

**PS: the three inseparable parts of the triptych :**

## **Social, Ecology, (but also) Republic**

The Socialist Party is in a phase of reconstruction. Within an alliance of leftists and ecologists, it must today regain a central place and for this, **affirm its doctrine, social, ecological, but also "republican.**

Olivier Faure and his team took charge, after the calamitous presidential election of 2017, of a bloodless PS, condemned by most observers to an inevitable disappearance. They have contradicted this prediction, first avoiding a new downfall in the European elections of 2019, and, relying on the territorial implantation of the party and a clever strategy of alliances, managed to make more than a good figure in the last municipal elections.

**The chosen strategy is undoubtedly the right one.**

Moreover, the PS has little choice. Whatever some comrades who cannot think outside the framework that shaped them may think, the SP can no longer reason as if it still regularly gathers 20 to 30 percent of the electorate. Unless it dies slowly in isolation, therefore, if it wants to continue to play a role, it must ally itself with other political forces.

The new party leadership has had the audacity and intelligence to embrace this strategy without ambiguity: accepting to no longer be hegemonic, to no longer be everywhere the central axis around which one assembles, leaving the head of the list, when it is useful, to an ally, this "new" socialist party has often succeeded in convincing people of the sincerity of this new orientation.

Thus, the municipal governments have made it possible to preserve and even conquer many municipalities on the territory.

This strategy satisfies "left-wing" voters, ulcerated by divisions and battles of egos. It provides the conditions for victory. The lesson must not be forgotten for future events.

However, **union does not mean fusion or confusion. And even less submission.**

Each component of the alliance has its own identity. And its own ambitions. Unitary goodwill does not lead to naivety. "Union is a struggle," the communists used to repeat, and they were not wrong. Today, the objective of the ecologists of the EELV is clear: based on the results of the European elections, which placed them at the head of the left, they aspire to become the axis of any coalition. This ambition is legitimate.

However, there are a number of us who believe that a leadership of the **EELV is not desirable** for two reasons: firstly, because some of the ideological, philosophical and cultural fundamentals of the ecologists are problematic, and secondly, because they do not seem capable of sustainably constituting a majority social bloc around them.

In the same way that a union dominated by the radical left was, the day before yesterday

with the Communist Party, and yesterday with unsubdued France, doomed to failure, a union dominated by the EELV seems hardly capable of gathering a sociological and ideological majority.

The socialist party can and must set itself, but **without making it a prerequisite for the alliance of leftists and ecologists**, the objective of (re)becoming that central force capable of getting France out of the "liberal versus populist" trap in which Macron has locked us.

It must therefore today, as a matter of urgency, deepen its identity, renew its theoretical reflection, clarify our social project, and develop its operational program. **And this if possible before negotiating a programmatic platform common to the entire left and to ecologists.**

**The party has made "social-ecology" its motto, adding to its social heritage the ecological emergency.** And municipal governments have shown that many communities led by socialists, such as Paris, Rennes and Nantes, have already successfully put this new political demand into practice.

**It must also claim its republican history and identity.** Indeed, he is the only one in the alliance to truly carry this heritage in his genes, and we are convinced that only those who carry this heritage and inscribe future struggles in the French republican national narrative will be able to durably gather a social and political majority.

**Social, Ecology, but also "Republic", such are, such should be, the three pillars that constitute its identity, can ensure its renewal and conquer new horizons.**

### *I - SOCIAL*

**This is the raison d'être of socialism.** The socialist left is heir to the French labor movement. It is part of the vast social and political movement that for centuries has significantly improved the living and working conditions of the working classes.

The first *raison d'être* of the left is to protect and represent the social strata that do not a priori have the means, material, cultural, technical, to defend their interests on their own, contrary to the possessing classes.

However, as confirmed by successive surveys and studies, and as illustrated in France by the social crisis known as the "Yellow Vests" crisis, the left has lost the ideological and cultural hegemony that it has long held within the working classes and modest middle classes, an evolution that has been reflected in the social composition of its electorate and its adherents.

So let us dare to say it at the outset: **the Left without the people is illegitimate and of no historical use!**

But at the same time, we also continue to think that the people without the left are disarmed in the face of the ruling classes, and at the mercy of the populists.

**Two main causes of this distance that has grown up all over the world between the popular and the left can be identified:**

1) Social democracy has unquestionably sinned by the **weakness of its theoretical reflection on the** considerable economic, technological, sociological and geopolitical developments of recent decades and their consequences for the social composition of social democracy and its electorate.

However, these immense social changes that have taken place over the last thirty years have not cancelled out the persistence of divergent or even contrary interests between the ruling class and the world of work, nor the need for the latter to be represented politically.

It is therefore obvious **that one of the first priorities for the left, and especially for the Socialist Party, is to reconnect with these social strata, and to draw all the consequences, first of all in terms of political orientation.**

2) On the other hand, let us be lucid enough to recognize that our political family has shown a certain **permeability to the influence of neo-liberalism**. This has translated into the implementation by social democracy itself of policies inspired by this ideology.

It therefore seems necessary to take an **uncompromising inventory of the last** three or four decades, and not just the last five years, to distance ourselves from the liberal measures that have been conceded in the exercise of power without denying everything that the Social Democratic Left, since its origin and even during this last period, has brought or contributed to bring about in order to improve the standard of living and living conditions of the workers.

Without falling into the overkill of the radical left, a clear break with the recent past is necessary. And it must be assumed: There is no point in **making "Social" the first term of our motto if we want to redo the same policy.**

We have entered a **favourable period**.

Awareness of ecological perils and the violent global economic crisis following the Covid 19 pandemic have exploded the taboos and the straitjacket of rules that stifled the sovereignty of states, in budgetary, monetary matters, etc..

Public deficits are exploding, and the resulting massive indebtedness of the States is controlled, secured, even reduced, and in part almost cancelled or neutralized by the central banks, which are ready to create money to revive the economies.

In short, the sacrosanct laws of ultra-liberalism that have inspired the action of major international institutions and liberal governments around the world for decades are now - for how long? - transgressed without hesitation by those who advocated them.

**An historic opportunity to pursue bold social and ecological policies is thus offered to the reformist left, without being constrained by the ultraliberal doxa that dominated European Union policy until then.**

## *II - Ecology*

**Just as it had achieved, at the dawn of the 20th century, the synthesis between political liberalism resulting from the French Revolution and Socialism carrying the aspirations of employees, between Socialism and Republic, a historical event embodied by Jaurès after the Dreyfus affair, the historical duty of the Left in the 21st century is to achieve a new synthesis of the same dimension between Socialism and Ecology.**

**The success of the ecological transition is incompatible with the pursuit of an ultra-liberal policy on the planet, which** is largely responsible for the dramatic worsening of the current situation in recent decades.

Who, indeed, can believe that the formidable challenges that will have to be met to combat global warming, the extinction of species, land pollution, etc. could be met sustainably and on a planetary scale by those who put forward the sole law of profit or national egoism? In order to be effective, the profound reforms needed, in the energy field for example, will have to be carried out within the framework of voluntarist public policies that go beyond the framework of communities and nations alone.

**Combining ecology and social progress is also a condition for the success of the ecological transition.**

The success of this initiative, which will require a profound and lasting change in the social behavior of the greatest number of people in the areas of automobile transport, energy savings, heating and food, implies a massive increase in public awareness, which cannot be reduced to that of the intellectual urban strata, as is still largely the case.

**The ecological transition must therefore be closely associated in the minds of the greatest number with social progress and improved living conditions.**

On such an approach to ecology (ecological policy incompatible with economic liberalism, just and non-punitive ecological reforms, improved public services, etc.) **the SP can, and perhaps better than the ecologist current, bring together in favor of ecology the social strata that remain, if not hostile, at least little concerned.**

This "mission" is all the more important because the right and the extreme right, using the pretext of certain blunders and extremist excesses of the ecology movement, use and will use more and more demagogic arguments to discredit ecology and in fact oppose reforms that are indispensable but which would harm the interests they represent.

**Environmentalists have played a positive role in** raising awareness of climate change, of the damage caused by human activity to natural balances and of the urgency of a proactive policy to achieve a transition towards a more respectful and responsible economy for the planet and future generations. That is a lot.

But as observed above, **the environmental movement does not seem to be able to gather around it a majority social and cultural bloc.** Without making amalgams or easy generalizations, it is indeed difficult not to worry about certain positions or behaviors:

**The insistence on making the "Productivists vs. Ecologists" divide the main one, before the so-called "right-left" nerd.**

**The relationship to science of** certain ecologists, which is a direct challenge to our vision of progress, science and research.

**The visceral, often irrational hostility towards nuclear energy** also poses a problem for a political force that is now asserting itself capable of managing our country.

**The fragile adherence of some ecologists to the cardinal values of the Republic: universalism, secularism, etc., manifested by complacency, if not complicity,**

of EELV members , and not the least, with **"indigenous"** movements, **"racialist"**, **"decolonial"**, **in reality racist and hostile to the Republic**

**- certain forms of action as well, all right coming from the American extreme left and the "cancel culture".**

### *III - The Republic*

**The specificity of the French left, in several of ses its components, is its inscription in the republican struggle.**

In France, this largely preceded the socialist movement born of the Industrial Revolution of the 19th century.

And if some of the first "socialists" naturally considered that the social demands of the proletariat extended and complemented the civic conquests obtained since the French Revolution, others long thought that this was only a struggle of the bourgeoisie which concerned only very little the workers, exploited by capitalists, many of whom were...republicans.

**It took a few decades before the synthesis was made between Republic and Socialism. Jean Jaurès, if he was not the first nor the only one, embodies this synthesis. Socialism is for him, the Republic pushed to the end, the social outlet of the republican promise of equality.**

**The Left, with the Socialist Left in the front row, is thus the main heiress of the philosophers of the Enlightenment, of the ideals of the French Revolution, of the Revolutions of 1830 and 1848, of the Paris Commune of 1871, of the republican and secular reforms of the Third Republic, of the social conquests of the Popular Front, of the so progressive and modern program of the National Council of Resistance, ...**

The **"French social model"** is the cumulative result of these republican and social struggles, consolidated and fortunately "constitutionalized" at the Liberation, imperfect but consistent and coherent enough for the Right to have tried so often, and its macronist version only recently, to deconstruct it without totally succeeding.

And we are convinced that **a large majority of French people** (and also most foreigners living in our country), **have deeply integrated, more or less consciously perhaps, this heritage**, so well expressed in our constitutional texts, too little known, forgotten?

Of course, some articles have remained a dead letter or have been partially or imperfectly applied, **the whole question of the republican "promise". It is not because it is slow to come to fruition that its content is obsolete. On the contrary**, it is necessary to rely on it in order to advance progress, which is always challenged by those it hinders. The Social Republic, as outlined in our founding texts, remains the goal to be achieved.

#### **The republic, but all of it**

In my opinion, these republican values today retain all their strength, provided that we consider them all, without neglecting some of them, because **together they form a system.**

Unfortunately, **a part of the French left**, out of ease, intellectual laziness and forgetfulness of its history, **has gradually distanced itself from the Republic and its values**, retaining only a few, the easiest to defend, those that seem more social, more generous, more liberal, and abandoning or even rejecting the other, more demanding, secularism, patriotism, civic-mindedness and respect for the law, the balance of rights and duties, the right to security, which it abandoned ... to the right, even to the extreme right ... when they were historically and fundamentally progressive values.

Thus **many citizens - first of all in the working classes - have moved away from the left and even believe themselves to be "right-wing" because they** love their country, because they prefer the policeman to the delinquent, because they want their families to be protected from drug dealers and big shots, because they like work, and even work well done, etc. Now these demands, dare we say it, are legitimate, and it is historically the left that has carried them,

Today, to find, assume, claim its attachment to all the dimensions of the republic, to all its values including the most demanding, is no longer old-fashioned, but resolutely modern and in perfect adequacy with the needs of the moment:

If the left is capable of this complete return to the republic, if it knows how to be the best at carrying this **balance, between national sovereignty and the universalism of values, between rights and duties, between generosity and exigency, between freedom and respect for the laws on** which it is based, between **security and protection**, we are convinced that it will be heard once again, especially by those popular and middle social strata, today without a compass, who have dispersed, most of them taking refuge in political abstention, others allowing themselves to be seduced by populist theses.