UDK 316.323.72
https://doi.org/10.2298/FID2304528B
Original Scientific Article
Received 12.10.2023. Accepted 14.11.2023.

PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIETY
VOL. 34, NO. 4, 523–700

To cite text:
Balunović, Filip; Mladenović, Ivica (2023), "Reflecting the Past, Envisioning the Future: The Journey of 'Democratic Socialism'", *Philosophy and Society* 34 (4): 528–549.

Filip Balunović and Ivica Mladenović

REFLECTING THE PAST, ENVISIONING THE FUTURE: THE JOURNEY OF "DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM"[1]

ABSTRACT
This article examines the evolution of socialism as a political ideology, from its primitive origins in past societies to its contemporary incarnations. It opens with an overview of the foundational and universal principles of socialism concerning equality and common welfare, which can be established as the historical vertical of socialism from its inception to the present. The focus then shifts to the Industrial Revolution, with special emphasis on the significant contributions of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, who envisioned a classless society as a product of revolutionary engagement. The 20th century, marked by key events such as the Russian Revolution and the Cold War, witnessed the practical implementation of two versions of socialism: a hybrid one existing as "real-socialism", a competitive project to Western capitalism, and the other – also hybrid but in a different way – existing within Western capitalism, as part of a concession to dominated classes, in the form of the "welfare state." As a result of the global strength and desirability of the socialist project, this period was marked by many social and civilizational achievements, in both the West and the East, but also confronted with challenges of authoritarianism, economic crises, and democratic dysfunctionality. On the other hand, by the end of the 20th century, the socialist project – with the fall of the USSR – experienced a complete delegitimization in the West, while in China it was maintained in a perverted form. At the beginning of the 21st century, growing dissatisfaction with economic inequalities and political disillusionment, especially after the financial crisis of 2007/2008, reignited interest in an alternative socialist model, particularly in something vaguely and theoretically underdeveloped called "democratic socialism." The authors in the text argue that this renewed interest should be transformed into a theoretically and strategic-politically fruitful maneuver, constructing a new, radically democratic socialist project as the only project that emerges as a sustainable alternative to today's socio-economic-ecological challenges.

KEYWORDS
socialism, democratic socialism, real-socialism, socialism for the 21st century

1 This article was realised with the support of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia, according to the Agreement on the realisation and financing of scientific research.

Filip Balunović: Research Fellow, University of Belgrade, Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory; filip.balunovic@ifdt.bg.ac.rs.
Ivica Mladenović: Research Fellow, University of Belgrade, Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory; ivica.mladenovic@ifdt.bg.ac.rs.

Introduction

Within the complex framework of political ideologies that have historically shaped societal structures and dynamics, socialism emerges as a particularly notable and divisive element. This ideology, deeply rooted in principles of egalitarianism and communal welfare, has persistently engaged intellectuals, political figures, and the general populace with its envisagement of a societal construct wherein resources and authority are distributed with equitable consideration for all constituents. However, the notion of socialism is frequently enveloped in conceptual vagueness, provoking a diverse spectrum of reactions that oscillate between idealistic visions of a utopian society and apprehensions of a dystopian downfall. To adequately decipher the nature of socialism, with its layered aspects and its evolving influence within socio-political discourse, it is imperative to undertake a thorough examination of its historical progression, engage in a critical analysis of its present-day expressions, and formulate thoughtful hypotheses about its potential paths forward.

The genesis of socialism, although the term gained its semantic identity around the 1830s in England and France, has its roots well before this period.[2] Pre-modern civilizations, engaged in proto-socialist practices characterized by communal habitation and the collective stewardship of resources. These historical formations represent archetypes of societies where the means of production were communally held within cooperative collectives. The evolution of socialism into its current ideological manifestation coincided with the upheaval of the Industrial Revolution. This era, marked by rapid mechanization and industrial expansion, also engendered pronounced socio-economic stratification and labor exploitation. It is within this historical milieu that seminal theorists such as Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels authored "The Communist Manifesto", articulating the ideological tenets of socialism as an ideological counterpoint to rampant capitalist expansion. Their vision encompassed a classless society, emerging from the proletariat's overthrow of the bourgeoisie, to restructure societal relations devoid of class hierarchies.

The twentieth century represented a critical juncture for the pragmatic analysis of socialism as an ideological construct. Initiated by the Russian Revolution in 1917, which marked the emergence of the world's inaugural socialist state, this era was significantly defined by the binary ideological confrontation characteristic of the Cold War. In this milieu, socialism, particularly its Marxist-Leninist manifestation, was positioned in stark opposition to the capitalist ethos predominant in Western countries. During this period, various states, including China, Cuba, and a number of Eastern European countries, adopted socialist paradigms, each distinct in its specific adaptations and contextual modifications. Despite this, the implementation of socialism within

2 In the June 1948 edition of the *Journal of the History of Ideas*, issued by the College of the City of New York, Arthur E. Beston Jr. presents a thorough study. He highlights that the earliest documented usage of the term [likely "socialism" or a similar word] is identified in the November 1827 issue of the *Co-operative Magazine* (Gans 1957: 79).

these geopolitical entities was marred by various conflicts and inconsistencies. Though there were considerable advancements in sectors such as education, healthcare, and the enforcement of fundamental human rights, these countries have faced the challenges of democratic dysfunction, economic malaise, and, above all, the perpetuation of class-based societal structures. The crumbling of the Berlin Wall in 1989, followed by the subsequent dissolution of the Soviet Union, significantly contributed to the questioning and delegitimization of socialism as a doctrine capable of delivering economic, political, and social egalitarianism (Mladenović 2013).

In the contemporary landscape of the 21st century, the discourse surrounding socialism is undergoing a significant transformation. The era dominated by the Marxist-Leninist interpretation of socialism has given way to a more nuanced and varied understanding of the concept. Globally, modern iterations of socialism frequently incorporate aspects of capitalist structures, resulting in the emergence of hybrid models. Notable examples include the social democracies of Scandinavia and the distinct framework of "socialism with Chinese characteristics". These models are characterized by the state assuming a pivotal role in ensuring social welfare, while concurrently allowing for the operation of private enterprises and market forces.

The present-day challenges, encompassing the escalating issue of economic inequality and the looming existential crisis posed by climate change, have rejuvenated interest in socialist tenets, particularly among the younger demographic. In an increasingly globalized context, there is a notable re-examination and expansion of socialist thought, reflecting on its potential manifestations in the 21st century. Crucially, this includes a deeper exploration of the interplay between socialism and democracy, especially informed by historical experiences with "real socialism". This re-evaluation represents a pivotal shift in the understanding and application of socialist principles today, aligning them with contemporary "democratic needs" and global challenges.

As we stand at the precipice of unparalleled technological advancements, with automation and artificial intelligence set to revolutionize the nature of work and the broader economic landscape, the question arises: what is the prospective trajectory of socialism in this new era? The foundational tenets of socialism, encompassing ideals of equity, collective ownership, and shared responsibility, may gain heightened relevance in addressing forthcoming challenges. These include, but are not limited to, the scarcity of resources and the potential surge in unemployment attributable to automation. Conversely, these technological advancements may also pose novel challenges to socialist frameworks, necessitating unprecedented adaptations.

It is crucial to recognize that socialism, as an ideological construct, has consistently exhibited a dynamic and evolving nature. Its historical evolution, spanning from early communal societies to its current iterations in the digital epoch, is a testament to its persistent allure and capacity for adaptation. This review article aims to embark on a comprehensive exploration of socialism, traversing its historical roots, analyzing its current manifestations, and

contemplating its future prospects. Through this examination, we endeavor to present a nuanced and holistic perspective of socialism, elucidating its successes and hurdles, and contemplating its potential role in sculpting the future trajectory of human society.

Socialism: The Origin and Meaning of the Concept in the 19th Century

The concept of socialism, though distinctly shaped in the 19th century, has roots stretching back to earlier philosophical ideas. Plato's "Republic" and Thomas More's "Utopia" are seminal works providing early conceptualizations of societies anchored in common ownership and equality. These texts laid a philosophical groundwork that would later be instrumental in the development of socialist thought. Prior to the crystallization of socialism as a structured ideology, several early 19th-century thinkers, including Robert Owen in Britain, Charles Fourier in France, and Henri de Saint-Simon, also in France, proffered diverse models of utopian socialism. These theorists proposed idealized societal constructs as antidotes to the disparities and adversities engendered by burgeoning industrial capitalism (Taylor 1992; Leopold 2005). While their propositions were, in many aspects, divergent, contradictory and in some ways unusable, they ignited a consequential discourse, fostering an exploration of viable alternatives to the prevailing capitalist paradigm.[3]

The genesis of socialism is deeply intertwined with the transformative changes brought about by the Industrial Revolution, commencing in the late 18th century. This epochal shift marked a transition from primarily agrarian economies to those dominated by industrial production, a transformation characterized by the proliferation of factories, rapid urbanization, and the advent of novel technologies. The Industrial Revolution catalyzed extraordinary economic expansion and technological progress, yet it simultaneously engendered profound social and economic inequalities. The emergent industrial society witnessed the ascendance of a distinct working class, which bore the brunt of this new economic order. Laborers in these industrial settings were frequently subjected to extensive working hours, meager wages, and perilous working conditions. This stark exploitation and the resultant socio-economic stratification served as a catalyst for widespread discontent among the working classes. It was within this context of industrial strife and inequity that the foundational tenets of socialist thought began to coalesce.

The burgeoning socialist ideology was a response to the systemic inequities perpetuated by industrial capitalism. Early socialist thinkers sought to address the grievances of the working class by advocating for more equitable economic systems, which included proposals for the redistribution of wealth, improved

3 Utopian socialism played an important role in defining the early contours of socialist ideology, contextualizing its evolution as a response to the socio-economic dynamics and social balance of power of the time (Droz 1996; Becker, Cander 2005).

labor conditions, and the establishment of social safety nets. These ideas were a direct rebuttal to the laissez-faire capitalism that dominated the economic landscape of the time, which largely neglected the welfare of the labor force in pursuit of industrial and economic growth. Thus, the Industrial Revolution, while a period of significant economic and technological advancement, also laid bare the stark realities of capitalist exploitation. This period not only transformed the economic and social landscape of the time but also sowed the seeds of socialist ideology, which sought to rectify the imbalances and injustices that became increasingly apparent in this new industrial world. The dialogue and movements that emerged from this period of industrialization laid the groundwork for the development and evolution of socialist thought, shaping it into a considerable force in the subsequent centuries.

The mid-19th century marked a pivotal moment in the evolution of socialist thought, primarily through the contributions of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, who exerted a profound influence on the trajectory of the socialist movement. Distinct from their predecessors, the utopian socialists, Marx and Engels pursued a decidedly more empirical and analytical approach to socialism, underpinned by a comprehensive critique of capitalist systems. This approach was methodically encapsulated in their seminal texts, notably "The Communist Manifesto" (1848) and "Das Kapital". Marx and Engels' intellectual endeavor was characterized by the development of a framework that they termed "scientific socialism." This framework was grounded in the analysis of historical and economic processes, standing in contrast to the "idealistic" and often "speculative" nature of "utopian socialism". The core of their theory was historical materialism, an innovative perspective positing that the material conditions of society – its economic and productive structures – fundamentally shape and determine the course of societal development, including its political and cultural aspects.

A critical element of Marx's analysis was the concept of class struggle, which he viewed as the driving force of historical change (Losurdo 2016). According to Marx, the inherent conflict between the proletariat (working class) and the bourgeoisie (capitalist class) was an inevitable outcome of the capitalist system. He posited that this struggle would ultimately culminate in a proletarian revolution, overthrowing the capitalist system and leading to the establishment of a classless, communist society. Marx and Engels' contributions provided a theoretical backbone to the socialist movement, offering a more structured and robust critique of capitalism than previously seen.[4]

The establishment of the International Workingmen's Association (IWA), commonly referred to as the First International, in 1864, represents a pivotal

4 While the social science legacy of Marx and Engels was very rich, and self-proclaimed socialist movements emerged in drove in the second half of the 19th century, the notion of socialism in the social sciences was very often confused with the notion of the "social question", and there was a cacophony of different meanings given to this concepts by sociologists, philosophers and other social science thinkers of the time (Mladenović 2018; 2019).

event in the annals of socialist history (Droz 1966; Julliard 2012; Winock 2006). This organization symbolized a unifying platform for diverse socialist, communist, and anarchist factions, providing a fertile ground for the exchange and synthesis of ideological perspectives and tactical methodologies. The IWA's formation was a significant step in the consolidation and dissemination of socialist ideologies on an international scale. The Paris Commune of 1871, though short-lived, was a pivotal event in the history of socialism (Lefebvre 1965; Marx 1973). It represented the first instance of the working-class seizing power, albeit briefly, and implementing socialist policies. The brutal suppression of the Commune by the French government highlighted both the potential and the challenges of socialist revolution.

Despite its promise, the history of the First International was beleaguered by internal schisms, notably the ideological divide between Marxists and "anti-authoritarians," i.e. anarchists (Musto 2014). This disagreement, focused on key differences regarding the function and essence of governmental authority and the ways to attain socialist objectives, led to the disbanding of the group following the Paris Commune. Anarchism, championed by figures such as Mikhail Bakunin (Михаил Бакунин), represented a radical strand of socialism, vehemently opposing all forms of state power. Anarchist theorists advocated for the immediate dismantling of both the state and capitalist structures, envisioning a society based on voluntary associations and mutual aid. In contrast, Marxism, as articulated by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, assigned a critical, albeit transitional, role to the state. Marxists posited that the state was a necessary instrument in the progression towards a communist society, envisaging a phase of "proletarian dictatorship" that would eventually pave the way for a stateless, classless society.

Mikhail Bakunin was ousted at The Hague Congress in 1872, and the First International ceased to exist in 1876. However, its legacy continued with the formation of the Workers' International, also known as the Second International or Socialist International, in 1889, which united the social-democratic parties of that era. The historical significance of the First International lies in its facilitation of a broader dissemination and cross-pollination of socialist ideas throughout Europe and beyond. By the end of the 19th century, socialism had significantly impacted European politics and society. Socialist parties began emerging across Europe, gaining considerable support among the working classes. These parties varied in their approach, with some advocating revolutionary methods and others pursuing reformist strategies. Socialism also influenced other social movements, including the women's rights and labor movements, contributing to broader struggles for equality and justice.

Karl Marx and Social Democracy

Social democracy emerged as the hegemonic theoretical and political force within late-nineteenth-century socialism. The conceptualization of social democracy has undergone significant evolution since its nascent stages, a transformation

deeply entwined with the revolutionary ideologies of Karl Marx. The influence exerted by Marx on this political and ideological movement is particularly discernible during the tumultuous epoch of the 1848 revolution. This period was instrumental in fostering a novel interpretation of socialism, one that was embedded within a democratic infrastructure. The 1848 revolution in France, which culminated in the overthrow of the July monarchy, marked a decisive turning point in the development of social democracy. In this era of political ferment, an array of political factions, encompassing embryonic socialist groups and bourgeois republicans, coalesced in opposition to a mutual adversary: the monarchy.

Marx's analysis of this confluence delineates it as the foundational moment for social democracy. He construed this alliance as a pragmatic conglomeration, wherein the proletariat and the "petit-bourgeois" – moderate republicans by definition – converged in their interests. This convergence was not merely oppositional to the royalist forces but was also a collective stance against the broader bourgeoisie. Such an alignment, as perceived by Marx, was not solely an intersection of varied political aspirations but a strategic unification, signifying a critical juncture in the development and embodiment of social democratic ideals.

At the heart of comprehending social democracy as envisioned by Karl Marx lies the principle of compromise, a concept he meticulously expounds in "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte". Marx portrays social democracy as a product of the proletariat's imperative to form an alliance with the "petit-bourgeois": "As against the coalesced bourgeoisie, a coalition between petty bourgeois and workers had been formed, the so-called Social-Democratic party" (Marx 1969: 32). This alliance, as Marx delineates, was not merely a coalition of convenience but a deliberate attempt to amalgamate the establishment of a democratic regime – a core republican ambition – with the social demands emanating from the working-class milieu. Marx's analytical framework postulates that social democracy arose from the need to defend and actualize these convergent but distinct demands, particularly in the context of opposing monarchical forces.

Marx's critique of social democracy is grounded in his perception of it as a dilution, or perhaps an adulteration, of pure proletarian aspirations. He contends that the requisite compromises, integral to the symbiosis between the proletariat and the "petit-bourgeois," precipitated a diminution of the revolutionary zeal that originally fueled these groups. Marx views the resultant form of social democracy as a deceptive amalgam, one that submerged the authentic demands of the workers beneath a veneer of democratic governance devoid of true revolutionary impetus. This synthesis, in Marx's eyes, constituted a strategic misstep, aligning the proletariat's objectives with a bourgeois democratic system intrinsically averse to profound alterations in the fabric of production relations. For Marx, such a system was incapable of truly representing or advancing proletarian interests, as it was fundamentally anchored in the preservation of existing capitalist structures. This critique reflects Marx's broader

skepticism about the capacity of social democracy to enact meaningful systemic change within the constraints of a capitalist framework.

Despite his pointed criticisms, Karl Marx's analytical discourse serves as a foundational bedrock for conceptualizing social democracy as an intricate synthesis of democratic and social aspirations. The terminology "social democracy" itself succinctly embodies this fusion, signaling an endeavor to meld the pursuit of a democratic system with a suite of policies expressly tailored to enhance the welfare of the working class. This amalgamation, as envisaged in Marxian thought, represents a concerted effort to navigate the complex interplay between democratic governance and social equity. However, Marx postulated that this synthesis, while aspirational, was intrinsically flawed. In his view, the amalgam of social democracy struggled to harmonize the defense of bourgeois democracy with the proletariat's vested interests. Marx's critique hinges on the argument that bourgeois democracy, by its very nature, is tethered to the capitalist order, thereby predisposing it to perpetuate existing power structures and economic disparities. The crux of Marx's contention lies in the assertion that the fundamental ethos of bourgeois democracy – with its inherent capitalist underpinnings – stands in stark contradiction to the proletariat's quest for socioeconomic emancipation.

Accordingly, Marx perceived this attempted synthesis as a well-intentioned but ultimately ineffectual endeavor. It was, in his analysis, a venture that could not truly reconcile the inherent dichotomies and contradictions between a democratic framework rooted in capitalist ideologies and the proletariat's pursuit of radical, systemic change. This viewpoint underscores Marx's broader philosophical and ideological stance, which advocates for a revolutionary overhaul of the capitalist system as a prerequisite for genuine proletarian liberation. Karl Marx's interpretation of the beginnings of social democracy provides a pivotal critical insight, indispensable to the analysis of the movement's late trajectory and metamorphosis. His skepticism, particularly regarding the efficacy of social democracy in effectuating substantive change within the confines of a capitalist framework, has persisted as a significant area of debate. Contemporary discourse on social democracy frequently contends with this inherent tension, striving to navigate a course that harmonizes progressive social policies with the extant political and economic infrastructures.

Marx's exegesis of social democracy, especially in the context of the 1848 revolution, presents a nuanced and incisive perspective on this political and ideological paradigm. His analysis is anchored in a deep examination of the principle of compromise, a hallmark of the social democratic movement. This focus brings to light the complexities involved in balancing the divergent interests and aspirations of various social classes. Furthermore, Marx's critique extends to the perceived dilution of proletarian objectives, a process he viewed as an inevitable consequence of the compromises necessitated by social democracy. This critique underscores the challenges inherent in synthesizing the ideals of liberal democracy with the social agenda of the working class.

Marx's legacy, as far as social democracy is concerned, remains profoundly influential on contemporary discourse. His ideas continue to prompt a theoretical-critical examination of the role and potential of the social-democratic approach in the 20th century (Zavadski 1975; Mladenović 2013; 2014). Despite the fact that Karl Marx was unaware of the development of parliamentary democracy and the social ascendancy of left-wing parties, the relevance of his critique is particularly evident in current debates on the feasibility and desirability of integrating egalitarian ideals into the existing capitalist framework. His analysis prompts a reassessment of how social democracy can be effectively implemented to meet the needs and aspirations of the dominated classes, without succumbing to the limitations imposed by dominant economic and political systems.

In essence, Marx's contributions to understanding the social-democratic strategy of his time provide a fundamental framework for examining its evolution and impact. His critical approach offers valuable insights into the challenges and possibilities of achieving a harmonious integration of social and democratic goals within a capitalist society. This ongoing commitment to Marx's legacy reflects the enduring relevance of his ideas for understanding social-democratic praxis and its limits in the 20th century, as well as the current state of this political current.

Social-democratic Marxism versus Leninist Marxism: The History of a Dispute

Social democracy, in its most sophisticated incarnation towards the latter part of the 19th century, after Karl Marx's death, was epitomized by The Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD). This party, embodying the ethos of the era, adopted Marxism as its foundational theoretical lens for interpreting and responding to the complexities of the social milieu. This adoption was not merely an ideological stance but represented a commitment to a comprehensive analysis of the socio-economic structures and dynamics of the time, aligning closely with Marxist principles. The intellectual and political dominance of Social-democratic Marxism in the European left was unchallenged until the onset of the First World War. This period was marked by a burgeoning confidence in the gradualist, reform-oriented approach of Social Democracy, which sought to reconcile the aspirations of the working class with the existing parliamentary democracy framework.

The SPD, in particular – but not only the SPD, as with other social-democratic or socialist parties, including the French Socialist Party, then called SFIO (The French Section of the Workers' International) – became the beacon of this ideology, advocating progressive social change through electoral politics and legislative reform (Droz 1966; Becker, Cander 2005; Winock 2006). The concepts of socialism and social democracy have become synonymous, used as generic words according to national traditions, but the theoretical content of

the dominant political fractions is quite similar: adoption of Marx's idea that class struggle is the central generator of history and that the working class is the only one capable of overcoming class society, but at the same time, the revision of certain points made by Marx, given the evolution of capitalism and parliamentary democracy. Jean Jaurès, the French socialist leader and theorist of the time, formulated this idea as follows: "Class struggle is the principle, the basis, the very law of our Party. Those who do not accept class struggle may be republicans, democrats, radicals, radical-socialists at best, but they are not socialists" (Hariou 1960: 19).

Social-democratic Marxism, firmly anchored in the intellectual tradition of theorists such as Eduard Bernstein, presented a nuanced and reformist trajectory towards the realization of a socialist society. Bernstein's critical work, "Evolutionary Socialism," stands as a cornerstone in this ideological edifice. Contrary to Marx's prognosis of an inevitable collapse of capitalism, Bernstein posited a different vision. He argued that capitalism was not inexorably destined for downfall; rather, it possessed an inherent capacity for reform and adaptation. This perspective marked a significant departure from classical Marxist thought, suggesting that socialism could be achieved not through abrupt, revolutionary ruptures but via a progressive, evolutionary process. Bernstein advocated for the attainment of socialism through democratic engagement, leveraging parliamentary mechanisms, labor union activism, and a series of progressive social reforms (Bernstein 1961).

However, the dominance of this vision of social change underwent a radical change with the collapse of the Second International, an organization that had served as a unifying platform for socialist parties. The outbreak of World War I created deep fissures within the International, as national allegiances and the support for war efforts by certain member parties contravened the fundamental internationalist and anti-war principles of socialism. This rupture was a pivotal moment, highlighting the limitations and contradictions inherent in the reformist Social-democratic approach. The paradigmatic shift was further catalyzed by the October Revolution in Russia in 1917. This revolution marked the emergence and rise to power of a new Marxist vision, "Revolutionary Marxism", a force that had already existed within the social-democratic movement since the end of the 19th century, but as a fragile force poorly articulated by the revolutionary fractions of social-democracy.

Moving away from the social-democratic approach dominant within the socialist/social-democratic movement, Leninist Marxism, under the aegis of Vladimir Lenin and the Bolshevik Party, advocates a resolutely different path.[5] Lenin, through seminal texts like "What is to be Done ?" and "State and Revolution", mounted a robust critique of the gradualist approach espoused by the

5 The Bolsheviks, a term derived from the Russian word 'bolshinstvo' meaning 'majority', were a radical left-wing group within the Marxist Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP). Under the leadership of Vladimir Lenin, they emerged as a distinct faction, diverging from the Mensheviks during the Second Party Congress in 1903.

old social-democratic parties. Leninist Marxism posited the necessity of a revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist system, eschewing the gradualism characteristic of Social Democracy. It emphasized the role of a vanguard party to lead the proletariat, a stark contrast to the mass-based, democratic approach of the SPD and similar parties. This perspective was significantly shaped by the socio-political milieu of Tsarist Russia, characterized by nascent democratic institutions and a prevalently repressive state apparatus. In such a context, Lenin viewed the prospects for gradual, reformist change as untenable, advocating instead for a more immediate, radical overthrow of the existing socio-political order.

The ascension of Leninist Marxism marked a pivotal juncture in the evolution of socialist ideology, heralding a profound shift in the theoretical and practical dimensions of socialist thought. This reorientation was characterized by an urgent call for revolutionary change, diverging from the prevailing European leftist norms which predominantly leaned towards a more moderate, reformist approach. Leninist Marxism brought forth a radical interpretation of Marx's theories, challenging the existing orthodoxy and advocating for immediate, revolutionary action as a means to achieve socialist ends. This ideological metamorphosis not only reshaped the theoretical landscape of Marxism but also prompted a realignment of political strategies and objectives within the global socialist movement.

The authoritarian direction of Russia's revolutionary socialist government, partly shaped by the Bolsheviks' strategic, political, and theoretical stance and partly due to the existential threat the regime faced from capitalist forces both domestically and internationally, marked a critical moment for examining the interplay between socialism and democracy. Before the October Revolution, various forms of socialism were universally regarded as a radical extension of democratic principles. Rosa Luxembourg, a prominent figure in the SPD's left-wing faction, criticized the opportunistic behavior of German social democratic leaders (Eduard Bernstein, Karl Kautsky) and the Russian Mensheviks, particularly their imperialistic tendencies. While she supported Lenin's Bolsheviks, she simultaneously voiced concerns over the erosion of political democracy occurring in Russia:

> Without general elections, without unlimited freedom of the press and of assembly, without a free struggle between opinions, life dies out in all public institutions; it is transformed into a fictitious life wherein only the bureaucracy remains the active element. [...] The fundamental error of the Lenin-Trotsky theory is precisely that, like Kautsky, they oppose democracy to dictatorship. (Luxembourg 1970: 187)

This era, therefore, stands as a pivotal chapter in the evolution of socialist thought, underscoring the intricate and dynamic synthesis of theoretical perspectives and practical implementations in the pursuit of socialist objectives. The ascendancy of Leninist Marxism and its ensuing ideological confrontation with Social-democratic Marxism precipitated a fundamental realignment

in the course of global socialist and communist movements. In the epoch following the Second World War, these divergent socialist ideologies found expression across an array of political systems and governance methodologies. Europe, in this period, gravitated towards a Social-democratic model, emphasizing progressive social reforms within a capitalist framework. Concurrently, in the Global South, the landscape witnessed the rise of revolutionary states, whose foundations were deeply rooted in the principles of Leninist Marxism.

The Social democratic paradigm, characterized by its focus on incremental social reforms situated within the confines of parliamentary democracy, garnered widespread acceptance among the populations of Europe, fatigued by the ravages of war. This model offered a vision of serene and progressive social transformation towards a "democratic socialist society". The term encapsulating this ideology was formally conceptualized in 1959 by the SPD during the seminal Bad Godesberg Congress. This historic congress marked a pivotal moment for the SPD, as it decisively distanced itself from its Marxist roots, renouncing its previous identity as a class-centric party. Instead, it redefined itself as a *Volkspartei*, or a people's party, signifying a fundamental shift in its ideological orientation and political strategy (Droz 1966: 315–321). This repositioning of the SPD not only reflected a broader reevaluation within the party but also symbolized a significant transformation in the landscape of European socialist movements, signaling – as Karl Marx well predicted – a move towards more centrist political approaches and reconciliation with bourgeois tendencies.

As revolutionary Marxism, in its practical political implementation, shifted towards Stalinist authoritarianism,[6] Western social democracy has increasingly distanced itself from Marxism and, to some extent, from the socialist agenda itself, despite continuing to identify as socialist. This historical phase culminated in the dissolution not only of the Leninist revolutionary states, but also of the traditional social-democratic project, marking a critical turning point in the history of socialist endeavors. Although all socialist/social democratic parties abandoned the reformist socialist project a few decades ago, during which time they pursued center-right policies on the economic front, today's Socialist International, as well as its members, have all kept "democratic socialism" on their agenda as their main objective. This expression was longtime associated with social-democratic parties, but from a theoretical and politico-strategic

6 It should be highlighted that the socio-economic structures influenced by Leninist-Marxist principles, commonly referred to as "real socialism" – the practical form of socialism in place until 1990 – demonstrated a significant diversity in their variants, evolutions, and national expressions. For instance, Yugoslav self-management socialism, even though it operated under a single-party system, incorporated various layers of democratic elements that were not typical in Western frameworks (see in: "La commune yougoslave", UNESCO, Revue international des sciences sociales, XIII (3), 1961). Regarding the connection between the Yugoslav model and the Eurocommunism movement in Western Europe, which sought to create a new communist approach devoid of the authoritarian aspects of the Stalinist approach, further information can be found in Filipović 2023.

point of view, it was totally emptied of meaning. But for some time now, and particularly since the 2007/2008 crisis, there have been theoretical and political attempts to articulate and revitalize the concept of "democratic socialism", linking it to the socialist project of overcoming capitalism.

Democratic Socialism and Critique of Capitalism in Contemporary Theory

Democratic socialism in theory today is inevitably building on the left tradition and combining it with new tendencies and challenges. Among the most serious challenges is neoliberalism and the social, economic and democratic "ruins" (Brown 2021) it has left behind. The neoliberal attack on democracy that followed the so-called "neoliberal turn" (Brown 2013), prompted authors like Colin Crouch (2000) to proclaim the begging of the post-democratic era. In return, the Marxian thought has taken a pro-democratic side, by arguing that socialism is democratic – unlike (neo)liberal capitalism. In his book "Why Marx Was Right", Terry Eagleton demystified the Marxian heritage and sought to defend Marx from unjustified accusations for authoritarianism. Contrary to the dominant narrative about Marx as an enemy of democracy, Eagleton elaborated the Marxian radical democratic position. Marx was critical of the bourgeois state because it was not class-neutral, whatsoever. Instead, he was not agitating for a strong state, but a state with an administrative, rather than oppressive role. He was in favor of substantial peoples' democracy (as seen in the Paris Commune) – not the rule of the political oligarchy as established in the representative bourgeois model. The contemporary theory of democratic socialism most definitely takes this Marxian position into account. It seeks true democracy. As put by Brie and Spehr (2012: 81), the general formula of "democratic socialism" in the 21st century could be allowing free and universal development of individuals through solidary development of all.

In terms of the class struggle, between the class of capitalists and the class of workers, Erik Olin Wright argues that democratic socialism is not defined as centralized state ownership of the means of production (like in the 20th century socialism aut. rem.) but as working-class collective control over capital (Olin Wright 2015: 219). For the contemporary, 21st century era, he nonetheless argues, we cannot proceed with the critique of capitalism or proposition of alternative socio-economic models without understanding what he calls "contradictory locations within class relations". The basic idea, Olin Wright argues, is "to identify a series of locations within the class relations of capitalism that were in some sense simultaneously in more than one class. More specifically, with respect to relations of domination and exploitation, some locations can be simultaneously dominated and dominating or exploiting and exploited. In the present context, this implies that with respect to material interests defined in terms of the games of capitalism versus socialism, such locations have contradictory interests – interests pointing in opposite directions (ibid.: 168). Such a set-up makes the socialist project way more complex than before.

Opposing the prevalence of the so-called "cultural turn", which explains the contemporary complexities and resilience of 21st century capitalism in terms of "non-material values", meaning ideology, culture, discourse etc., another author scales up the complexity of the project of democratic socialism. Vivek Chibber, in his "The Class Matrix", defends the hypothesis that workers' consent does not decisively affect the stability and durability of the system of exploitation under capitalism. The more fundamental mechanism for capitalism's stability, Chibber argues, is workers' resignation coming out of their situation. He thinks that workers resign themselves to it because of the constraints on class formation:

> [...] the myriad obstacles to collective action incline workers to resist as individuals, and not through mutual coordination, which sometimes improves the situation of particular workers but does little to alter the structural inequality in capacity between the two classes." [...] (In turn) "They accept their class position, even though they may not deem it desirable or legitimate. (Chibber 2022: 80)

The general trend of resignation and absence of efficient and politically potent collective action is, nonetheless, not without exceptions. In many parts of the world, collective and well-organized resistance takes place. As difficulties with conceptualizing resistance, at the same time, spillover to the theorization of the new democratic-socialist subject, progressive mobilizations around the world incentivized thinkers to restore the search for new conceptualizations of resistance. As every system has its own characteristics and means of reproduction, every social/systemic change starts from conceptual delegitimization of the status quo, before it develops conceptual and political/economic strategies for the future. If feudalism was challenged by the Enlightenment; early industrial capitalism by utopian and scientific socialism; late capitalism and "consumerist culture" by the Critical theory – one inevitably wonders about contemporary neoliberalism and the substantial critique from the left. Firstly, it took a long time for neoliberalism to become the main object of criticism, as it has been analyzed so thoroughly in order to be criticized aptly.

The American theorist, David Harvey and his "Brief History of Neoliberalism" (2005) contributed greatly in this respect. Elsewhere, he argued against the right-wing propaganda which claims that socialism is the enemy of individual freedom. The exact opposite is true, he claims, "socialists work to create the material conditions under which people can truly be free, without the rigid constraints capitalism imposes on their lives" (Harvey 2020). Other Harvey's concepts, in a way, operationalize or concretize the idea of democratic socialism. His "right to the city" (Harvey 2008) represents the key conceptual pillar of municipalism which fueled the idea of "rebel cities" (Harvey 2012). These "rebel cities", or "critical cities" as called by some authors (Naik, Oldfield 2012), have become the platform for plausible critique under circumstances of globalized neoliberal capitalism. Local "laboratories" of democratic socialism can, nonetheless, "never be an end in itself, even if it increasingly looks to be

one of the most propitious paths to take" (ibid.: xviii). Municipal struggles, instead, should not be "an end in itself", but connect with other local, national or international struggles.

Interestingly enough, some authors argued, more than a century ago, that democracy should be the final aim of socialism – but not necessarily the mean. It was Robert Michels, the author of the famous "iron law of oligarchy", who thought that "socialism does not signify everything by the people, but everything for the people" (Michels 2001: 58). The experience of socialism of the 20th century went mostly in this direction. The 21st century socialism, on the other hand, mostly undertook a different path, insisting on democracy both as an end and as a means. Contemporary socialist-democratic thought, is hence preoccupied with the reinvention of a (new) radical subjectivity and the search for a social actor who could successfully challenge the ruling paradigm, with democratic means. As argued by Michael Lebowitz:

> Despite the intensification of capital's class war against the working class, despite capital's insistence that workers must bear the burden of capital's own failures, the working class sees no alternative other than to try to say 'no' – no to cutbacks, no to austerity, no to new user charges, no to the destruction of our lives and our environment – but not 'yes' to a socialist alternative. (Lebowitz 2013: 117–118)

This is why thinkers have started building new concepts on the ashes of 20th century ideologies and their conceptual backgrounds. In this regard, there were two concepts which have managed to attract more attention than others and contribute to what Hugo Chavez urged for in 2005 in Porto Alegre when he said "We have to re-invent socialism" (Lebowitz, ibid.). The first concept is populism or a populist subject, followed by the concepts of "radical democracy" (Laclau, Mouffe 1985) and the "populist reason" (Laclau 2005). Within such, the so-called "post-Marxian tradition", the field of contestation has been shifted away from materially determined class struggle, and pointed towards a discursive field of articulation. The idea of "left populism" thus introduced social demand as its central category and, among many unfulfilled social demands, Laclau argues, there should be one which is capable of articulating all other demands. This demand Laclau calls an "empty signifier". Considering that each unfulfilled demand is carried by an actor, gathering social demands into one which is "emptied of meaning", signifies, by the same token, a convergence of different actors. What appears as crucial in Laclau is that all these demands and actors are pointed against a "common enemy".

At the dawn of the 21st century, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri formulated the new emancipatory actor: multitude. They defined it in a radically democratic sense, as a class concept that resolves the tension between unity and plurality. They find the presumable necessity of choosing between these two seemingly contradictory positions false. "The mandate to choose between unity and multiplicity treats class as if it were merely an empirical concept and fails to take into consideration the extent to which class itself is defined

politically" (Hardt, Negri 2004: 104). From there, they define class as being determined by class struggle (ibid.). A similar track is chosen by other thinkers, including the above-mentioned Michael Lebowitz. Like Laclau and Mouffe, as well as Hardt and Negri, Lebowitz also sees class as an actor that can potentially become more radically democratic through action.

While arguing that workers rebel mostly when the bottom line of their existential needs is threatened (the concept he uses is the one of E.P. Thomson "moral economy of the poor" or "moral economy of the working class"), Lebowitz sees the potential in such action: "Even though the moral economy of the working class as such is not an immediate challenge to exploitation, it can be the basis for a process by which workers themselves change in the course of struggle" (Lebowitz, ibid.: 122). The general tendency of radical democratic, socialist thought in the 21st (and for the 21st) century is clear. It seeks to accommodate radical socialist ideas from the past into the new era and it offers new conceptualizations of radical subjectivity in the contemporary context. It critically reflects on the heritage and the defeat of the political left in the 20th century, while, at the same time, offering a plausible critique of neoliberal capitalism of today. The effort is there and the question of the objective political effect of this effort still needs to be addressed.

The 21st Century "Democratic Socialism" in Action

The 21st century socialism "in action" was fueled by the global economic crisis of 2007/2008. Since then, it has had several important tasks. Firstly, it needed to regain support and legitimacy after the defeat of the "real socialism" of the 20th century. Secondly, it sought to reclaim its democratic essence, as opposed to the reactionary, anti-democratic or post-democratic political tendencies promoted by most of the liberal and conservative political forces. Thirdly, its task was to react to the revisionist political practice of the so-called "third way" social democracy. Finally, it had to be innovative, in both ideational and practical political senses.

When Robert Michels talked about oligarchic tendencies in democratic socialist parties already in the early 20th century, he somewhat criticized and absolved the left at the same time. Namely, he argued that the sociological "iron law of oligarchy" holds for every organization, be it democratic or not. "Who says organization, says oligarchy" (Michels *ibid*: 241). The 20th century socialist experience, in this sense, complied with an inevitable force within every organization, including socialist political parties. The 21st century socialism has aimed at overcoming these limitations. Such attempts were usually tightly associated with branches of contemporary critical socialist theory, which had a decisive effect on the new social and political actors on the left.

In Europe, among the most well-known cases is Spanish social movement Indignados or "M15" and Spanish movement-party Podemos, whose "populist strategy" closely followed the new socialist conceptualization developed by Lacalau and Mouffe (see: Mouffe and Erejon 2016; Valdivielso 2017; Eklundh

2019). Instead on the working class solely, as in the traditional left, the focus was on the formation of a wider social base and creation of a "populist" and radically democratic political subject called "the people" or in Spanish *pueblo*. On the opposite pole, the role of the main political enemy of the people, there was the so called *casta*, or the political class. After gaining an envious level of social and later, political support, Podemos lost the momentum which resulted in decline in both political power and popular support.

Another political breakthrough from the Left happened in the second decade of the 21st century in Greece. Similar to Podemos, Syriza's rise to the position of a relevant political actor and later, its rise to power, owed much to the world economic crisis of 2008 and the wave of anti-austerity contentious politics from below (Della Porta 2015). Therefore, the contemporary left managed to bypass the heavy burden of the 20th century defeat: not necessarily by distancing from its historical legacy, as much as by focusing mostly on the contemporary economic and social challenges which made the 20th century type of ideological debates taking the back seat. Syriza, unlike Podemos, was the strongest partner in the Greek government elected in 2015, and came into the position to offer a socialist future for its country. It turned out that the anti-socialist and anti-democratic international financial institutions and governments of the strongest EU countries were more powerful. Eventually, the Syriza project ended ingloriously.

Other European countries have seen new socialist actors as well, though not so paradigmatic and successful as Spain and Greece. When saying democratic socialism, one inevitably thinks of the British Labor Party under Jeremy Corbyn. At least temporarily, this leader managed to cancel out the legacy of the "third way" pro-capitalist agenda of social democracy. This process generally referred to as revisionism, as argued by Donald Sassoon, accelerated in the late 1950s with the German SPD Bad Godesberg Congress and got its culmination with Tony Blair's New Labour in 1997 (Sassoon 1996: xiii). Corbyn, unlike Pablo Iglesias from Podemos or Alexis Tsipras from Syriza, is an experienced politician who became the symbol of radical resistance for the younger people in the UK. He inspired youngsters to create a new vision of socialism for the 21st century and get more involved both in voting and in day-to-day politics (Young 2018). For Corbin, the relative weakening of the Left and the labour movement was not the reason to move to the right, but to patiently rebuild (Seymoure 2017: 6). In spite of the defeat, mainly due to the backlash within his own Labor Party, Corbyn remained one of the most vigorous politicians who pushed the idea of "democratic socialism" way beyond the limitations imposed by the *status quo*.

Another politician, or better said, political movement mostly compounded of young, enthusiastic people, significantly contributed to the project of 21st century socialism. Bernie Sanders, who ran twice and lost the race for democratic nomination in the US, in 2016 and 2020, empowered social movements with socialist ambitions. The emergence of socialism into the mainstream of American politics (Sunkara 2019), was announced by social movements such

as "Occupy Wall Street", which came as a consequence of the economic crisis of 2007/2008. The reason was that the crisis hit the economically disadvantaged the most, thereby opening space for the "revival of democratic socialism" (Panitch, Gindin 2020). The political movements behind Sanders significantly helped with regard to the "spiking" popularity of socialism in the United States and a record 43 per cent of all Americans who now believe that "some form of socialism would be a good thing for the country as a whole." (Solty 2020: 37; in Maher, Khachaturian 2020). In a way, the new democratic socialist tendencies hit very strongly in the "heart of the neoliberal project", namely in the Anglo-Saxon world. For now, such tendencies have been "pushed back" before managing to come to power. On the other hand, the latest crisis of capitalism is not even close to coming to an end, which still leaves space for regrouping of the socialist political forces from the past decade. Contrary to diminishing, the complexities and depths of global issues are intensifying with each emerging ecological, economic, and geopolitical challenge. This evolving landscape raises a critical question: How probable is it for a resurgent socialist perspective to assume a more influential position in shaping the world's future?

Conclusion

The evolution of socialism as a political, economic, and philosophical doctrine, both as an ideology and a tangible political endeavor, has shed light on its possibilities and constraints in the 21st century. Up until recently, the socialist project was heavily weighed down by its 20th-century political legacy, coupled with a profound crisis of legitimacy and challenges within socialist thought itself. However, in the last fifteen years, particularly since the onset of the 2007/2008 financial crisis, these barriers have become increasingly surmountable. This shift is not so much a result of the resurgence of socialism's inherent strength, but rather due to the profound crisis afflicting the prevailing capitalist system. This crisis has opened new avenues for socialist ideas, allowing them to gain traction and re-enter mainstream discourse as viable alternatives. The current scenario calls for a re-examination and adaptation of socialist principles to contemporary challenges, suggesting that socialism could offer relevant solutions to the systemic failures of capitalism, especially in addressing issues of inequality, environmental sustainability, and social justice.

The resurgence of socialism, much like its historical "takeoffs," has been contingent on its ability to intervene and leverage the crises of capitalism to establish its validity. This pattern was evident in the late 2000s and early 2010s when socialist ideologies and actions re-emerged as significant intellectual and political forces. This revival occurred after nearly two decades of the prevailing paradigm's dominance, marked by an alliance of liberal and conservative thought. However, socialism still faces numerous challenges, though their nature has evolved compared to two or three decades ago. These challenges, while significant, do not completely incapacitate the socialist agenda. Instead, they maintain the typical level of difficulty that socialism has historically encountered

in establishing itself as a viable alternative. This implies that the path forward for socialism is not blocked but is as arduous as it has traditionally been, requiring adaptation and innovative strategies to navigate the new landscape of global politics and economics.

The contemporary challenges faced by the socialist project in the 21st century are twofold. Firstly, there are the formidable forces committed to maintaining and reproducing the capitalist system. These forces have always been influential, exerting their power even during post-revolutionary periods and following socialist revolutions in the 20th century. Their influence is even more pronounced in non-revolutionary times, such as the present era. This enduring strength of capitalist structures and ideologies represents a significant obstacle to the advancement of socialism.

Secondly, the socialist project itself grapples with its own internal complexities and contradictions. Like any theoretical or political endeavor, socialism is not immune to internal disagreements and conflicts. These internal challenges are evident in the difficulties progressive forces face in uniting different strategies and approaches. This struggle for cohesion and direction is apparent both on a global scale and within individual political communities. Even during periods of acute capitalist crises, when the failures of the existing system are most visible, progressive social and political forces often find it challenging to present a unified front and agree on a coherent strategy for change. This internal discord within the socialist movement complicates its efforts to present itself as a viable and attractive alternative to the prevailing capitalist paradigm.

These limitations highlight the need for a nuanced approach within the socialist framework, one that can effectively address and navigate the external pressures from entrenched capitalist interests while also resolving internal ideological disputes and practical challenges. The task involves not only presenting socialism as a viable alternative to capitalism but also ensuring that it remains adaptable and responsive to the evolving socio-economic landscape. This requires a careful balance between maintaining the core principles of socialism and adapting them to the current global context, which includes addressing issues like environmental sustainability, digital transformation, and global inequalities. As such, the future of the socialist project hinges on its ability to evolve, innovate, and present coherent, practical solutions that resonate with the needs of diverse populations.

The potential of socialism in the 21st century is rooted in the growing disillusionment and discontent among people who lost faith in the system following the 2007/2008 financial crisis. Despite promises, political and economic elites have largely failed to provide social and economic security to the majority. This reality has intensified the struggle to conceptualize and mobilize resistance against the domination of ruling classes. Unlike the relatively obscure nature of this struggle in the 1990s and early 2000s, it has now become not only visible but also significantly relevant, both socially and politically. The emerging capacity of socialism is in its ability to counteract the anti-democratic tendencies of the elite. This resurgence has led to a renewed emphasis on

"democratic socialism", highlighting the political significance of socialism in contemporary times. Socialism is positioned not only against the anti-democratic practices of liberal and conservative groups but also against the rise of extreme right-wing movements, such as the "alt-right". In the current context, the concept of socialism is gradually reclaiming its significance and re-emerging as a potent force, lending renewed importance to Rosa Luxemburg's assertion, "Socialism or barbarism".

In a world rife with conflict and growing disparities in social and economic realms, socialism shines as a beacon of hope. This hope is anchored in the belief that socialism can present a more equitable and just alternative to the prevailing systems. However, the journey to realizing these socialist aspirations is not solely fueled by hope. It necessitates the development of effective political strategies and potential mobilization, forming a theoretical and political vision that appeals to the broader population. The path to socialism in the 21st century is an active process that transcends the simple revival of past ideologies. It involves considerable effort to thoughtfully adapt and evolve these ideologies to be relevant in the complex and diverse context of the contemporary world. This process entails, as Herbert Marcuse and György Lukács suggest, not seeking new utopias through the mere opposition of abstract ideals against real-world realities, but rather building these utopias within the framework of these realities, engaging with the forces at play in the current class struggle. This approach requires a deep understanding of current conditions and a commitment to shaping a future that is both visionary and grounded in the practicalities of today's world.

References

Becker, Jean-Jacques; Cander, Gilles (2005), *Histoire des gauches en France*, Volume 2, Paris: La Découverte.

Bernstein, Eduard (1961), *Evolutionary Socialism*, Stuttgart: Schocken.

Brie, Michael; Spehr, Christoph (2012), *Šta je socijalizam?*, Belgrade: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung.

Brown, Wendy (2013), "Neo-liberalism and the End of Liberal Democracy", *Theory & Event* 7 (1): 37–59.

Brown, Wendy (2019) *In the Ruins of Neoliberalism: The Rise of Anti-Democratic Politics in the West*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Crouch, Collin (2004), *Post-Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Chibber, Vivek (2022), *The Class Matrix*, Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.

Della Porta, Donatella (2015), *Social Movements in the Time of Austerity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Droz, Jacques (1966), *Le socialisme démocratique (1864-1960)*, Paris: Armand Colin.

—. (1997), *Histoire générale su socialisme, Tome 4*, Paris: Armand Colin.

Eklundh, Emmy (2019), *Emotions, Protest, Democracy: Collective Identities in Contemporary Spain*, New York: Routledge.

Filipović, Luka (2023), *Evrokomunizam i Jugoslavija (1968-1980)*, Beograd: Akademska knjiga.

Gans, Jacques (1957), "L'origine du mot 'socialiste' et ses emplois les plus anciens", *Revue d'histoire économique et sociale* 35 (1): 79–83.
Hardt, Michael; Negri, Antonio (2004), *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, New York: The Penguin Press.
Hariou, André (1960), "Jaurès et la démocratie", *Revue d'histoire économique et sociale* 38 (1): 5–23.
Harvey, David (2005), *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
—. (2008), "The Right to the City", *New Left Riview* 53: 23–40.
—. (2012), *Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*, London: Verso.
—. (2020), "Socialists Must be the Champions of Freedom", *Jacobin*, (internet) available at : https://jacobin.com/2020/10/david-harvey-the-anti-capitalist-chronicles-socialism-freedom. (viewed 19 November, 2023).
Julliard, Jacques (2012), *Les gauches françaises (1762-2012)*, Paris: Flammarion.
Lebowitz, A. Michael (2013), "The Concept Of 'Fairness': Possibilities, Limits, Possibilities", *Studies in Political Economy* 92 (1): 117–135.
Lefebvre, Henri (1965), *La Proclamation de la Commune*, Paris: Gallimard.
Leopold, David (2005), "The Structure of Marx and Engels' Considered Account of Utopian Socialism", *History of Political Thought* 26 (3): 443–466.
Young, Liam (2018), *Rise: How Jeremy Corbyn Inspired the Young to Create a New Socialism*, London: Verso.
Losurdo, Domenico (2016), *Class Struggle: A Political and Philosophical History*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Luxembourg, Rosa (1970), *Die russische Revolution*, Hamburg: Rowohlt.
Maher, Stephen; Khachaturian, Rafael (eds.) (2020), *The Sanders Movement and After: Socialist Strategy and State Crisis*, Toronto: Socialist Project.
Marx, Karl (1969), *Le 18 Brumaire de Louis Bonaparte (1851)*, Paris: Les Éditions sociales.
—. (1973), *Građanski rat u Francuskoj*, Zagreb: Naprijed.
Michels, Robert (2001), *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchic Tendencies of Modern Democracy*, Ontario: Kitchener Books.
Mladenović, Ivica (2013), "Pokušaj socijaldemokratije u jednoj zasebnoj zemlji: slučaj Francuske", in Zoran Stojiljković (ed.), *Levica u postkriznom kontekstu*, Beograd: Friedrich Ebert Stiftung i Centar za demokratiju Fakulteta političkih nauka, pp. 71–83.
—. (2018), "Sociologija protiv socijalizma u radu Emila Durkhajma", *Sociologija* 60 (2): 433–457.
—. (2019), "Socijalizam protiv komunizma u radu Emila Dirkema", *Politička revija* 59 (1): 171–187.
Mladenović, Ivica; Stojiljković, Zoran (2014), "Socijaldemokratska levica u Srbiji : akteri i mogućnosti", *Srpska politička misao* 45 (3): 11–32.
Mouffe, Chantal; Erejon, Inigo (2016), *Podemos: In the Name of the People*, London: Lawrence & Wishart.
Musto, Marcello (2014), "La Première Internationale et son histoire", *La Pensée* 380 (4): 129–143.
Naik, Deepa; Oldfield, Trenton (2012), *Critical Cities: Vol 3*, London: Myrdle Court Press.
Olin Wright, Eric (2015), *Understanding Class*, London: Verso.
Panitch, Leo; Gindin, Sam (2020), *The Socialist Challenge Today: Syriza, Corbyn, Sanders*, Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Sasoon, Donald (1996), *One hundred Years of Socialism: The West European Left in the Twentieth Century*, London: Tauris.
Sunkara, Bhaskar (2019), *The Socialist Manifesto: The Case for Radical Politics in an Era of Extreme Inequality*, London: Verso.
Seymoure, Richard (2017), *Corbyn: The Strange Rebirth of Radical Politics*, London: Verso.
Taylor, Keith (1992), *The Political Ideas of Utopian Socialists*, London: Cass.
Valdivielso, Joaquín (2017), "The Outraged People. Laclau, Mouffe and the Podemos Hypothesis", *Constellations* 24 (3): 296–309.
Winock, Michel (2006), *La gauche en France*, Paris: Perrin.
Zavadski, Silvester (1975), *Država blagostanja*, Beograd: Radnička štampa.

Filip Balunović i Ivica Mladenović

Razmišljanje o prošlosti, zamišljanje budućnosti: put „demokratskog socijalizma"

Apstrakt

Ovaj članak razmatra evoluciju socijalizma kao političke ideologije, od njegovih početaka u drevnim društvima do savremenih inkarnacija. U njemu se najpre istražuju polazni i univerzalni principi socijalizma o jednakosti i zajedničkoj dobrobiti, koji se mogu ustanoviti kao istorijska vertikala socijalizma, od njegovog nastanka do danas. Zatim se fokus premešta na Industrijsku revoluciju, s posebnim naglaskom na kapitalan doprinos Karla Marksa i Fridriha Engelsa, koji su zamišljali besklasno društvo kao produkt revolucionarnog angažmana. XX vek, obeležen ključnim događajima poput Ruske revolucije i Hladnog rata, svedočio je praktičnoj implementaciji dve verzije socijalizma: jedna koja je u vidu real-socijalizma postojala kao konkurentski projekat zapadnom kapitalizmu, i druga – isto tako hibridna, samo na drugačiji način – koja je postojala u utrobi zapadnog kapitalizma, kao deo koncesije dominiranim klasama, u vidu „države blagostanja". Zahvaljujući globalnoj snazi i poželjnosti socijalističkog projekta, ovo razdoblje je obeleženo mnogim socijalnim i civilizacijskim dostignućima, i na Zapadu i na Istoku, ali i izazovima autoritarizma, ekonomske krize, demokratske disfunkcionalnosti. S druge strane, krajem XX, socijalistički projekat je – s padom SSSR-a – doživeo potpunu delegitimaciju na Zapadu, dok je u Kini *pro forme* održan kao pervertiran režim. Početkom XXI veku, rastuće nezadovoljstvo ekonomskim nejednakostima i politička deziluzija, posebno nakon finansijske krize 2007/2008. godine, ponovo je rasplamsala interesovanje za alternativni socijalistički model, posebno za nešto što se maglovito i teorijski nedovoljno razvijeno naziva „demokratskim socijalizmom." Autori u tekstu brane stav da je potrebno ovu obnovljenu zainteresovanost pretočiti u teorijski i strateško-politički plodan demarš, konstruišući novi, radikalno demokratski socijalistički projekat kao jedini projekat koji se javlja kao održiva alternativa današnjim društveno-ekonomsko-ekološkim izazovima.

Ključne reči: socijalizam, demokratski socijalizam, real-socijalizam, socijalizam za XXI vek