

The crisis of democracy borders – Etienne Balibar's approach

Berkane Hassane

University of Batna 1- Haj Lakhdar- Algeria, Laboratory of Dialogue of Civilisations and
Globalization, hassane.berkane@univ-batna.dz

Received: 15/02/2025

Accepted: 17/05/2025

Published: 30/06/2025

Abstract: This research deals with one of the new concepts in contemporary political philosophy, which is the borders of democracy. So, Balibar Etienne, analysis these borders crisis, and critics its new conflicts such as New Apartheid, Citizens / Subjects, Xenophobia, Institutions / Freedom, International Violence, Wars...etc.. For this purpose, he establishes a philosophical approach based on the Democratization of borders. We have to analyse and critic this thesis, if it is concrete or impossible to realize due to global political conflicts and globalization effects.

Key words: Borders; Democratization; New Apartheid; Equal – Freedom; Subject.

Introduction The concept "borders of democracy", was mentioned for the first time by the French philosopher Etienne Balibar (1942 -), disciple of Louis Althusser (1918 – 1990), Marxist Philosopher. They developed together one of Marx thesis, which is reading capital. It is a work of political philosophy, which constitutes a continuing interrogation of Karl Marx's philosophy, in a politics of emancipation which is a human rights policy. Balibar mentioned in borders of democracy what he proposed the component of Equal – Freedom cited in the declaration of 1789. The founding affirmation that there is no freedom without equality, nor equality without freedom,

which strikes the boundaries of democracy with essential instability the borders of democracy. However, the very perspective of an extension of these borders of which the demand for equal freedom is the driving force, through struggles and demands.

In order to reach this philosophy – politics end, we can problematize his thesis: what does it mean the concept of Democracy – borders? Is Europe - as a bloc or union – a political border that blocks democracy? Can we democratize the borders?

First, in our methodology, we put on a plan for this research. In the introduction, we try to

Present a brief providing to the philosophical forms proposed for later

analysis and discussion. After that, we present a precise philosophical problematic concerning Etienne Balibar's approach to the borders of democracy. Therefore, in the first step, we move on the basic issue, which is the borders of democracy, its philosophical meaning and the political problems it raises. In the second step, we analyse the internal borders of democracy in Balibar's view who refers to the German philosopher Johan Gottlieb Fichte, and we critic his approach. After that, we move on to analyse and discuss what Balibar established as a philosophical idea, which is Europe, as a western bloc or as European Union, constitutes Unthinkable –borders of democracy. Finally, we analyse and discuss the political proposal presented by Balibar regarding the democratization of borders. Is the same project possible to achieve or it is just Utopia? . In conclusion , we try to draw the most important results that must be logically consistent with what has been analysed.

Before starting our research, we must pay attention rapidly, to Balibar's scientific and philosophical / political life.

1. Who is Etienne Balibar?

He was born in 1942 in France; a political philosopher with a Marxist tendency .He was a disciple of Louis Althusser (1918 – 1990). Together they work on Karl Marx philosophy and they wrote "Reading

Capital" in 1965, which is a structural reading of Marxism. He participated in editing the Critical Dictionary of Marxism under the supervision of George Labica in 1982 .He worked as a professor supervising postgraduate studies at the University of Paris X. His activities were around the world in international forums. Among his important books, we can quote: On the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in 1976, and in collaboration with Labika , J.Boya and Lefebvre : let's open the window comrades in 1979 , **the borders of Democracy** in 1992 , *la crainte des masses* (1997) , *Nous citoyons d'Europe* (2001) , *Droit de cité* (2002) , *l'Europe , l'Amérique , la Guerre* (2003) , and so on...

2. The borders of democracy:

2.1. What is a border?

According to Balibar , it is not easy to give an answer to such a simple question , " ...because we cannot attribute to the border an essence which would be valid for all places and all times , and which would be included in the same way in all individual and collective experiences". (Balibar, 1997, p 371). Therefore, borders have the meaning of limits; but after the invention of the notion of cosmopolitanism, which means universal by going beyond all borders: geopolitical, ethnic, linguistic ...etc. Therefore, Schengen convention reinforces it and the ambiguity of the border has

deepened, because we do not cross all borders in the same way with one European passport or another (foreign nationals).

In order to understand the political world nowadays, Balibar suggests an appeal to complex notions, which are dialectic such as the notion of Equal – Freedom. So, the simple definition of border – meaning seems to be absurd because “...drawing a border is precisely defining a territory, delimiting it, and thus recording one’s identity or conferring it on it. But conversely, defining or identifying in general is nothing other than drawing a boundary, assigning the limits.” (Balibar, 1997, p 372). We can conclude that defining a border is an ambiguous approach because the very representation of the border is the condition of any definition. Beyond that, Balibar indeed evokes three major aspects of the historical equivocality of borders:

2.2/.**Their over determination:**

For the first aspect, each border has its own history, which contains the claim for the rights of peoples, the power or the powerless of states, cultural demarcations and economic interests ...etc. Balibar confirms that, “we notice less that no political border is ever the simple limit of two states but always over determined and in this sense, sanctioned, duplicated and relativized by other geographical divisions. This trait is not accessory, or random, but

intrinsic. Without the world – configuring function that they perform, there would be no borders or no lasting borders”. (Balibar, 1997, p375).

In order to clarify this trait, Balibar gives two examples:

The first one is concerning the European colonial empires since the treaty of **Tordesillas** which determined in 1494, the territorial borders between Spain and Portugal until 1960, within the framework of successive world – economies, the condition of emergence, strengthening and substance of the nation states of western Europe. Because the borders between these states were inseparable from the national borders, and the imperial borders at the same time, in Africa and in Asia. These borders separated different kinds of nationals because the national – imperial states did not have only citizens but also **subjects** (European citizens of foreign origin).

The second one concerns Cold War camps or blocks from 1945 to 1990.

For this purpose, the division of the world between colonial empires strengthened certain national sovereignties (but on the condition of, purely and simply, prohibiting some others). The division of the blocks (of which the creation and functioning of the UN were the counterpart), seems combined with a generalisation throughout the world

of the nation form, a hierarchy between these nations within each bloc, and consequently, more less sovereignty for most of them. Therefore, the national borders of state were, for a second time, over determined and, depending on the case, strengthened or weakened.

2.3/. Their polysemy:

Concerning the second aspect, polysemy of borders means that they do not have the same meaning for everyone. Nothing less resembles the materiality of a border which is the same whether one crosses it in one direction or in other , as a businessman or an academic for a conference , or as a young unemployed person ; But the political problem lies in the discrimination and screening of people crossing the border .

2.4/. Their heterogeneity:

For the third aspect , it deals with heterogeneity and ubiquity of borders : this means that the confusion of political , cultural , socio – economic borders , previously more or less well achieved by nation – states . So , the problem lies in this : certain borders are no longer located at all , at borders in the geographic – political – administrative meaning , but they are elsewhere , everywhere , like the health controls which Michel Foucault (contemporary French philosopher 1926 - 1984) called bio power , and also security . Therefore, Balibar concludes: “borders have

been the anti – democratic conditions of this partial, limited democracy that nation states have known. The borders are differentiated and multiplied again, they tend to crisscross the new social space and no longer limit it only from the outside ”.(Balibar , 1992 ,p06).So , He thinks that the borders of democracy are not limited to material territorial borders – transit , but they are more than that . We can find them in the institutions, which confirm a certain racial discrimination (Racism or New Apartheid), in several ways: cultural, social, ethnic, political and so on. We can see with regard to the new generations immigrating in France for example: the **Beurs** (New generations of French immigrants of North African Origin: Algerians, Tunisians and Moroccans who lived and live nowadays in France, but they are suffering from new racism), “Where does it come from that we bring together certain attitudes under the common name of **racism**? Why are a whole, extremely diverse set of opinions which tend to isolate, stigmatize, threaten, discriminate against human groups, social groups, considered racist?” (Michel, 2005, p 11). In this context we can ask serious questions : why do we qualify as racist different practises , some spontaneous , others institutional , which have in common the engendering of oppression , hostility and mutual distrust , leading to occasion on

extreme violence , and which affect all kinds of societies in history and in present ?

Finally, the boundaries of democracy are not limited to geopolitics, but they are within the confines of society and everywhere on the space – temporal level because they have existed, and will continue to exist, and if we follow this political approach according to Balibar, **there are other borders of democracy whose importance prompts us to analyse.**

3. The Internal borders of democracy:

The problem of internal borders in Europe is a cultural problem which concerns **Europe Language** and which is not only a problem of the public sphere but also linked to this question: from whom does this sphere come? In addition, for whom is it built. Balibar focuses on a multicultural hypothesis: “my hypothesis, which joins here Umberto Eco, is what is necessary in theory and in practice to question, in particular at the level of educational practices. the concept of romantic (Humboldtian) origin of language as a closed totality , expression of a community also closed on itself (at the same time as universal in itself) which has been perpetuated until our days (including in its structuralism clothing) “. (Balibar , 2001 , p 315). Umberto Eco (1923 – 2016, Italian writer, academic and scholar), hypothesis

did not concern only, the translation practises but also, the possibility of living with others on a polyglot continent by Vocation. Therefore, the European cultural problem in future, is not related to the victory of total polyglot’s ,but concerns_in fact persons who can take the spirit , scent , atmosphere of different speech , : “ Europe of polyglots is not Europe which speaks fluently several languages , but in best way , persons who can meet ; everybody with its language but understand the others . Although, he cannot speak easily the other languages, but can hardly understand them”. (Balibar , 1997 , p 372). It should be added that the translation community is not one in which everyone speaks or understands everyone’s languages , but on the contrary one in which the role of intermediary , depending on the situations and configurations of exchange , is likely to fall to anyone in turn moving from the majority position to the minority position . Balibar confirms it is cultural – position which is based on rich multilingualism, “We must start from multicultural practises and not only from the law which organizes both the hierarchy of state languages (integration language, main and secondary working language ...etc.) and the protection of unofficial languages (charters of regional or minority languages of 1992 whatever its usefulness). This means that we must start

again from a singular and even unique use in the world that has produced the history of the European continent. And its interaction with all the regions of the world (There are other regions in the world whose civilisation is based on a secular "colingualism": for example the Far East, but apparently according to a completely different historical concept for which it is not certain that the concept of translation is suitable". (Umberto Eco, 1994, p395).

We have to remind that Balibar spoke about the Internal borders of democracy referring especially to the German philosopher Fichte Johann Gottlieb (1762 – 1814), author of speeches to the German nation in (1807 – 1808), speeches bubbling with chauvinism and racism. "The primary, real and natural borders of states are without a doubt the Internal borders. He who speaks the same language is, above all, a human being, who is linked in a general way to one nature, by a multiplicity of hidden ties" (Balibar, 1997, p 134). The internal limits of democracy lie mainly in the human being, meaning in his spiritual and intellectual aspects. In addition, to belonging to a specific nation. It is what determines the geopolitical external borders. We can confirm in this meaning, that the geographical area alone is not sufficient to form an authentic, unique people, as one pure language must be available. Therefore, the people must be a

single whole that does not accept division, so Fichte defended this idea with a great chauvinism, through his speeches to the German Nation, Fichte said in his eighth speech "The German spirit, on the contrary, opens up other areas. It bring light and day into the darkness and shakes a group of ideas that future generations use to build their residence. The other genius (of other people) is a bee that uses and collects honey wisely ... while the German spirit is an eagle, which with its strong wing lifts its heavy body and with a firm, high and long – practiced flight, ascends higher to approach the sun, where contemplation tempts it". (Fichte, 1808, 8th discourse).

It must be mentioned that in 1915 (during the first global war), After this slogan launched by the imperial government, the German High Staff had printed hundreds of thousands of copies of these speeches, so that each German soldier going to the front could take one in his pouch. Balibar reminds too, that Fichte has focused on the language (the Original German Language : **Usprache**), for the Original German People (**Urvolk**), in order to realize in history the **German Nation Union, its historic civilisation and the Superiority of the Germanic race**. We can confirm that Fichte Johann Gottlieb was the first philosopher who built the internal borders of Democracy by its speeches to German

Nation (1807-1808). He focused on the factor of the unity of German language and the unity of the German people. So, how do we evaluate Fichte's ideas regarding the internal borders of Democracy? Is he a supporter of freedom and Democracy or a supporter of dictatorship and totalitarianism?

Is he a defender of truth and rational conscience, or an advocate of irrationality and racism? Some philosophers classify him as an advocate of freedom and democracy, while others classify him as an advocate of totalitarianism and blind racism, Jack Derrida said, "Fichte is known as one of the thinkers of German nationalism at the dawn of the nineteenth century" (Derrida, 1987, p 63). In addition, the thinker Fougeyrolas Pierre considered that Fichte started from the cosmopolitics towards patriotism "He shares with the German thinkers and intellectuals of his time a turn that starts from the cosmopolitanism and popular philosophy towards national enthusiasm inspired by both genders of the German Empire" (Fougeyrolas, 1987, p 82).

However, the difference between Balibar and Fichte – despite their agreement on the functional value of language – lies in the linguistic diversity that Balibar favours and supports as a varied cultural medium in a polyglot society.

In return, Fichte was one of the most "Unilinguistics" philosophers (racist), and that forms the internal boundaries of democracy which conflict with the desired true Democracy.

4. Europe: unthinkable borders of democracy:

We confirm that the whole Europe can form a bloc against democracy. While its discriminatory laws, its new racism based on cultural – ethnic and also ideological dimensions which are always strong and dangerous means of non – democracy. Despite the discrimination they suffer, populations of colonial origin (like Beurs: North African citizens like Algerians, Tunisians and Moroccans of the third generation of French nationality who lived and live nowadays in France), within the former European metropolis, formed one of the basis of the lesson of otherness that Europe can draw from its history. Balibar confirms, "to think in an original way about one's own power (or imp-power) in the world. This idea may seem exaggeratedly optimistic, if not mystifying: I would like to clarify its meaning, by examining the formulations put forward by two Italian sociologists: Alessandro Dal Lago and Sandro Mezzadra, engaged for a long time in the analysis of the effects of postcolonial immigration in the European space, in the

process of globalization" (Balibar , 2001 , p318).

Dal Lago (was born on 1947 in Rome, worked on philosophy of Social Sciences), and Mezzadra (Associate Professor of Political Philosophy at the University of Bologna), they published together an essay entitled: the unthinkable borders of Europe. They study the way in which, come in conflict in today's Europe, the two meanings associated with the idea of a border which is said in Italian "Confini ". At the end of the cold war and the division of Yalta (from 4 to 11 February 1945 between USA and Great Britain at Yalta in order to prepare **peace** after the second world war) which has re-opened a historical and philosophical question which concerns the very meaning of what we understand by **Europe** . During the bloody wars of ex- Yugoslavia, it took on a dramatic form, prefiguring other events of the same kind.

This question has been replaced by Dal Lago and Mezzadra in the context of the evolutions of Imperialism , "The struggle of the capitalist powers for control of the Western economy is now transformed into a total struggle in which all aspects of the social , demographic and humanitarian relationship are integrated... to impose a global constraint on the movement of populations" . (Balibar, 2003, p157).

We can feel this situation that Balibar was talking about the **borders areas** where exists a co – existence between two controls : political control and military control (ex-Yugoslavia) but " there were violent gaps between both of them , in which men are at the same time displaced , set in motion and placed under house arrest ". (Balibar, 2003, p158).

From this idea, we arrive at the profound equivocality of the European project, as Dal Lago et Mezzadra affirmed: "We can therefore affirm that the borders of Europe have multiplied and diversified. As a result, the political concept of Europe also exploded significantly. We could say that today there are as many distinct Europa's, as there are functions assumed withdrawal of the United Kingdom on the international scene by this continental nebula "(Balibar, 2003, p159). Therefore, there is none one and unique Europe, but there are several on the political level because the aspect of borders develops and strengthens as the new racism spreads in the different spheres (political, ethnic, cultural, institutional...etc.). Thus , there are within the European community today , underlying ideological divergences , which risk breaking up the European Union , like the problem of Greece which seemed to be economic in its appearance , but deep down ,it is more than that , given its cultural and

political history . In addition , the problem of England (Brexit) or the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union has been mentioned in British and European political circles since its integration into the European Economic Community (EEC) “ the composed word : Brexit , composed of the words : Britain – and exit : exit from European Union by the United Kingdom .” (Dal Lago and Mezzadra, 2002, p145). The opposition to European integration has been present in the United Kingdom since the first moments of integration into the EEC at the beginning of the 1970s, but it gradually gained importance over the following decades, while the EEC is replaced by a more organized structure, the **European Union** ”(la tribune, 2002, p6). Therefore, the debate regarding the question of Brexit, focused on economic and financial data and projections, because one of the hottest questions is whether the United Kingdom would have more to gain outside the European Union than within it. This question within British society gave rise to two different referenda: a first in 1975 where the British decided to remain in the European Economic Community (EEC), and a second in 2016, during which the British decided to leave the European Union with 51% of the votes cast. I think that this exit from the EU has other more important

reasons, because the English seem to fear the Congregation of terrorism coming from some European countries and in particular France.

The European bloc, nowadays, is an obstacle against democracy .If we analyse the external policy of the EU towards the southern countries, we can deduce that there is a double game based on Machiavelli's: the end justifies the means!

So we can ask this question: How can we conceive, Europe, idol of democracy, declares war on global and especially “Islamist Muslims”? but in return , the member countries of the EU encourage in an indirect and diabolical way , the terrorism which takes away every day dozens or even hundreds of lives in countries on the path to democracy such as Arab countries : Tunisia ,Libya ,Syria , Iraq , Sudan , Palestine , Yemen... However, among the Jihadists who sow death in these countries, we find Europeans (French, Swiss, Belgian...). With the recent terrorist attacks in Europe, as in France (the Bataclan in Paris, in Nice, Toulouse and what happens in France sometimes...), or in Belgium (airport attacks...) ...etc. The borders of democracy have multiplied on a qualitative level. The state of siege officially declared in France for example (Plan Vigipirate) , can generate non-democratic political repercussions towards European

citizens of foreign origins such as Arab-Muslim immigrants currently living in France and elsewhere in Europe and others coming from southern countries who want to reach the Paradise " of which they dreamed (illegal migration) . In return, they face the wall , a cemented wall of discriminatory laws and rigorous prosecutions, violent and murderous " the resulting consequences transforming border control, under the pretext of keeping labour trafficking in check , into a real hidden land and maritime war , at the limits of the Schengen area , whose victims number are thousands of corpses ". (Balibar , 2003 , p 08).

The young stuntmen coming from the southern country , which does not date from today , as said **Juan Goytisolo** (1931-2017 , writer and journalist , one of the most formidable opponents of **Franco in Spain**) " A new protective wall... but also effective and much more mortifying , stands around the fortress of the twelve ... the tragic harvest of the crossing of death. The passage of the strait on the Andalusia coastal zone neighboring Morocco . The Spanish police do not shoot at them, they just catch them in their nets and bring them back, dead or alive, to their starting point." (Goytisolo, 1992, p 8). These young refugees want to reach the European shore, the paradise they dreamed of, fleeing their

countries of origin, because of poverty, unemployment, terrorism... and seeking a better life in Europe. This Europe has forgotten, that yesterday, it supported the refugees from East Germany. People who climbed the Berlin Wall to arrive to West Germany. They applauded and received them like heroes , " While yesterday Europe had its eyes fixed on the Berlin Wall to welcome in solidarity those who cross it , today it turns its back with contempt on the drama of these fugitives , as if this problem do not concern it... the Spanish impassively witness the enactment of their own past . **An almost general historical amnesia has taken hold of them...**" (Goytisolo, 1992, p 8).

This is why all critical thinking must begin today by questioning the status of Europe's external and internal borders and reversing exclusion procedures. Only on this condition, it is possible to see in the demand for a political Europe, a revival of its unfinished movement of Constitution. Therefore, there is a real war on the external and internal borders of Europe, but it is undeclared given its political economic, military and ideological consequences. It is why we should rethink the borders. Finally, Balibar proposes a political approach democratizing borders.

5. Democratization of borders:

Because this thesis is very important, we have to ask this important question: Is this project of democratization of borders feasible? Can we concretize this project, especially nowadays, in a world overwhelmed by political, economic, and ideological and security conflicts (terrorist threats)?

During a debate between Jean - Francois Bayard and Balibar Etienne, speaking on the question of democratization of the boundaries of democracy, he confirmed "Europe can do nothing but the permanent transit of three borders: Atlantic borders, Media borders and Eastern borders. Except that today, there are problems posed concerning these three spaces." (Bayard, 2003, p 1). These three spaces, which Balibar spoke about, determine the different political problems experienced by a large majority of foreign nationals or "subjects" in Europe. Among which institutional racial discrimination, which led to the creation of Europe's instead of one, and policies towards "non-citizens", and the construction of a new wall of political order while the Berlin Wall was abolished at the night of 9/10 November 1989.

Frontier / Europe and democratic / Europe are two expressions, which are ultimately synonymous. they both designate the impossibility in today's world of unilaterally

resolving the now unavoidable question of the regimes of movement and integration of concrete groups, "cultural spheres or bodies of civilization, ranging from workers to students, professionals, to intellectuals that parts of the world exchange with each other". (Balibar, 2003, p 171).

He proposes a good idea, which is to make one Europe, while remaining several and according to this revolutionary political approach against all the colonial ideas of traditional Europe. It would be necessary to introduce a pragmatic exchange between the north and the south without discrimination, nor racism but for a civilizational complementary, "This is why in particular the northern Mediterranean needs its south as much as the south needs the north, not only to have jobs, but to invent statutes and rights, to define constitutions. This complementarity is not necessary, but it is possible". (Balibar, 2003, p 171). Therefore, the democratization of borders is an essential condition, among other conditions of course, to build a democratic and just Europe. This Europe should recognize its serious errors of the past, such as colonialism, which ruined civilisations and free peoples like French colonialism in Africa, especially in Algeria. In addition, its errors of present such as the new apartheid or racism against European citizens of foreign origins like the

discriminatory laws against the **Beurs**. Democratic Europe should face its political, social, cultural, economic and above all historical problems, "the system of external and internal borders remains radically anti – democratic , with no possibility existing for border users , individually and collectively , to negotiate the mode of administration , the rules of crossing ".(Balibar ,2003 , p 170). Thus, Balibar proposes a logic and a praxis solution in order to realize the democratization of borders which is: **decolonization at home**, so what does it mean? , it means decolonizing Europe itself from colonialist past in several ways: official political Europe should definitively get rid of the superiority complex towards the countries of the South, and by replying on the psycho-political tool (the political unconscious). It should also change the discriminatory laws against foreign nationals (subjects) and **recognize its historical crimes of its colonial past**. In this meaning , we can speak about the historic , cultural and politic relations between Algeria and France because some voices in France (ancient *pieds noirs*) do not agree with the independence of Algeria and still demand that Algeria remain French politically , especially economically and culturally , " Algeria , France : one or two nations ? The formulation is certainly provocative, since the answer is obvious

.Who would want to return to independence, to revise the meaning and effects of the Algerian war of liberation," (Balibar, 2002, p73). On both sides of the Mediterranean, voices declared the non – separation of Algeria and France, why? According to the historical dimension, they regret that they are not really two, but in political- view, they say that each one is not really one , " Algeria still too French or " Frenchized " , France already too " Algerianized " ... such a provocation , or socio – temporal , of an irreversible duality was the mark , not of decolonization of the history " (Balibar , 2002 , p 73).

On the economic side, it should stop economic profits, especially debt and famine. It should create a mutual economic cooperation without exploitation by international economic organizations such as: **WTO** (World Trade Organization) , **GATT** (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) , **IMF** (International Monetary Fund) , " the people of poor countries work hard to finance the development of rich countries . The south finances the North, and in particular, the ruling classes of the northern countries. The most powerful means of domination of the north over the south today is **debt service**", (Ziegler, 2005, p 94), the **World Bank**, "The World Bank is the largest development agency in the United

Nations system. Under its own statutes, it is up to it to support, help and finance the development plans of the poorest government in the planet. However, in Nigeria (**as in many other countries in the South under Western rule**), the reality is very different. The World Bank is here at the most direct service of the lords of Western private companies" (Ziegler, 2008, p 223-224).

I think that the idea of democratization of borders has its political and Cosmo political value. Because the current political world is experiencing turmoil with the rise of new ethnic, cultural and religious racism, and especially towards Muslims who live in Europe (Islamophobia). Without forgetting the economic interests, that the west wants to preserve for its future generations, by tying up the countries of the South with debt and hunger. So the people of poor countries work themselves , to death to finance the development of rich countries , in this purpose Ziegler said : " the South finances the North , and in particular the ruling classes of the Northern countries .The most powerful means of domination of the North over the South today is debt servicing " .(Ziegler , 2005 ,p 93). Finally , we can confirm that Europe , as a political bloc , could be really democratic by abolition of all borders that block true democracy , and this

aim should be concretized if an European Political / Ethical will , will be born.

CONCLUSION:

In concluding, we can say:

1. The borders of democracy remain everywhere inside and outside, the national and international political sphere.
2. Democratizing borders of democracy, means reviewing an entire political-global system. We must start with the institutional component, amended by a serious and committed anti-racist conceptual movement , based on human rights and equal – freedom.
3. Europe as a large political bloc should review its colonial history and recognize its crimes against weak and poor people of the South, like French colonialism in Algeria, which killed millions of Algerians. On the other side, it exploited all the geographic riches of Algeria (Oil, gas, all agricultural products, and even tourism and historical monuments ...), for 130 years and persists on its wicked and imperialist / exploitative policy on some southern countries.
4. Today's global political life calls for a general politico-economic balance. It must review dangerous issues that threaten democracy and Human

existence: **Stop** global terrorism and economic exploitation of the G7 towards the countries of the South, give up the criminal wars nowadays, like the war on GAZA in PALESTINE led by the Zionist Israel, supported by Europe and USA. **Stop** inferring in the internal policies of some countries, especially the Arab ones in order to create internal disturbances and civil wars.

5. Therefore, Politicians and decision makers have to restore a philosophy of tolerance based on ethics. Thus, they should review the internal and external boundaries of democracy, is it possible? Is it Utopia? We think that the future will have the decisive answer.

Bibliography :

1. Alessandro Dal Lago et Sandro Mezzadra (1991), les frontières impensées de l'Europe, traduction par Balibar Etienne, édition Manifestolibri, Rome, Italie.
2. Balibar Etienne (1992), les frontières de la démocratie, éditions la découverte, Paris, France.
3. Balibar Etienne (1997), la crainte des masses, éditions Galilée, Paris, France.
4. Balibar Etienne (2001), Nous Citoyens d'Europe, éditions la découverte et Syros, Paris, France.
5. Balibar Etienne (2003), l'Europe, l'Amérique, la guerre, réflexion sur la médiation européenne, édition la découverte, Paris, France.
6. Balibar Etienne (2002), Droit de cité, éditions Press Universitaires de France, Paris, France.
7. Derrida Jack (1987), Invention de l'autre, éditions Galilée, Paris, France.
8. Fougeyrolas Pierre (1987), la nation essor et déclin des sociétés modernes, éditions Fayard, Paris, France.
9. Goytisolo Juan (1992), l'Europe européenne, le monde diplomatique, Paris, France, N490.
10. LA Tribune (2002), Paris, France, N 158.
11. Michel Prigent (2005), Actuel Marx, le racisme après les races, éditions : Press Universitaires De France, France.
12. Umberto Eco (1994), la recherche de la langue parfaite dans la culture européenne, traduction Fr, éditions du Seuil, Paris, France.
13. Ziegler John (2005), l'empire de la honte, librairie Arthème Fayard, Paris, France.
14. Ziegler John (2008), la haine de l'occident, éditions Albin Michel, Paris, France