

Celebrating Althusser's Legacy

Fernanda Navarro

Abstract:

My intention in this article is to stress the fact that Althusser's main work does not end with *Pour Marx* nor *Lire Le Capital*. There is a late Althusser, less known, but just as brilliant and provocative and indeed more visionary in his "Aleatory Materialism".

This is what I tried to stress, plus the fact that it is precisely this that makes him more actual today in 2015.

Key words:

Crisis, Critique, "Materialism", aleatory, interstices.

1. Althusser's use of "*Crisis and Critique*" as key concepts
2. Meeting Althusser in the '80's
3. Aleatory Materialism
4. Althusser's influence and revival

"Crisis" and "Critique" are concepts that allow us to descend into the vast universe of language, in all its different fields. We acknowledge their value when we approach the diversity of meanings and interpretations that appear in most texts, philosophical, political as well as scientific. This can be said concerning many authors, but in Althusser's work it is more than evident.

Beginning with the concept of "crisis": any dictionary will explain it in the most obvious way regarding a dramatically negative circumstance, be it personal, social or political. As most of his readers know, our philosopher gave it a completely different, positive sense. A clear example was when he cried *Vive la crise!, en fin la crise!* at a time when most of the audience concerned was mourning. I am obviously referring to what was finally revealed, and had been kept silent, by the XXth Communist Party Congress in the Soviet Union.

At that time, Althusser considered the meaning of "crisis" not as chaos or death but as a catharsis, a possible *renaissance* or transformation.

Suddenly I ask myself, would he would now apply that same concept if he lived today, year 2015, but this time referring it to Capitalism? Could we imagine him saying "Vive la Crise"? Or would he rather discuss it with either Immanuel Wallerstein or Thomas Picketty in order to come closer to the 'true' forthcoming road that awaits us?

As far as "Critique" is concerned, all those who have studied the

history of philosophy know that there is a wide scope of meanings related to this concept, far beyond its common use where its sense tends to be negative: a criticism or fault that may be pointed out, in front of us or behind our backs. Kant is a clear example of a different use or meaning of the term. From his *Critique of Pure Reason*, to the *Critique of Judgment*, he uses it in the sense of setting up the basis or conditions for the possibility of any idea, concept or category .

Here again, Althusser has a different approach: more than simply using the word "critique" in his writings, he makes a practice of it. (as if reminding us Marx's emphasis on that same word 'practice' in the *XI Thesis on Feuerbach*). Thus, he practices the *critique*, even in such 'delicate' concepts as *Materialism*, for example, producing a different interpretation, closer to *criticism* . We can see that the late Althusser questions Marx's use of the term when he bluntly admits that the Materialism he himself is referring to "evades or avoids any *subject* (be it God or the proletariat)". It is then that he explains the "process without a subject... which determines the order of its development, without an assigned end".

Here is the foremost conclusion in his own words:

"This materialism is opposed, as a wholly different mode of thought, to the various materialisms on record, including that widely ascribed to Marx, Engels and Lenin, which, like every other materialism in the rationalist tradition, is a materialism of necessity and teleology, that is to say, a transformed, disguised form of idealism."¹

And he adds:

"Precisely, in as much it represented a danger for the philosophical tradition, it made a deviation interpreting it as an *idealism of freedom*"²

Here we have a clear example with regard to Althusser's **critical** use of language, claiming other forms of representing or interpreting a concept (in this case, that of *Materialism...*) *quite distinct in the* history of philosophy.

The consequences of the above are profound, reaching its height in the paradox explicit in Althusser's Conference in the University of Granada, Spain in 1976. There he points out that Marx considered that in order to elaborate a philosophy as such - even in opposition to it - leads one to play the enemy's game and contribute to the dominant bourgeois

.....
1 Althusser 2006, p.167-8

2 Ibid.

ideology... thus falling on the side of the State. It is well known what the State meant to Marx and why, in the end, he teleologically mentions the non-State.

Referring to Jacques Bidet's research work in *Que faire du Capital? Althusser* tells us that

"Marx in fact never wholly freed himself of Hegel, even if he shifted to another terrain, that of science, and founded historical materialism on it."³

When I asked Althusser whether this rupture was total, complete, he answered: "No, it only marked a tendency ... we are faced with a new task: that of determining the type of philosophy which best corresponds to what Marx wrote in *Capital*. Whatever it turns out to be, it will not be a 'Marxist philosophy'....it will be a philosophy for Marxism."⁴ It is on this quest that Althusser embarked, and he set for himself the daring task of elaborating *Aleatory Materialism* in the last period of his life, as an answer to that "philosophy for Marxism" (which we shall develop later on).

My aleatory Encounter with Althusser

I had the pleasure of meeting Althusser at a timereferred to as "between his two deaths" (1980-90), when his name passed from a myth to a mystery... yet later on, many had to acknowledge that he kept reflecting and rethinking, questioning and writing in this period which, in spite of undoubted suffering, was also rich in new ideas and conceptions. There were even those who regarded this last period as a turning point in his philosophical writings.

Along these lines, I would like to include a few of these new ideas and conceptions, since I had the unexpected opportunity to go over his papers and manuscripts directly from his desk, whose photocopies I still keep, due to his generosity.

It was a rainy day when he showed me an antique wooden armoire (closet) where he kept manuscripts (many of them unedited!) and said: see if there is anything you find interesting. I couldn't believe my eyes. It was then that the idea of elaborating a book came to my mind... it was

.....
3 Ibid., p.257

4 Ibid., p.258

too rich a gift to keep to myself. That was the origin of the book-interview, now translated into 5 languages... written by two hands (with correspondence during 2 years, across the Atlantic) starting in 1984 in Paris, - including photos and recorded interviews - and then again in 1987. II along, we kept the mailman busy, as the French, Spanish and Italian translations show.

What did I find there? First, the astonishing, dreadful dream of 1964 where he wrote that which he actually committed 16 years later. The difference was the person addressed: instead of his mother (in the dream/letter) it was Helene, his wife, in real life. In reading it, I wondered how, if and when would be the right moment to show him that dream. I finally chose the day he visited Dr. Dyatkine, the psychoanalyst he visited every week. After reading it, he calmly told me: "It is undoubtedly me who wrote it, but I had completely blocked it out of my mind." A few minutes later he asked me if I would go with him to the doctor's appointment. We took a taxi near his *new* apartment house, in a *new* district, far from the Ecole Normale Supérieure, under a *new* name at the building's entrance: M. Berger (his grandfather's name). We came back and calmly had lunch. (Later, in my book, in a part of our correspondence, he thanks me for keeping him company that very day).

With regard to his whole work, it was not until after his death that his famous "L'avenir dure longtemps" (The Future Lasts Forever) was published, revealing the whole tragedy with exceptional honesty. (As many close friends knew, he suffered from mania/depression since his residence in a German prison camp during World War II, a fact that explains the tragedy).

Going back to the indescribable surprises that awaited me in his armoire, I found a philosophical novel where he welcomed a number of famous philosophers of different centuries and traditions to discussions in a great party, reminding the reader of Plato's "Banquet". Also, there were long pages dealing with information unknown until after his death, when it was published under the title of "Stalag" (the above mentioned prisoner's camp in Germany where he was kept for 5 years!)

But definitely, the one that thrilled me the most was that on Epicurus and his worlds, written in 1982, which came to be known somewhat later as *Aleatory Materialism*, where he gathers the materialist tradition barely acknowledged by the history of philosophy in the Western world.

Here I want to include a few words of another contemporary French philosopher, Clément Rosset, because I feel he somehow shares the above line of thought, stressing the aleatory, **hazard**:

"The History of Western Philosophy opens up with an announcement of mourning, of sorrow, due to the elimination of notions such as **hazard, disorder and chaos...**

From then on, a common philosophical program was set up searching to reveal an order and manage the apparent disorder to allow the emergence of constant and intelligible relations, with the purpose offering humanity a greater "well being" compared to the negative effects of blindly walking without any intelligibility.

In spite of the strength of this predominant logical current in search of order, wisdom and reason...as well as progress: experts in "logic of reparation" who have erased **hazard** from the horizon of philosophical conscience, there have been -nonetheless- thinkers who have remained apart, assigning themselves the opposite task...they are the tragic philosophers whose desire has been to dissolve the apparent order so as to find the chaos and **hazard**, buried by the logocentric rationality engaged in preserving the relative permanence of a certain order that assures the illusionary fixed stability of a *certain being*.⁵

After this parenthesis which I found interesting to include, we may come back to my frequent visits to our "Maitre à penser". One of the simple questions I remember asking was related to what he considered as the best way to teach philosophy to young students, like my own. His answer was: "philosophy cannot be taught, only practiced...just like swimming". Months later, I couldn't believe that this *encounter*, deeper in dialogues every day, would end up in a long interview finally edited as a book (the last one published during his life-time). Thus, I indeed learned that life is full of surprises thanks to **hazardous** or aleatory *évenements!*

The questions continued. I asked him how he explained the fact that among the authors he mentioned as having influenced him there was not one Marxist thinker. I was referring, of course, to Foucault, Lacan, Bachelard, Canguilem and Cavailles.

His reply came quickly: "It is simply because what has been done with philosophy in the USSR in recent decades is absolutely crashing, appalling. The poverty of theoretical concepts held by Socialist Realism and Dialectical Materialism simply proves the surrender of intelligence, whereas the authors to whom I refer to not only allow us to think but also open new ways of thinking, new paths. We must remember, he added, that

what is important is not the object of reflection but the *mode* of reflection"

Jumping to his last writings, we may now consider directly *Aleatory Materialism* as a possible *philosophy FOR Marxism*. Following his own description, he continues the line of Epicurus who escapes Democritus' determinism based on the parallel fall of atoms in a void. Epicurus, instead, proposes the aleatory deviation of the atoms to the point of making the encounter with another atom possible in their fall... and these kinds of encounters *give birth to a world*. This aleatory deviation has serious implications: among them that the origin of the world was no First Cause nor Reason. Without the *clinamen* the atoms would not be more than isolated and abstract elements, without any existence nor consistency.

But once provided with existence, the world is constituted by the main entities: atoms and void (vacuum). This turns out to be a philosophy based on categories such as being and not-being, void, limit, nothingness, relativity and freedom. Consequently, it announces the elimination of all pre-established finality (teleology), be it rational, ethical, political or aesthetic; thus manifesting its aleatory character.

A most important issue I want to point out is that it is precisely there where the so called *Interstices*, or open spaces appear (to which we will come back later).

In this same line of thought, Althusser included all of the materialist tradition which was barely acknowledged in the official history of philosophy. All those rare, non-apologetic thinkers who were able to avoid being caught in such dichotomies as materialism-idealism and who claimed no First Cause, no Sense, no Reason (Logos), no End.

He added that this materialism does not call for any subject but rather proposes a process **without** a subject, referring to Machiavelli, Hobbes, Rousseau, Marx, Nietzsche and Heidegger and to their respective categories: limit, margin, void, lack of center and freedom. *Aleatory Materialism* is thus a Materialism of chance, of contingency, **not** in the sense of an absence of necessity but in the sense of necessity conceived as a **devenir**, a **becoming** necessary for contingent encounters.

In this view, Materialism needs not conform to any idea of a system in order to be considered a philosophy, because what constitutes a philosophy as such is not its justification in discourse or demonstration, but the position for which it stands in the philosophical battlefield, as Kant's "Kampfplatz" implied.

For our author, *Aleatory Materialism* represents the highest point of Materialism because of the compelling impulse it has to open the world

to the event, "l'événement", to all living practices, including politics...in an unpredictable way, modifying all fixed premises and data. Here, among other examples, he referred to Wittgenstein's proposition: "the world is alles was das fall ist" (the world is everything that takes place, or is the case" in B. Russell's translation)...an astonishing proposition because - as Althusser agrees - there exists nothing but cases, particular situations, singular things in the world that simply fall over us, in spite of us, without any notice, and each of them has a proper name.

Althusser's influence in Latin America (1965-1977)

Many of us - philosophy teachers and students - in this part of the American Continent have concluded that, after this period, it was impossible to approach Marx or to conceive Marxism in a pre-Althusserian manner. In other words, one cannot read Marx without considering Althusser's theses, regardless of one's own position for or against them. The simple fact was that Althusser could not be ignored. Was this due to the clever way in which he updated Marxism, introducing linguistics, epistemology and psychoanalysis in order to rethink Marx? Or was it due to his project *Returning to Marx* which left out all litany and dogmatism, proving that he was an unusual thinker capable of questioning western rationalism as well as its dominating structures? Or was it thanks to the ethical stature of a man engaged with his own time, searching to inaugurate new possibilities for a different society and a different consciousness? Hard to say! The fact is he provoked passionate, polemic discussions that went beyond the normal academic tone reserved for philosophers, from Mexico to Argentina, where his writings were studied intensively from 1967 to 1978... not to speak about his recent revival (2015) in many countries.

Another unexpected influence of the late Althusser, in Mexico: the *Interstices*. (1994-2015 still in action) What are the *Interstices*?

The *Interstices* refer to the popular movements and struggles of marginalized, oppressed people that have emerged all over the world, such as the pacifist, ecological, feminist, gay, lesbian, student, Indian and immigrant movements. Together, they bring new ways of functioning and organizing without dominating structures.

These movements, Althusser added, have followed the line of Rosa Luxemburg rather than that of Lenin. Our philosopher was convinced of their priority, as opposed to those with rigid, vertical structures like those adopted by political parties, making the practice of democracy difficult, if not impossible. I would like to quote our author more closely, from the notes I still keep from that time, 30 years ago! Among them I found the following, of which I only will quote a few lines:

"Everything in this world is in a constant, unpredictable flow. If we want to give an image of it we must go back to Heraclitus or Epicurus. Yet if we want to give a more recent image of it we must follow Deleuze in order to avoid Descartes's hierarchical representation of the world as a tree but rather as a rhizome: Deleuze's horizontal root. Yet I still prefer Marx's image: 'the gods exist in the *interstices* of the world of Epicurus. In the same way that mercantile relations existed already in the interstices of the slave world"

Althusser adds something more: "the proletariat is found in the margins of the bourgeois society. The question now is to place the margins in the center".

The difficulty **today** is the dispersion and lack of connection of these multiple alternative movements, or *interstices*. He goes on making a last, unexpected recommendation, that I consider a visionary approach:

"In order to open these *interstices* that announce a more just society, we must learn -from and with the people- a language in which they may recognize themselves...thus ending up in a new conception of a real materialist and aleatory history"

He summed it up precisely:

"In order to change the world, from its basis, we must think differently, speak differently, in order to act differently and conceive the horizon of our actions in a different manner, in order to reach and propose a different conception of history: materialist and aleatory".

This is an obvious refusal to today's official political practices, so degenerated and sealed by corruption and violence. How to overcome this? **Organization** was and still is the key word.

In his *Theses de Juin* (of which I keep a copy), still unedited during his life-time, he made the following brilliant assertions: "To think of an International Liberation Movement would be utopian. The most we can conceive of is an International Center of Ideological Convergence for Liberation, capable of unifying alternative and revolutionary movements that are appearing everywhere, searching a new strategy and new practices and principles as well as communitarian forms with transversal relations. A Center of Information without the pretention of **Directing or Taking Decisions** since this belongs to the militants of each region or country. In short, a **Center of/for Encounters** where interchanging (sharing) ideas, positions and experiences may take place. **This**, he said, showing his visionary approach, **will first come true in the Third World countries"**.

He considered this a possibility of a real materialist and aleatory history.

A new way of thinking in action caught our attention in my country, Mexico, in 1994 (after 10 clandestine years).

We all remember the date of Althusser's death: 1990, 4 years before this Mexican *interstice* was publicly known, showing a clear alternative way of organizing - expressing total refusal to integrate to the capitalist values and ways of life: The Zapatista Movement is its name, the southern State of Chiapas its place.

The link between the Zapatista Movement and Althusser: An identity and a philosopher's name revealed:

In February 1995, Subcomandante Insurgente **Marcos**, one of the leading figures of this Movement, the only mestizo, (not 100% Indian) was assigned "to be the voice", rather than lead, of the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN). He turned out to be an Althusserian Philosopher. From then on, he became known as a brilliant thinker and writer.

How was his identity discovered? When a huge mobilization was geared up to apprehend him through the press and TV, where Marcos's double picture appeared, with and without the ski mask, as "Wanted". But what was astonishing for us was the end of the clipping: "*Rafael Sebastian Guillen* (his supposed name): *An Althusserian Philosopher.*" He had actually studied philosophy at the National Autonomous University of Mexico

and the thesis he graduated with was on Althusser's *Ideological State Apparatus*.

The geography turns out to be meaningful as well: Chiapas is inhabited by the millenarian Mayan culture which is known for having discovered (with high achievements in) Mathematics and Astronomy. Up to our day, their cultural heritage is known and felt in various ways, especially in their sense of community whose horizontal structures produce far more human relations and practices than our so-called western "civilization" today.

Another philosophical difference concerns Monism versus Pluralism. They originally rejected Monism even in religion. Before the Spanish Conquest they believed in a plurality of gods, not in a single true God; afterwards, monism was to be imposed by the cross and the sword.

Another interesting difference is their language structure, quite distinct from ours whose origin is to be found in the Greek-Latin tradition. What marks the difference? The fact that in their grammar there are only subjects, and no objects at all. Why? Because for them *everything is alive*. Not only human beings but also animals and vegetation. This entails important consequences that go beyond an Anthropocentric conception, reaching a Biocentrism.

This is reflected in their respectful relationship with Nature, another trait which leaves our Western civilization far behind. They have a completely different conception of nature, considering it their Mother Earth, and leaving out private property entirely! They work it collectively. This has been a source of conflict with Mexican authorities since 1994; following their tradition, it is impossible to think of selling or buying land. "The land (territory, earth) does not belong to us, we belong to it" they say.

Another difference, regarding their language, is that there exist no antagonistic dichotomies such as body-soul, good-bad, black-white, conqueror-vanquished (this they learned after the Conquest).

In as far as their self-government is concerned, there are 2 key concepts that explain it: **Autonomy and Territory**. The last one has been the hardest to achieve and is still the cause of constant aggressions from the government, through paramilitary groups, etc.

What turns out to be outstanding is that in spite of the constant above-mentioned aggressions, they have been able to cope, showing great courage and **organization** in building an autonomous education system, health services, self-government with inherent gender equality

and more recently, agrobiology.

They have finally established themselves in 5 different zones in the state of Chiapas, with collective self-governments in each one (including women) and each must follow their 3 main principles, after being elected by the community: 1) rotativity 2) revocability and 3) transparent declaration of their deeds, duties and expenses.

But there is still a higher level of authority: the Assembly. Again a blunt pluralism versus a personal authority: be it President, King, Patriarch or Messiah, quite a lesson for our actual governments around the *civilized* world!

I couldn't end this paper without touching one key concept that stands out in the Zapatistas' way of thinking and acting: the reformulation/resignification of the concept of **Power**. What did they mean when, in 1994 they took up arms and at the same time made it clear that their aim was not to seize power, a statement that inflamed political parties both from the Left as well as from the Right? "What on earth can one do without Power? they asked? the Zapatistas silently responded "Anything different from Barbarism, per chance"?

At the same time this position evoked the admiration of many who are looking beyond the traditional political spectrum. They understood it meant a different way of relating to power. Marcos, among other things, said that "the only virtue of Power is that, in the end, it inevitably produces a revolution against itself".

History has taught us that even in the outstanding cases when tyranny or dictatorships were overthrown by revolutionary liberating forces, disillusionment sooner or later followed when we witness that the basic principles of justice and freedom, which led the struggle, begin to decay. It is as if there were some dominating traits inherent to Power itself which gradually end up in a repetition or reproduction of the rigid, arbitrary government dominating structures which were overthrown. Not to speak of the price it meant for the people (always anonymous) who gave their lives in vain! We can name a few cases in Central America during the last decades: Nicaragua comes to my mind.

Marcos also said "our people taught us that it was not a matter of substituting one domination with another domination; that we should convince, not conquer by vanquishing and crashing"...in order to reach a real transformation.

Another reason for choosing a different road and saying no to the seizure of Power is that it is incompatible with real Democracy (not only in electoral terms), because Power implies domination, hierarchy, authority, and imposition, and is unable to listen to others. The Zapatistas consider and practice other kinds of Democracy, not only our representative electoral one, but the participative and communitarian one, where the word "we" stands out over the word "I". "Our democracy does not fit in the ballots" they declared, after deciding to do everything in and through their Assemblies where everyone has the right and obligation to speak and be heard.

This was when they revealed a peculiar ancestral slogan: *Mandar Obedeciendo*: "Govern by obeying": meaning that whoever is elected to be an authority (never a single person but collectively) must obey the needs, claims and suggestions of the people being led. The authorities receive no payment, and when their period is over, they go back to their usual activity in the community.

After having been with them in several visits year after year since 1994 I can attest to the fact that, after 20 years, the Zapatista Movement has proved to be one of the most vital, successful and exemplary *interstices* up to now; and this is the reason for which I wanted to address it in this chapter, knowing that it is barely known abroad mainly due to the State's manipulation of the mass media, since this Movement represents everything the powerful ones want to destroy. Many times they have tried to. But due to the strong determination and **organization** as well as the values they have built in their autonomous self-governments, they have resisted, giving hope to many Mexicans and all those who have visited them from abroad, in their creative, original Forums, Meetings and Congresses when they have received thousands of people from the five Continents, who after visiting them, enthusiastically have organized solidarity committees in their own home-towns or cities, including some in U.S.A. Just to mention a few examples: from the very beginning there was a group of students from Texas that came to help build the first Secondary school (Junior High) in a Zapatista community: Oventic. It was highly rewarding to see how language was not a barrier between the two groups: North Americans and Mexican-Indians, working, laughing, playing and sharing meals together! The same happened with people from Greece, Spain, France and Italy, this last country rendering an incredible "gift": electricity for a whole community called La Realidad, as well as a

doctor who has been in a hospital for over 17 years, teaching them scientific medicine (even surgery) in combination with their natural, herbal practice. I could mention other valuable cases, free from all government support since they decided to never again receive a single penny, or "charity", from the Mexican State. They are well known for being proud of their dignity.

Today, twenty years after their ¡Ya Basta! (Enough!) on January 1°, 1994, when they took arms for only 12 days, dialogue continues to be their strongest weapon. There still remain many active solidarity committees in several countries that keep coming to their events in Chiapas and beyond. For example, on June 20th, 2015, a "Journée Zapatiste" was organized by Paris VIII University, to which I was invited. In spite of our government's interests in wiping the Zapatistas off of our map, they haven't been able to do it. This, however, has not stopped the governing class from continuous aggressions towards the recuperated territories, without which Zapatistas could not be Autonomous; Autonomy being the key to building new human relations and values and to make their famous slogan true: "We want to build a world that holds (includes) many worlds"...showing that in spite of being a marginal movement, it is based on universal grounds and values and has been successful in influencing other movements such as the *Altermundistas* in Seattle, (1999) up to the *Indignados* all over the globe in 2011, including Occupy Wall Street in New York and beyond...not to speak of the native groups in Latin America: Bolivia, Ecuador, Paraguay and elsewhere throughout the globe.

The Zapatistas have influenced people far beyond the scope of the Left: mainly the non-organized, non-militants in political parties: common citizens and intellectuals fed up with traditional politics. This is new. With great creativity and imagination they have organized all kinds of meetings. One of the last ones took place in 2013/14 called "La Escuelita de la Libertad, según los zapatistas" (The School of freedom, according to the zapatistas). It gathered altogether 5,200 people from five continents. They generously opened up their poor houses for us to share a whole week, day and night, living and working as they do in the fields and their schools, far from any luxury, but satisfying their basic needs with great dignity. My 27 students and I were astonished by their authenticity, and the brotherhood they practice among themselves - as part of their Mayan heritage, that stresses the capacity **to listen** to others.

Let me now quote the Zapatistas at the height of a most inhuman experience that happened just last year in May 2014, when armed persons

- paid by the local and federal governments - killed a teacher/guide of the "Escuelita de la Libertad".

In spite of this injustice they answered back with another lesson. Far from answering the provocation of those in Power, they kept an unexpected, disciplined attitude, saying:

"We don't want vengeance, we want justice".

This sentence is more than meaningful today in my country where all politicians, regardless of belonging to the left or to the right, have shown the greatest degradation of the governing class in general, acting with an incredible impunity, corruption and violence.

This New Year, hundreds of us celebrated with the Zapatistas the *First International Festival of Resistance and Rebellion against Capitalism* gathering an ever greater number of people along the lengthy road leading to the southern part of the country before reaching Chiapas. This included a great number of Indian groups with millenarian heritage as well, from many far-away corners of the country, willing to gather and take common, peaceful steps in following the Zapatistas' influence in their path towards liberation.

The conclusion being that to a considerable part of our population, this **interstice** has become a contagious alternative that provides us with some hope and oxygen...not only rage!

This brings us back to Althusser himself when he said: "These organized minorities or *interstices* that give place to 'possibility' as a category, coexist already at a micro-scale and are working on an alternative platform seeking a different kind of politics that may allow a different kind of human practice and human relations, one sharing a common goal: to build a more just society, free from ideological manipulation, misery and oppression".

He concluded that the interstices should be not centralized, but local, not international, but regional. They should find their unity in objective, intersecting lines, by communitarian forms with transversal relations.

Reaching this final step, I ask: couldn't we conclude that he would agree with this approach if he had lived to see it? Knowing there is no possible answer to it, I go back to my first pages, following this daring line of thought in order to close the circle.

Considering what I have stressed above and given his visionary

approach, couldn't we have enough grounds and arguments to announce a different **crisis** today, in order to repeat with Althusser **"Vive la Crise! - this time regarding Capitalism,** (accepting the meaning of chaos and catastrophe since Capitalism still prevails) but also considering another, positive meaning which favors new revival given that the fact that multiple *interstices* have emerged intertwined within the Capitalist/Neoliberal stage?

How? Through an all-embracing glimpse of the *interstices* or open spaces in widespread geographies all over the globe, who are gradually and silently strengthening their **organization**. How? By opening up consciences in the hope they will gradually extend themselves imperceptibly like Deleuze's rhizome and fulfill Althusser's recommendation of non-centralized forms.

In closing, we can agree with Derrida's words at Althusser's funeral:

"His work is, in the first place, great by what it attests to and by what it risks."⁶

What he never knew was how far -in those widespread geographies along the globe- his ideas would land and start to bloom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Althusser, Louis, 2006 *Philosophy of the Encounter: Later Writings, 1978-87*, London: Verso.

Derrida, Jacques 1993, *Text Read at Althusser's Funeral, in the Althusserian Legacy*, eds. E. Ann Kaplan & Michael Spinker, London: Verso.

6 Derrida 1993, p.243