideological struggle to guide at its will (thus tearing the veil imposed by a given *superstructure*, it becomes possible to establish a possible form of alignment between the *infrastructure*, the class consciousness and the interest that can take the place of the driving force) the proletarian movement, because the state of servitude in which it is found cannot be brought to last, given the contradictions inherent in the capitalist system of production. The idea of an enlightened and petty bourgeois elite remains unclear²⁰, because it refers to all kinds of interpretations, considerations, and diverse and varied interests of these social actors who do not come solely from the proletariat, but nevertheless decide to assist him in a struggle against another bourgeoisie which is parasitic. The latter being no other thing than a new “aristocracy” as arrogant as ignoble, that only the possession of capital distinguishes from those they subjugate, not to mention their propensity to break taboos, prohibited and other moral requirements judged summary, such as deviant sexual practices – making these elites outlaws – namely: pedophilia.

« (...) le bourgeois est d’abord préoccupé par son propre bien-être matériel ; il n’a ni vertu ni souci du bien public, et ne se consacre absolument pas à la communauté humaine qui l’environne. En bref, il est égoïste, et cet égoïsme individuel a été au cœur des critiques de la société libérale, aussi bien de la part de la gauche marxisante que de la droite aristocratique ou républicaine. »²¹

Thanks to the idiosyncrasy²² of this educated elite (which history had nevertheless kept away from the social conditions lived by the proletarians), the proletarian revolution, due to the addition

20 Yet it is the responsibility of leading the proletarian revolution that has fallen to them, and thus to form the possible unity of the working class.

21 Francis Fukuyama, *La fin de l’histoire et le dernier homme*, op. cit, p. 175

22 In this case, this idiosyncrasy leads specific individuals to build a political consciousness against their social environment of origin, against which they will reinvent other values. This is another form of alienation very different from Marx's.

of the forces of the proletariat and the bourgeois elite to form its vanguard, seems problematic enough to judiciously illuminate a contemporary era that has become infinitely more complex because of the multiplicity of determinations that now govern a social body prey to *racialization*. How can the enlightened elite in question, these clerics of the petty bourgeoisie, still play an equally decisive role in the contemporary era without betraying the proletariat ? According to Marxism of yesteryear, humanity will be happy only when society has definitively abolished private property and capitalism itself opens the door to its own disappearance. Today, however, the levers on which a revolution is likely to be based seem quite different: a revolutionary project no longer seems to be able to break down the levers of power.

From a Nietzschean point of view, the suffering induced by the hostility of the world can paradoxically play a fundamental role in the *formation* of a political consciousness; the latter would therefore proceed from an internal struggle, which results from the omnipresence of the power²³. The formal freedoms as referred to above can only be exercised during the rest periods provided for in the employment contract, moments during which the workforce must be reconstituted. In this regard, the proletarian revolutions themselves seem more than uncertain today, and the remaining collective actions carried out by today's workers' movements are, at most, general strikes²⁴, confined within a given sector of activity. It is then necessary to carry out a critical work having as object, the real economy and the way in which it is possible to mobilize the present proletarians, in order to produce a radical reading of the forces in presence and giving account of their considerable complexity. One cannot be content to transpose Marxist thought as it is, and naively believe that a proletarian revolution in the contemporary era could rely on the levers of yesteryear.

This is where all the ambiguity of current Marxism resides - dominated by the Freudo-Marxist²⁵ inspiration embodied among others by Slavoj Zizek, Axel Honneth (whose work consists,

23 Florence Andoka, « Machine désirante et subjectivité dans l'Anti-Œdipe de Deleuze et Guattari », *Philosophique* [Online], 15 | 2012, posted on March 5, 2012, accessed November, 27, 2019. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/philosophique/659> : « Le pouvoir ici n'est plus une unité globale de domination, mais bien un processus de production. »

24 Whether it is the disengagement (an unexpected cessation of work) or the general strike (which is carried out following a notice of strike filed by the staff representative within a company) are, at best, prejudicial only to Micro-Enterprises or Small and Medium Enterprises (Smes). In other words, a better future takes place here and now within the means of production, in order to solve in a very pragmatic way the problems posed by the economy of subsistence in which the proletarians participate. Nevertheless, strikes today are more sectoral and therefore less effective.

25 What does Freudism do here: all interpretations are in their turn re-interpretable. In his own way, a psychoanalyst – such as Freud and especially

among other things, of studying and *understanding* social pathologies, by examining as rigorously as possible the least « malleable» couplings that would be likely to lead to *what should be*, namely: impulses, desires and passions, while probing the depths of the unconscious – social, colonial or postcolonial – where the multiple inclinations, including the obsession with a meteoric social ascent, swarm unknowingly), but also in their time by Wilhem Reich, Cornelius Castoriadis, and above all, Herbert Marcuse “*Eros and Civilization*” written in 1955 – who refuses to recognize the predominant role that the figure of the forceful selfishness embodied by the entrepreneur could play [other class defectors] wishing to gentrify themselves and be softened by the possessors he only sings, including when the latter are struggling to pursue their only interests, namely: the development of his individual economic project.

By contributing to the realization of a personal purpose (this good-natured arrivism which ultimately comes down to leaving the proletariat), the entrepreneur equips himself with the tools and methods of research on the efficiency of a concerted collective action, as well as on his "infinite" quest of ever more efficient productivity; to achieve its ends, the individual can only rationally arrange the most irrepressible forces (inner forces²⁶ – desires, impulses – and external forces – the set of constraints that apply to an action) and the means that he is aware of. His own esteem is dependent on the *gaze* that the *Other* carries towards him, a gaze which he expects a recognition [which is no less than the fascination for worldly success] for which he stands ready to fight with all his might.

2. Neoliberalism: the last stage of Capitalism or the theory of global justice?

for Lacan – is also a genealogist who interprets the conscious discourse, the pathologies, the diseases and the symptoms delivered to his analysis; these thin films behind which lie the unconscious, understood as the ultimate crucible of our most intimate irrational, cognitive and behavioural mechanisms (**including the phenomenon of alienation, understood as the reverse of economic exploitation within the capitalist mode of production, making the present proletarians amnesic and obedient to a commodity society erected as a model despite its most manifest excesses. In accordance with the Latin etymology of the word alienated [i.e.: alienus which means to belong to another], the proletariat spends its labour force in the context of an economic process that he can not understand**). While the psychoanalyst’s interpretation is similarly interpretable, in accordance with the Nietzschean idea of the “New Infinite”, Marxist genealogy begins with the analysis of manifest ideologies, but ends with its latent face (unconscious interests), or its ultimate foundation from which the genealogist must stop, especially when his approach is scientific. The scientific aspect comes to define the work of the genealogist so that the said method leaves the sphere of representation and leads to what is more indeterminate. But, for Nietzsche, life understood as the will to power can take on different faces, which clearly defy the principle of identity. It can therefore act as a catalyst for the latent revolutionary possibilities of the will to power. In this regard, the genealogy itself holds its *raison d’être* as well in its infinite and unpredictable character; **it is therefore possible to question the absence of spiritualization of desires (in case of alienation), which is conditioned by the dominant ideology, and to grasp the most paradoxical dimensions.**

26 This is particularly the case when these inner forces spring straight from the most unfathomable depths of this point of encounter that constitutes the unconscious to apply in fine to a collective.

2.1 Global rule of law and fact

As an advanced stage of capitalism, *mainstream* neoliberalism – as the open plague of our time, which makes the market its cornerstone – seems to literally knead the minds of its contemporaries, by generating a deep resentment with those who simply endure it, for this doctrine denies life (accustomed that we are to think as democrats and capitalists, and the fact that they are not known of other alternatives – on the a priori level – must moreover be questioned), by insidiously casting opprobrium upon the proletariat. To escape the notorious mediocrity proper to wage labor, again, these dominated ones internalize the dominant values²⁷, never forgiving themselves for having been proletarians themselves. In other words, a certain denial of social origins could become a guarantee of social success.

By a determination of the cognitive and behavioural mechanisms deriving from the infrastructure, the dominant ones opposing the filthiest condescension towards the most disadvantaged classes²⁸ thus speak through the said dominated classes which, sometimes, they like to repeat such moralizing discourses whose stakes they ignore, by once again maintaining the possible social conflicts on a horizontal level.

Thus, unknowingly diving into the icy waters of instrumental rationality, the entrepreneur must compartmentalize his affects (being himself in the midst of his own resentment) in order to be able to calculate coldly – that is to say, to remain sufficiently impervious so that we can use the means at our disposal to achieve our ends, namely: without any form of empathy, or could we say surgically – the quickest way to achieve “one’s” life. And this, even if it means eviscerating those of others; it is an externalisation of the impulse of death that these bourgeois values have made acceptable: Greed is thus hidden behind the more acceptable mask of a desire for recognition whose propensity to be satisfied speaks volumes about those who experience it. The scheme, previously described by Marxism, is understood as the sum of the energies deployed by different actors

27 Individuals can somatise socio-economic evils generated by a society that promotes individualism, which as a value system causes the individual to bear on his shoulders the problems that he will soon encounter.

28 Turned towards the people of modest means, this class contempt is none other than a strange feeling of superiority due to objective material conditions and the representation by a social class of a historical context marked by specific social and economic inequalities, to which are added the judgments of Judeo-Protestant values which legitimize a state of fact on the moral level. As it discloses the place where a speech is articulated, a symptom betrays the act of concealing the state of a diminished life.

wishing to carry out a common project, in the absence of all possible forms of class solidarity. The latter must be possible by the progressive formation of an invisible, neutral and self-conscious social body; but in the absence of politicisation of the various cells of the social body, there is hardly any possible resistance²⁹ that is conceivable, or values based on mutual aid, which may form the basis for collective action. It must also be disinterested, as the proletarian class and an enlightened vanguard are pivotal figures, and this common project cannot in any case be transposed as it is in our time. For example, the employers/workers dichotomy, putting back-to-back these two links of the economic production apparatus, prevents to identify the complexity which is inherent to it. Today, in the framework of branches: first, the bosses are techno-managers participating in the apparatus of economic production working on behalf of atomized capital which – contrary to what was described earlier in the Marxist conception – is itself no longer national:

« Une valeur permanente, qui se multiplie et ne périclit pas [...] Puis cette valeur se détache du produit qui l'a créée, elle devient une quantité métaphysique et immatérielle toujours en possession de celui qui l'a produite, pour qui elle pourra [être fixée sous] différentes formes »³⁰.

Secondly, for some of them, some workers are small rentiers who, because of this ambivalent position, implicitly participate in the domination of capital over one another. Thirdly, while the workers we have just described may be climbed up the ladder within the company, the bosses are likely to regress by becoming downgraded. Under these new configurations, the reading of the social question must be freed from outdated and archaic concepts that prevent a more perceptive understanding of the real, its economic conjunctures and its so-called objective conditions. From now on, the more the Marxist conception strives to seek the proletariat in social reality, the more it will realize that it does not exist at such a level of simplicity. A Chinese worker will not see his social condition in the same way as a Marxist born in the West, if only by his conception of time, which is that of a temporality flowing in a circular way, the specificity of which is to induce a kinship of origin between the future, the present and the past, which Western thought conceives to be intrinsically separate.

Moreover, beyond the fact that Marxism is outdated in its ability to grasp reality, the material

29 « Le but de toute association politique est la conservation des droits naturels et imprescriptibles de l'Homme. Ces droits sont la liberté, la propriété, la sûreté, et **la résistance à l'oppression** », article 2 of the « Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen de 1789 ».

30 Jean-Charles Sismonde de Sismondi, (1827) *Nouveaux Principes d'économie politique*, éd. Calmann-Lévy, Paris, 1971, pp. 81-82.

structures of the domination it vigorously denounced reduced social criticism to a public debate on the conditions for the possibility of wage increases. This is what the ruling power will deign, or not, to concede to the proletariat. However, the wage question does not become secondary. Nevertheless, this theme divides the working class between those who, by force of circumstances, have become reformists – for whom the negotiation of wage increases is essential and seem to be the majority – and the left elite who aspire more broadly to a radical social and political change. It does not commit the political regime in question to the path of democratization as such, but to a dictatorship exercised by and on behalf of the proletariat.

Marxism has erred intellectually insofar as its conception of a power that can be held by the oppressed has declined from the outset into an ideology of struggle against capitalism, even to the point of proposing what appeared then to be a political choice offering an alternative vision of life in common. Although it has enabled future academic and political research to take into account the social question, all the more so that of workers living in industrial times, however, he made a fatal mistake by ignoring the appeal of the idea of selfish profit. This can be achieved at the expense of the life of others, which the latter augured to all Western society. Indeed, even if one can speak of the existence of an Invisible Hand, this idol so dear to the partisans of the economic current called the classics, Capitalism has indeed confirmed factually that man is an individualist who lives in society only out of opportunism, not to undertake, but to consume. Moreover, the Marxist idea that capital would generate capital quite autonomously³¹, a process that does not go without recalling this homogeneous and empty temporality, brushed by the political modernity described above, there are nevertheless a number of socio-economic determinisms, each as powerful as the other, which need to be highlighted. Thirdly, Marxism also omits that the creation of wealth that the proletarian state in its intermediate phase must share comes – whether it likes it or not – from the conditions of possibility of free enterprise exercised by a productive bourgeoisie; in other words, before redistributing national wealth, it must be produced. He will therefore be forced to make some concessions to the social class which formerly oppressed the proletariat, while remaining able to negotiate with capital. The problem that this proletarian state will inevitably encounter does not stem from the divergence of interests between proletarians and bourgeois, but rather from the

³¹ Baptiste Say, *Traité d'économie politique*, éd. Déterville, vol. II, Paris, 1819, p. 429 : « Le capital est toujours immatériel par nature, car ce n'est pas la matière qui fait le capital mais la valeur de cette matière, valeur qui n'a rien de corporel ».

absence of a political foundation and the refusal of roots, which are induced by the neoliberal paradigm.

2.2 The paths of a new interdependence between technology and Capital

In the absence of national rooting, Marx's internationalism does not allow enough necessary powers to be coalesced, in order to contravene the interests of a tiny minority, which now resemble a new, more globalized bourgeoisie, which clearly neither the small entrepreneurs nor the proletariat belong to. When the capital of Small and Medium Enterprises is opened up and shareholders are added to their boards of directors, that SME may lose what until then constituted its national identity or its roots in favour of global financial logic and stateless actors³². In addition to its financial and planetary dimension, because of its *digitalization*, the extension of the commodity logic applies all the better to the bodies, the lives (intimate, private and public), the unconscious as well as the spheres that relate to the sacred. In this respect, private means of production are reduced to mere goods that can be transferred, exchanged, or even torn according to their size, according to their assumed values. When the purses of the stock market loosen for a company considered profitable, the aim of the shareholders is to play the card for the less virtual of a total market; it is indeed the concrete interests of the nation-states which will thus be ousted in favor of a general tendency consisting in combating the tendency of the rate of profit to fall. With this in mind, a company placing its capital (the money invested when the company was set up) on the stock exchange may at the same time lose the possibility of protecting jobs in its homeland, to the benefit of shareholders as distant as uncertain. Conversely, as long as it retains its stake in its capital, and therefore retains its room for manoeuvre with regard to supranational financial logic (private shareholders seeking to increase the value of the capital initially invested), the undertaking would not necessarily be obliged to act as a predator acting in a globalised market, but would be limited to a role of taxpayer; however, it would take the risk of being less competitive with its competitors who will have made the decision to reduce the cost of payroll, by outsourcing certain services or by applying social plans. Previously, the general strike was the favorite mode of pressure exerted by proletarians in a specific country against the holders of the means of production.

32 Revue Actuel Marx 2016 n°60 sur « Une classe dominante mondiale ? » KORSCH Karl, Marxisme et philosophie [1923], Allia, 2012.

However, since capitalism as we know it is financial and globalized, the employment for which a proletarian is paid, can be done elsewhere, by another, and for a much lower salary, following the relocation of the means of production. As a result of this relocation, the product sold on the market mechanically increases the dividends distributed to shareholders. We can notice that these economies of scale can reach staggering amounts, thanks to the margins created by the relocation of the means of production abroad and that they benefit only a tiny minority.

It is a question of the relationship between production and consumption. In other words, the division of labour has therefore internationalized to the detriment of the proletarians, thereby reducing the effectiveness and the scope of general strikes that have become sectoral (public/private spheres, private spheres are themselves divided according to trades and collective agreements) ; here again, such a context will largely condition the representation that the proletarians will make of the possible outcome of the trade union struggle and the formation of exorbitant power that proceeds from the loan to interest. To summarize, as the present proletarian has no longer any guarantees on his salary or on his work (because of the supranational financial logics that have ensured that economic and/or industrial production are secondary with regard to speculation) he is going to accept the idea that fighting for his rights has become useless. Thus, although he was aware of his class interests (which in this case constituted the most powerful spring of collective action), the worker would prefer to oppose the idea of a general strike rather than to support it.

Marx would make a radical criticism of North-South immigration, because it lies at the heart of the strategy of bourgeois international domination by capital. Adorned with the finest attire of egalitarianism, it allows the extortion of surplus-value through the skilful use of an international division of labor, which *builds* producers outside the West and consumers within it. Indeed, as a power, capital can only function if it possesses a reserve army³³, which it will enlist at its leisure, in order to be able to reproduce continuously, thus making profitable the costs of production and extending the commodity society. Whether it comes from the unemployed (as a labour force available but still not employed by the capital³⁴) or from immigrants, when a labour force made up

33 7e section of Livre I du Capital de Marx.

34 The work of women and children is a figure of instruments as to the logic of reproduction of capital. What is presented as an advance or an advance of freedom leads jointly to an extension of the commercial logic.

of undocumented workers forced to be underpaid³⁵ occurs in a specific socio-economic context, it then becomes possible for unscrupulous employers to break existing social and economic norms. First of all, by replacing the worker paid at the minimum wage in effect³⁶, with one or more migrant workers who will accept a much lower wage for the same work, the employer may then have a negative influence on the social condition of all the workers. This supranational law, which consists in maximizing profit, is *de facto* established by the banks, which themselves prosper through the destruction of the wealth inherent in the industrialized nations or those that are in the process of being. This so-called headlong rush forward logic also leads to a fundamental demarcation between profitable companies and the others between those that will be more predatory than they were before in terms of their mode of operation.

Encouraged by the banks, businesses will therefore be asked to “modernize”. It is understood that they will have to ensure that they either become more efficient or not lose any. We will see later that this mercantile logic also applies to states, a fortiori when they meet the so-called democratic-liberal criteria. The idea of a reserve army developed by Marx is what allows capital to amortize the costs relating to productivity, especially at the level of the wage bill which is still used as an adjustment variable, while seizing potential markets outside its borders, literally plundering the natural resources of the country of origin of the said migrants.

This new employer³⁷ exercises another form of domination, as soon as a class consciousness emerges on the side of the local proletarians. Indeed, in addition to the cost of the legal labor of a specific society, the rise of the critical sense of the proletarian class poses a problem for the employers. On the one hand, if the proletarians manage to acquire the means to exchange equal to equal with the employers, for the latter the question of a more equitable distribution of the most-value and the rewards of manual labour may eventually become inextricable for which the labour force is interchangeable. On the other hand, if the proletariat manages gradually to establish a

35 This labour force often comes from the former colonies having no choice but to accept to be paid below the minimum wage and/or to work under the table in a country other than their own, because another bourgeoisie exploits the natural resources as well as the labour force in their native nations, whose political future is conditioned from the outside.

36 In France, this minimum wage amounts to 1,201 euros net in 2018.

37 This new management has adapted to the new economic demands inherent in the globalization of trade. As a result of this adaptation, they are thus able to organize economic production on an international scale. However, in order for this expansion to be possible, the employer must be eligible for the credit that a bank is likely to grant it to support the initiative. Private banks therefore play a decisive role in the internationalization of a portion of the class formed by this new employer. The new dominant ideology will induce the dominated to exalt a propensity to satisfy frenetically desires linked closely or remotely to consumption, so that the capitalist system can function at full power; the dominated appears here only as a passive receptacle of his most wily compulsions to which he blindly obeys.

balanced balance of power with this employer, its social conditions will be likely to be improved, and thus become more expensive for the employer, but less painful, and more decent for the employees. Nevertheless, the local strategy of the conquest of social rights initiated by the Western working class is necessarily thwarted, taking into account the presence of a Western and/or non-Western sub-proletariat³⁸, *a priori* devoid of political consciousness, outside its national territory.

« *Auquel cas, si les divers droits-libertés qui, dans les déclarations, déclinaient sous ses diverses face cette notion de la liberté bourgeoise pouvaient avoir été présentés comme universels, c'était dans l'exacte mesure où le capitalisme, soubassement de la société bourgeoise, comprenait en lui le projet, mis en évidence dès le Manifeste du parti communiste (1848), de sa propre mondialisation. En donnant un caractère cosmopolite à la production et à la consommation de tous les pays, la bourgeoisie exporterait aussi la représentation de la liberté dont elle a besoin pour étendre sa domination et sa recherche du profit à l'ensemble de la planète.* »³⁹

What we must understand is that the uncontrolled immigration of a specific country to a host country reduces the objective social conditions due to a phenomenon of social *dumping*⁴⁰, by establishing de facto competition between two active populations – the first, which is western, and the other, which is non-western – which thus form and complicate the same social class. By omitting the said competition – which *a contrario* has not escaped the owners of the means of production – Marxist internationalism anchored to the left objectively serves the interests of a ruling class that has become stateless as described before⁴¹, making huge profits on their own account thanks to neoliberal capitalism, which has become both cross-border and financial, enslaving the peoples of the South and generating in the North what looks like a migratory wave.

³⁸ In the West, the idea of the sub-proletariat, Lumpenproletariat or proletariat in rags, refers to the many actors whose life is intrinsically more vulnerable in a specific society, which cumulate pathologies equally linked to health (disability, addictions, psychic fragility) and social inequalities. Unlike the proletarians as such, the Lumpenproletariat cannot be placed under the same banner because it is unemployable and is forced to live day by day in the spheres of the informal economy. Since the sub-proletarians are both marginal, poor and excluded from growth, homeless and unemployed, they are more easily manipulated by the employers. Although they are clearly at the other end of the class struggle, namely: alongside the proletarians and the revolutionary bourgeois elite, the sub-proletarians can react counter-revolutionary or revolutionary without being aware of its effective role in the class struggle. It is in the interest of the bourgeoisie to corrupt the sub-proletariat in order to act against the revolution, or to do everything possible to keep the conflicts horizontal. Seeing its rights and dignity trampled daily in the most total indifference, the sub-proletariat constitutes the reverse of economic modernization and all their practices refer to the economy of survival.

³⁹ Alain Renaut, *Un monde juste est-il possible ?* éd. Stock, Paris, 2013, p. 108

⁴⁰ See the letter of Georges Marchais (former general secretary of the French Communist Party, a political party that dominated the French left until May 1981) to Hamza Boubakeur, rector of the Mosque of Paris, dated January 6, 1981.

⁴¹ Stefano Petrucciani, *Le concept de classe dominante dans la théorie marxiste*, Dossier : une classe dominante mondiale, in *Revue Actuel Marx*, n°26, 2016, p. 12-27

3. The illiberal model in postcolonial context

3.1 The relationship of neoliberalism to its peripheries

As a phenomenon, immigration itself proceeds from the devastation by the capital of the living conditions of many individuals who, subsequently, are forced to migrate; and, very often, these are neocolonial inter-state agreements, which make such economic and social imbalances possible⁴². Private capital cannot withdraw money from Africa without investing huge sums of money in maritime, port, rail and highway infrastructure (not to mention schools and hospitals) over periods ranging from 30 to 40 years. However, neocolonialism – a power that Thomas Sankara and Mouammar Gadhafi have risen against – is more discreet and more subtle, exercised by multinationals wishing to exploit the soils in Africa.

Let us note that as patriarch, the migrant comes from an *Elsewhere*, a distant country where the latter was respected, to find himself, once arrived on the soil of the metropolis, in the most complete precariousness by assisting in vain in the unavoidable desecration of his paternal authority⁴³: whether on the scale of his own family sphere and/or with regard to the social sphere. This new avatar of capitalism engenders a subtle form of so-called democratic governance that authorizes the pure and simple rendering of wages (or even of the proletarian class as a whole), thereby dismissing the social question of the political agenda⁴⁴ and valuing the study of the various expressions of what the philosopher Axel Honneth refers to as the pathologies of freedom. In spite of its political and intellectual proximity to Marxism, postcolonial thought remains, in many ways, quite different. Indeed, within the Marxist representation of politics in the post-colonial context and under the impetus of globalization, the differences between the Western and non-Western

42 Jacques Marseille, *Empire colonial et capitalisme français. Histoire d'un divorce*, éd. Albin Michel, Paris, 1984

43 Vumbi Yoka Mudimbé, *L'odeur du Père. Essai sur les limites de la science et de la vie en Afrique noire*, éd. Présence africaine, Paris, 2000, pp. 12-13 : « Pour l'Afrique, échapper réellement à l'Occident suppose d'apprécier exactement ce qu'il en coûte de se détacher de lui ; cela suppose de savoir jusqu'où l'Occident, insidieusement peut-être, s'est approché de nous ; cela suppose de savoir, dans ce qui nous permet de penser contre l'Occident, ce qui est encore occidental ; et de mesurer en quoi notre recours contre lui est encore peut-être une ruse qu'il nous oppose et au terme de laquelle il nous attend, immobile et ailleurs. » One of the repercussions of this de-cralization of a paternal authority that no longer exercises full rights – which has been carefully deconstructed by postmodern philosophy – can affect the future of the offspring, which can be led to feel the need to be built up with or against said paternal authority, carefully internalizing the dominant values. What migrants are fleeing is a West that they find incarnated through their own offspring. In other words, following this symbolic parricide, a dominant ideology can be imposed on the unconscious without encountering any counter-power and thus gain the most intimate spheres; this interiorization short-circuits the transmission of traditional values [able to play the role of bulwark to the neoliberal wave] to the descendants.

44 See the speech of Georges Marchais at Montigny les Cormeilles, in February 1981

bourgeoisie are small (apart from the differences concerning the impetus of the race) : bourgeois and proletarian⁴⁵, proletarian from *here* and *elsewhere*. This thought presents itself as a glaze through which it is impossible to account for the multiple subtleties that bind the dominated to each other, these buffer zones or blind points where the political stakes of such alliances are played out.

In Marxist orthodoxy, a number of subordinates seem gagged (even if invaders trample their soil), at least initially, before adhering to the discourses of an elite, representing the fine flower of the proletariat, who wishes to overthrow the established order of the most sulphurous and bloodthirsty *compradores* elites, who are in collusion with western bourgeoisies. In addition, a number of objective conditions⁴⁶ must be gathered so that a proletarian revolution can take place even in regions that are *behind*⁴⁷ and that the said revolution is able to dismantle the networks of local authorities.

Moreover, internationalism obscures the historicity of non-Western nations, which must wait for a proletarian revolution to happen in the West, to be exported outside the borders of the countries of the North or of certain revolutionary countries, before occurring in the South of a hemisphere situated for its whole in a precapitalist moment. In other words, the very idea of historicity is being sacrificed on the altar of egalitarianism. On the other hand, in Marxist orthodoxy, the link between the enlightened elite and the proletarian class seems to be fortuitous, even though it must be a necessary foundation for the struggle against imperialist powers. Marx was a virulent critic of the ideology of human rights, which is why at the Tours Congress of 1920, the French Communist Party wanted to distance itself from a more social left-liberal party, which intends to improve the living standards of the most deprived through social dialogue, without compromising universal principles. Marx attacks this conception of human nature separated from social policy and citizenship which tends to reduce the autonomy of politics. The ideology of human rights is thus similar to the intellectual framework that accompanies the spread of the liberal and merchant system on a global scale, whose particularity is to conceal the most glaring injustices

45 This is an objective alliance of possible circumstances, as improbable as it was, between two adversaries of the past, who were supposed to heartily hate each other, that history has long held back – in view of their diametrically opposed interests, the proletariat and the employers are at the opposite ends of each other – but a savage globalization has de facto brought them together.

46 Here we refer to those moments in Human History where the dominant ones make the mistake of revealing the most implacable face of power, especially when the evolution of their means of production generates its share of contradictions, which thus allow the dominated, albeit by chance, to become aware of it, and, if necessary, to react

47 The nations in question are in a pre-industrial and/or pre-political phase.

suffered by those that economic growth makes conspicuously invisible.

By definition, a revolution is an upheaval, a transformation, an important and processual change, which looms at the heart of the political life of a specific nation and its different structures, which can be possible to anticipate. The question of revolution appears to be difficult to transpose on an international scale because the holders of power are much less easily identifiable, their power seems clearly more disparate and shows an astonishing capacity for resilience. In other words, even if the quantity was changing in quality⁴⁸ at the international level, as long as the opponent or those who are supposed to be, it cannot be located. It seems difficult to be able to take collective action. Once the objective is achieved (i.e., control over the means of production, the financial levers and the various engines of economic growth), revolutionary action can be applied to many areas (of superstructure) such as law, social, political, economic, cultural, moral, scientific and technical, in order to subvert the dominant ideology.

However, contrary to popular belief, a political revolution can claim both liberalism⁴⁹ and Marxism⁵⁰. since all forms of alternative solutions – reformist measures such as the distribution of wealth, the reversal of the unemployment curve and/or correcting the excesses related to globalization with the help of the law – have failed and that compliance with the current law violates common sense.

3.2 The notion of *sittlichkeit* related to global inequalities?

In the strict political field, a revolution is characterized by the brutal and bloody suppression of an established order from the political regime in place, which is replaced by the revolutionary forces.

48 In the *Anti-dühring* and *The Dialectic of Nature*, Engels referred to the laws of dialectics: The law of the transformation of quantity into quality - and vice versa. The law of the interpenetration of opposites

49 At the dawn of political modernity liberalism did not exclude the idea of Revolution, we want as proof § 168 of the *Locke Civil Government Treaty* : « En vertu d'une loi qui précède toutes les lois positives des hommes, et qui est prédominante, le peuple s'est réservé le droit qui appartient généralement à tous les hommes, lorsqu'il n'y a pas d'appel sur terre : le droit d'examiner s'il y a juste sujet d'appeler au Ciel. On ne peut, même légitimement, renoncer à un droit si essentiel et considérable, parce que personne ne peut se soumettre à un autre, jusqu'à lui donner la liberté de le détruire et de le rendre malheureux. Dieu et la nature ne permettent jamais, à qui que ce soit, de s'abandonner tellement à soi-même, que de négliger sa propre conservation ; comme nous ne saurions avoir le droit de nous ôter la vie, nous ne saurions, par conséquent, avoir le droit de donner à d'autres le pouvoir de nous l'ôter » We can also quote Article 35 of the Constitution of 24 June 1793 which states the following idea: « Quand le gouvernement viole les droits du peuple, l'insurrection est, pour le peuple et pour chaque portion du peuple, le plus sacré des droits et le plus indispensable des devoirs ». It is therefore not surprising to see those who have usurped the power to be brought before the Court of History.

50 For revolutionaries, wars (civil and/or military) also serve to solve political and economic problems, tackling the root of these evils.

Unlike a revolt, or even an insurrection, the nature of a revolution, a reform or a coup d'état already includes a plan for the irreversible establishment of a new order. However, whether it is an insurrection or a revolution (liberal or socialist), these two paths are political responses to the common problem of alienation; they consist in seizing political power, so that the majority of the people may reclaim the means of production. The revolutionary elite necessarily inherits a corrupt world, from which it plans to make a clean sweep, forming a large number of proletarians to the rudiments of revolution. In other words, as an active minority, this same revolutionary elite intends to build a new world on the rubble of the previous one. In this, a revolution – whose will to power constitutes here (as an invisible but essential element of Marxism) the substantific essence – proceeds from a certain use of practical reason, when the insurrection – which, for its part, is neither Marxist, neither liberal – seems to flow from the singular expression of what lies halfway between desire⁵¹ and reason.

During an insurrection, the adversaries make the revolutionary, patriot or citizen fiber of their opponents vibrate without their knowledge, pushing them to transgress eventually the least unjust law that it would be likely to institute. Indeed, an insurgent is, at first sight, an ordinary individual who does not wear a uniform, going peacefully to his occupations, but de facto participating in a nascent power, who will nevertheless preside over a upheaval during pre- electoral, pre-insurgency and/or pre-revolutionary; it is not a question of waging a conventional war against an opposing political group claiming to be such, but to make sure that a rampant paranoia runs up his spine and that a threat constantly hovers over the occupier. In this sense, there are no warning signs to predict the preludes of an insurrection; this moment during which a sum of one-off interests occasionally conflate, where murderous impulses and/or disparate passions are freed from the valves of the Sur-I, for this time, being directed towards the summit of economic exploitation, in order to conquer rights and freedoms. While revolutionary actions are clandestinely being carried out, the insurrections, on the other hand, are impulsively carried out without being predictable by the present forces.

Because of the contingencies of their foundations and as they shelter in their midst heterogeneous political forces, insurrections are therefore by definition as subdued as unpredictable,

51 A desire which, according to Plato, would be similar to the Danaid Barrel, namely: inexhaustible.

they seem in this way impossible to mater (from the point of view of the dominant) or to be tamed (from the point of view of the insurgents themselves); the insurrectionary threat is therefore latent, and its threat remains permanent, as long as the action has not taken place. One cannot therefore make ontological rapprochement between the revolutionary, who embraces a cause, by being in this a declared adversary, and the insurgent. Although often present in the political revolution, widespread violence is not necessary to characterize it. What matters most is the scale and speed of change. To remain the same, all the more so within a dialectical reality in its essence, the revolutionary must change partially according to immanent situations subject to transformations, taking into account ideas considered as intangible such as: the *Beautiful*, the *True* and/or the *Just*. These two parts (immanent and transcendent) are incarnated in the subjects in the context of a third moment, which is synonymous with going beyond the two preceding moments. However, a strategy of conquest presiding over the irreversible establishment of a new order may encounter certain difficulties at the time of its realization, what was initially planned by revolutionary elites can be upset by the fact that they will inherit necessarily the previous disorder and bankruptcy engendered by the economic system they fight. In the absence of experience(s) relating to the exercise of power at the highest levels of the State, a revolutionary project risks giving rise to terrible disillusionments, those of which one returns by inevitably pouring into the *realpolitik*; there may be a risk that a revolutionary state will find itself in the hand of international finance.

Moreover, what the revolutionary state allows to do, at least in the domestic sphere, is a manu militari redistribution of wealth to the most disadvantaged. As a possible response to the *sittlichkeit* crisis, it is incumbent upon the revolutionary state to provide an equally effective and lasting solution to one or more structural problems, such as the phenomenon of poverty that constantly affects societies governed by capitalism supposed to secrete its own destruction. In order for this revolutionary approach to fall by right into the non-ideal field of global justice, revolutionary states must arise on the front of the international scene, in order to be able to overthrow this international order with a stroke, which embedded in the world many parts of extreme poverty and creates an ocean of suffering. Sometimes with the rampage of the very places where they live, an aborted revolution worsens the situation of the proletarians, especially if it fails as to the expectations created beforehand. We cannot decently ask anyone who has just opened his eyes to immediately

close them on the effective conditions of his own enslavement. In spite of the lot of cold passions that gallop within this international order, by physical heroism, a handful of men risk their respective lives in an approach as dignified as it is reckless, having for purpose the seizure of power, not by the ballot box (preferred way of liberal revolutions, that is: by democratic or/and legal means) but by weapons.

However, far from imagining the power of attraction that they involuntarily possess on the imaginaries (thus opening new perspectives), even if during their lifetime, people do not think for a second to be offended by it, such economic social inequalities appear, on this scale, so endemic and anxiogenic that the solutions offered to them seem insignificant and it seems difficult to think that such chaos can be the matrix of any new order; this international order, which is clearly corrupt to the core, is generating more and more poor people [who are literally being silenced by such social and economic inequalities] while the privileged are less and less likely to enjoy the subsidies resulting from these privileges.

CONCLUSION

The *Permanent Revolution* is a concept developed by Leon Trotsky in his work of 1930 and inspired by Karl Marx. The three main ideas are the following: in *dominated*, defeated, colonial, or underdeveloped countries, it is not necessary to go through a *bourgeois revolution* and a period of development of the working class before the *socialist revolution*. The permanent point of the socialist revolution is characterized by the continuous transformation of social relations. The need for an international revolution⁵² because the socialist revolution was not viable in a single country, as opposed to the Stalinist vision of restricting it to a single country (the USSR).

⁵² In the image of a revolution supposed to occur on a national scale, the possibility of an international revolution also encounters the following difficulty: how to deal with the previous international order?