

Democratic Socialism

as transformation project

A contribution to the programme discussion of the PDS

By Dieter Klein

(Senior Fellow at the Rosa-Luxemburg-Foundation)



Democratic Socialism as transformation project

A contribution to the programme discussion of the PDS

“It is important after all that we stand to our time and consider precisely its ‘transitional character’ as the possibly great, without any squinting to the times of ‘fulfilment’ (deceptive reflections of good old times in our heads).” (Brecht, 1981: 531)

First Thesis

To consider democratic socialism as a transformation project that can win contours already in the midst of bourgeois society and in a predictably longer process at the same time will go beyond it, is a break with the Marxist-Leninist dogma that socialism is only possible as the consequence of a political revolution in the guise of a socialist revolution. This dogma necessarily draws in its wake a tendency to sectarianism and dictatorship or to opportunist adjustment to the ruling conditions.¹

Not only the confrontation, necessary as before, with the causes for the defeat of state socialism, with its structural basic deficits and with the theoretical and political false tracks at its foundations, is occasion to stress the breach of democratic socialism with this dogma in an emphatic way. The political situation also suggests so. An uneasy discomfort has seized the majority of the women and men citizens of the Federal Republic. It expresses itself in increasing dissatisfaction with parties and abstention at elections. A diffuse anxiety goes through the country. The fear that the social gaps will widen, that small people always pay extra and that politicians as a rule act past their interests, is the conviction of most. The anger about that is more pronounced in **France**, for instance, than in the Federal Republic. Yet also in Germany, the new social movement against a globalisation marked by the interests of the multinationals gains a foothold. The number of adherents of Attac is growing. Within just a few months, the German public has become more sensitive to the dangers that are provoked by the militant global strategy of the Bush administration in the name of the war against terror. Again, there rumbles the feeling that things cannot continue this way and shouldn't. It is not decided, into what direction this mood will lead.

In such a situation, where political and social change happens to slide onto the agenda or at least might, the question for possible paths of such change wins first-rank importance. Parties are called to testify what paths they think are voyageable and future-oriented. That also applies to the **Left Party.PDS**.

Socialist politics in the Federal Republic aims at a probably long process, where in many individual steps, it will be a matter of building a more peaceful world, of

¹ Original of June 25, 2002. The theses 1 to 3 were written using to a very large degree an unpublished paper by Michael Brie.

conserving the natural conditions of life, of reducing unemployment on the road to a new form of full employment, of granting socially equal participation in education and culture, of renewing systems of social security, and as the condition for such developments, of giving decisively more democratic influence to the citizens (women and men) on the decisions in economics and society. Such a destination of socialist politics requires separation from dogmas that run counter to it.

The idea that one can assume that in spite of the capitalist basic structure, important steps can be taken in the direction of social equality of the participation of all in the elementary conditions of a self-determined life, that inroads for emancipation and better social standards can be hewed into profit dominance, however, to quite a few left-minded people still appears as inadmissible deviation from the true teaching. They still consider the concept that civilisational qualities of bourgeois societies might harbour multipliable cells of a “good society” and extendable possibilities for socialist policies as a violation of a basic dogma of historical materialism. That used to read as follows back then: “The bourgeois revolution only anchors the revolution of the economic conditions that has taken place spontaneously in the womb of the old, feudal society, and with the help of the bourgeois state secures the conditions for the further development of the capitalist way of production. By contrast, the socialist productive relations cannot develop spontaneously in the womb of the capitalist society, because here it is not a matter of a replacement of one form of relations of exploitation by the other, but of the elimination of all relationships of exploitation based on the private property of the means of production altogether. That means that the political revolution of the proletariat, the elimination of the power of the bourgeoisie and the construction of the dictatorship of the proletariat are necessary prerequisites and conditions for the creation of the economic basis of the socialist society.” (Introduction 1977, p. 349, 350). It was forgotten that Marx – even if with less emphasis – certainly had pointed to developments of the new still within the framework of the old society, for instance, when he wrote about the working class: “It does not have any ideals to realise; it only has to set free the elements of the new society that have already developed in the bosom of the... bourgeois society.” (Marx, MEW, vol. 17, p. 343).

A socialist society should be fashioned according to the will of a party come to power that creates the economic basis of this power post festum. The political revolution of the proletariat became a prerequisite for the development of a socialist economy – and be it only in its simplest features. A transformation of bourgeois relationships with socialist orientation without political dictatorship of the proletariats was, therefore, considered excluded.

The task of women and men socialists, therefore, following this logic, had to consist mainly in the political enlightenment of women and men workers and their organisation for the goal of a political revolution. Any other type of acting was to be rejected as *economism and reformism*.

The logical consequence of such an understanding of socialist politics was a distance from social and economic reforms under the given circumstances. The Communists were of course in the game when in 1919 a growing movement of workers’ council and trade unions demanded a socialisation of mining, co-determination with equal rights in the economy by way of business councillors and a democratisation of administration in local communities and regions. In the struggles of the year 1921, the defence of the right to unionise, the right to strike and the eight-

hour work-day as well as the purging of justice from reactionary forces belonged to the demands of the KPD. It participated in 1923 in the movement for control committees and spoke up for better provisioning with food stuffs against price extortion, speculation, and black markets (Kinner, 1999, p. 29 ff., 42, 52 ff). Yet such steps in the strategic concept of the KPD only served as advance skirmishes for the impending world revolution. Measured by that yardstick, reforms were not considered as essential changes. Reforms rather served as attempts by the rulers – including social democracy – to dissuade the workers by partial improvements of their situation from the historical revolutionary mission appropriate to them. Therefore, many members of the Communist Party in Germany and in other countries took part in the daily social struggles. Yet in the last instance, the leadership of the KPD judged reforms mainly from the point of view of the stabilisation of capitalist rule.

Such a distancing from reforms in bourgeois society could also take reference from Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, who in the “Manifesto” had criticised the practical “bourgeois socialism”, namely that it was being tried “to spoil any revolutionary movement to the working class by the proof that not this or that political change, but only a change of the material conditions of life, the economic relationships in general could be of use to it. By change of the material conditions of life, this socialism, however, in no way understands abolition of the bourgeois production relationships that is only possible on the revolutionary track, but administrative improvements that take place on the soil on these productive relationships, in other words that change nothing to the relationship of capital and wage labour, but in the best case reduce the costs of its rule to the bourgeoisie and simplify its state budget.” (Marx, Engels, MEW, vol. 4, p. 489). Later corrections of this conception by Marx and especially by Engels were mostly ignored in Marxist-Leninist theory.

Since in the logic of such an understanding of socialist politics, social and economic reform efforts do not have any independent value as part of a longer-term socialist strategy, but had a value only then, and moreover, an instrumental value, if they contributed to the enlightenment and politically-revolutionary organisation of the working class, they were to start with schizophrenic and were pre-programmed to finally lead to a split of the socialist movement. The consent of the social democratic leaders to the First World War, their coalition with the reactionaries against the radical left in the January struggles in Berlin and during the smash of the Bremen and the Munich council republic, this in the very first years of the KPD, contributed considerably to this attitude. On the one side, they gained a foothold who were able to conduct practical social and economic reform policies. Those who understood the practical movement mainly as preparation of the revolution remained on the other side. The Communist Party in the Weimar Republic became the strongest antifascist force of resistance, but in the tradition of the disdain of reformist parties, it was not in a position to build bridges to the social democratic party and to develop its own socialist reform strategy.

In the October revolution of 1917, the Communist Party was able for a historical moment to bundle the longing for peace of the majority of the population, the democratic demands of the peasantry and the elementary desire for getting rid of hunger and misery by the masses for a departure in the direction of surmounting capitalism. Yet the conquest of power was twisted into a dictatorship in the name of the ideally conceived working class and in that way into a dictatorship over the real women and men workers.

The Marxist-Leninist revolutionary concept thus, first of all, left the field of practical social and economic reform policy mainly to those who did not link it to surmounting of capitalism, or to parties who pursued the socialist goal on reform tracks. Their compromises were demonised – even where they did not result from pure opportunism – for instance, by the condemnation of the Eurocommunism of the Italian Communist Party in the 70s. Cooperation with them was “out” and, in that way, the chance was excluded, to link, in common struggles, limited reforms and further-reaching goals. This encouraged a situation, where social democracy that in evolutionary times had been able to win the democratic support of large parts of the population for its reform, shifted ever further in the direction of a non- socialist opportunism – except if it succeeded, like the Allende government in Chile, to conceive a socialist project that connected social and economic reforms with elements transgressing capitalism.

Second, this revolutionary concept pushed its supporters that wanted to hold on to socialist goals into self-isolation. Except in a revolutionary situation, this position could not secure any lasting democratic mass support. Successful engagement, under the current conditions, for more justice, more liberty, and more equality for each and every one, was at most considered a means of preparation for the revolution. The “genuine” was always expected only beyond the Rubicon of the socialist revolution.

Because a chance of the left for broad alliances with other democratic forces for larger political and social changes turning away from capital dominance and common practical learning processes in the search for a just society were excluded in such a concept of socialism, the consequence was clear. An avant-garde had to bring about the revolution and to try to reach by means of its own dictatorship what was not expected to be achievable by democratic means. Third, this concept implied a decoupling of revolutionary goals from the large majority of the population. Revolutionaries, who succeeded to seize power, employed it to create a new world according to a politically conceived model according to the “recognised regularities”. This new world was supposed to overcome capitalist exploitation. At its centre, there was supposed to be man. Yet what “man” wanted was decided in the leadership bodies of the avant-garde party. In this bag, there belonged, under the conditions of the GDR, the liberation from unemployment and inter-human competition, to a large extent equal access for everyone to education and services of the health system, affordable apartments, relief of families by territory-wide coverage with child-care installations, encouragement of women, high expenditures for cultural installations and for a broad movement of amateur artists, the testing of cooperative development paths, especially in agriculture and the persecution of neo-fascism and racism. As soon, however, as independent thought in schools or universities or critical voices in art, culture, the public, and in the party itself were perceived by the party leadership as a threat to its power, as soon as more decentralised responsibility in the process of economic reforms was considered a threat to the central concentration of power, as soon as even mobility and informational needs collided with the ruling ideology and claims to individuality got into contradiction to its almightiness, “the Party”, there came to daylight what had been the real inner criteria of social development under state socialist conditions: the dominance of state power. However, the party itself was not a monolithic whole. Socialist ideals, creative thinking, and independent initiative in the biography of millions went along with discipline, self-censorship and submission to party discipline.

However tragic it may seem: a communism that excluded that the new society could also develop in the pores of the old society, had its fate pre-programmed: to become sectarian and dictatorial or to tip over into opportunism and renunciation to socialist values.

The result was an attempt at socialism without individual liberty, a centrally organised economy that could only inadequately scoop out the individual interests of the individuals in efficient economic management and their creativity. The outcome was, despite all socialist ideals, despite their partial realisation mainly in the social sphere and despite enormous efforts by millions, the failure of this attempt in the East. In the West, this strategy did not lead all, but most Communist and left-socialist parties into sectarian narrowness.

Second Thesis

The statement that socialism could economically and socially not come to life in the womb of the “old society” rested on the assumption that socialist society would be founded on state property. The transfer of means of production into state property was considered the primary goal of political seizure of power. Such a state socialism has not turned out to be viable in the long run.

The Marxist-Leninist revolution concept measured socialism against the predominance of state-social property under the leadership of the Communist party.² As the point of departure of reproduction of such a society, there figured a party that has seized power and does not put this up to the democratic disposition of the free will of the population. This party centralises control over means of production. As the determining point of departure, the power of the party was also the end point of the reproduction of a production organised in a state-socialist way; it was the overarching relationship of domination, whose conservation meant the limitation of all other social and cultural objectives. Frequently, such different objectives resulted precisely from the limited nature of the power of the party, from the necessity to bear account to other than only one's own requirements of reproduction in order to balance the lack of democratic legitimation.

In practice, the reproduction of state-socialist societies despite the higher goals proclaimed and despite the commitment of millions of people to their advancement, always took place in the framework of an expanded accumulation of the power of the state party.

A considerable part of individual energies did not find any room for action in the state-regulated spheres and was spent by the individuals in private spheres and in the shadow economy outside the grip by party and state. It was not possible to integrate the individual interests into a future-oriented development in a system-

² As the two most important essential traits of socialism, the last official textbook of *Scientific Socialism* of the GDR defines “-exercise of political power by the working class under the leadership of its Marxist-Leninist party in alliance with the class of the cooperative peasants, intelligentsia and the other working-people, - social property in its two forms, socialist planned economy and accumulation of social wealth in the interest of the working class and all working people...” *Scientific Socialism. Textbook for Marxist-Leninist Basic Studies*, Berlin 1988: German Publishing House for Sciences, p. 277.

supportive way. The reproduction of the individuals remained the subordinated process, the reproduction of the rule of the state parties the determining process in the general reproduction of state socialism.

The consequence of an understanding of socialism as marked by Marxist-Leninist avant-garde parties and founded on state property was the need to exclude the theoretical possibility of emergence of real elements of socialism and effective socialist tendencies in the bourgeois society. There, where state socialism became reality, the consequence of this basic structure was its necessary failure.

Third Thesis

An emancipative socialism must free itself from the Marxist-Leninist fixation on state socialism and declare the free development of each and everyone to be the goal of its movement.

If it is indeed the idea of socialism as a society resting on the almightiness of a Communist party and its disposal over state property in a planned and centralised way that damned the socialist movement at least in its Communist guise to sectarianism and/or dictatorship and pushed other reform efforts off, the women and men socialists stand before a clear alternative: Either they reduce their political action to resistance against deteriorations, at most to improvements in the given and to the revolutionary education of women and men citizens, because they do not ascribe any socialist perspectives to more far-reaching practical reforms. Or they are ready and capable to subject the socialist objective itself to a radical reformulation and to discover the possibilities of socialistically shaping politics and policies under the conditions we encounter.

The most important question that women and men socialists have to ask themselves in this connection is: What is the real criterion of socialist politics? If it is the bringing about of the dictatorship of the proletariat under the leadership of a Communist party that then produces state property, any reform policy aimed at changing things that does not directly or indirectly serve this goal should really be considered unsocialist. If one assumes, however, that such a concept is refuted historically as well as theoretically, then the criteria of socialist politics must be determined in a new way.

In the commentary on the programme of democratic socialism, the authors stated: "The political claim of socialism consists in such a shaping of modern societies with their institutions and power structures that the realisation of human rights in the unity of political, social, and individual rights and their indivisibility is guaranteed for every single individual and for all. In this sense, socialism can also be considered the human rights ideology of modern societies." (Social analysis, 1997, p. 49) The state, under this pre-sign, would acquire an important role for the long-term shaping of conditions such that proclaimed human rights could also become legal reality.

In the light of the overwhelming importance that at least in continental European thinking Marx assumes for the whole socialist and Communist movement and respecting the fact that the reference to Marx is used again and again to criticise changes in socialist thinking as un-Marxist, one should turn at first to the characterisation of Marxism /Communism by Marx himself.

In Marx' thinking, two different concepts competed with one another. On the one hand, there was the tendency to think of Communism as the centralisation of production, as étatisation under the control of the workers. This was closely linked to the fixation on the primacy of a political revolution as the prerequisite of any socialist transformation. In his thought in the area of history of philosophy, Marx himself, on the one hand, has himself criticised such conceptions early on as “barrack communist”, on the other hand, he has himself developed alternative notions of Communism.³

In one of his attempts at periodicising human history and at distinguishing traditional, modern capitalist and Communist formations – in the “Basic Outlines of the Critique of Political Economy”, written between 1857 and 1958, he summarises these thoughts in sentences like these: “Personal... relationships of dependence – (at first quite home-grown) are the first social forms, where human productivity only develops to a small degree and at isolated points. Personal independence founded on *material* dependence is the second large form, where there first forms a system of general social material exchange, of universal relations, all-encompassing satisfaction of needs and universal capacities. Free individuality, founded on the universal development of the individuals and the subordination of their common, social productivity as their social wealth, is the third stage.” (Marx, MEW, vol. 42, p. 91). The counter-pole of the development he hoped for, he described in this way: “The social relationship of the individuals to one another as autonomous power over the individuals, whether it is now presented as natural force, accident or any such like force, is the necessary result of the fact that the point of departure is not the free, social individual.” (ibidem., p. 127)

In delineation to such situation, Marx and Engels stated what in essence constitutes the core the socialism/communism, “an association, where the free development of each and everyone is the development of the free development of all.”

Free individuals as the dominant point of departure of reproduction in socialism and as the determining goal of this reproduction! The “general form” of a socialist/Communist society, therefore, would be: “free individuals – social action – further developed free individuals.” As the general formula of capital, Marx had described the circle “Money – Commodity Production – more Money” (M – C – M') at the disposal of the money capital holders.

³ It belonged to the antinomies in Marxist thinking to let irreconcilable ideas stand next to one another in one and the same text. This explains the possibilities of very contradictory interpretations of the “classic texts” or Marxism and the usability of the texts for a humanistic-democratic just as for an anti-emancipative-dictatorial reading. The reason for that lies among other things in that Marx, on the one hand, decided himself early on, in a Communist way, for the realisation of common property, on the other hand, however, held on to its radical-emancipative aim, however, was not able to link the two constructively, and precisely for that reason, was also able to evade to a large extent any clarification on how the institutions of a future society should look like. In “Capital”, under the heading ‘Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation’, meaning with view to a non-capitalist formation, this antinomy is expressed in the formulation that the capitalist production process “with the necessity of a natural process” produced “its own negation”. This negation of negation “does not reinstate private property, however, certainly individual property on the basis of the achievements of the capitalist era: cooperation and the common property of the earth and of the means of productions produced by work itself.” (Karl Marx: *Capital. First Volume*, MEW, vol. 23, p. 791). Individual property on the basis of common property – a paradox unsolved until today.

What today is more than ever the key is to increasingly realise, already in bourgeois society, those conditions that offer the individuals more scopes of freedom for their unfolding in solidary action. In a presumably long-term transformation process, it is a matter of giving the capital circulation processes a new general framework to then integrate step-by-step entrepreneurial profit into socio-ecological change in favour of the common weal and of all individuals. *The dominance of profit, corresponding to what Marx called the general formula of capital must yield in favour of developments according to an "alternative formula", whose content is the unfolding of the individuals and their shared responsibility for the social benefit of all.*

Fourth Thesis

Transformation – that in the last decade was the notion for the transition of state socialism to capitalist-bourgeois societies. Democratic socialism as a project of transformation aims at the reversal of this procedure, however, not at the return to state socialism, but at progress to a situation where in place of the functionality of the individuals for capital extraction, there steps the individuality of each and every one.

The implosion of state socialism and its consequential replacement by capitalism were such a deep historical break and the triumph of capitalism such a spectacular one that following the prevailing opinion, transformation could only have one direction left: All ways lead to capitalism. Francis Fukuyama's image of the "end of history" (Fukuyama) has hooked into the transformational notion in mainstream thinking and robbed it of its openness.

The general content of the notion of transformation as process of transition from one society to the next, let loose by the incapacity of a given society to find solutions to its contradictions and to ripened large scale problems solutions in the interest of the majority, was pushed aside. Transformation as double process of erosion of a social order and the crystallisation and strengthening of structures of another order according to the predominant Western opinion – however unsolved a multitude of concrete conflicts or problems may be there – for the CIS countries and East Central Europe is considered by and large as completed, because in the stead of the leading party, there has stepped capital – frequently however in the particular repugnant form of mafia capital and with the consequence of the social impoverishment of large sections of the population in wide parts of the former Soviet Union. A critical analysis of the process of transformation from state socialism to capitalism would explode the frame of the present contribution. The great boom of transformation or **transition research, as it was**, seems over: "the fact that transformational research does not take the upheaval in Central and Eastern Europe as an occasion to deal with the problem of social transformation in general reflects... its implicit assumption that history up to now had now entered in a post-historical state, as if beyond parliamentary democracy and market economy on the basis of private property in principle, there could be nothing in the form of social organisation." (Hopfmann; Wolf (ed.); 2001, p. 22). However, what about if capitalism was after all not the end of history, if it was only left over for the time being? If in the East, there had taken place only the first act of recent transformation and, moreover, this had ushered into a society that does not have to offer any solutions for virulent global problems, but whose rule structures bring forth these problems themselves. Then the next act of contemporary transformation would be still in the offing – as a transformation that points beyond capitalism. Then the reduction of the notion of transformation to the

universalism of capitalism and the practical transformation politics in the East corresponding to it would be a limited statement that would enter into conflict with the self-description of bourgeois society as an open society. Then transformation should not be realised in the direction of capitalism, but in the opposite direction of a democratic socialism.

For such a point of view, there speaks that a society, whose basic structure is determined by capital extraction, cannot be a just society. A reversal of the direction of transformation would be motivated by the recognition that an unharnessed, above all profit-dominated growth would destroy the natural life conditions of the people. Profit dominance is a main reason for the split of the earth into rich and poor. The USA especially raise the claim to determine the world order according to their own interest, have introduced a new armament round, by way of the modernisation of nuclear weapons, are preparing the lowering of the threshold for their use, even point to Russia and China as possible goals and declare self-mandated wars against "evil" as a suitable means for the solution of world problems. Such arrogance and the poverty in the "South", on the other hand, form a nurturing ground for terrorism. A profit-dominated society gives birth to all forms of crime. It provokes daily violence, economic crimes and other crimes that are hardly noticed by the public.

What should one think if pharmaceutical companies sue against the cheap production of Aids medication in South Africa – in the light of the probability that in the year 2005, the number of death from AIDS in Africa will surpass the victims of the First and Second World War together? What should one think of the firm H.C. Stark, a daughter firm of the Bayer Corporation that, on a world-wide scale, processes more than half of the Contan ore, out of which the metal Tantal is won predominantly for being used in electronics, among others at the Siemens daughter Epcos? A fifth of the global incidence of this hotly desired metal stems from the ore sources in Congo. The wars there, which since 1998 have cost 2.5 million people's life, according to an investigative report of the UN of April 16, 2001 rage especially over the control of ore mines, where prisoners of war, deported civilians and often children work under inhuman conditions. The warlords, who control these mines, finance their wars by their deliveries to the international companies (Werner; Weiss, 2001: 45 ff.).

While the transformation to capitalism still continues, its constitution speaks for the introduction of a new large cycle of transformation, whose direction women and men socialists describe as democratic socialism. "Transformation is a social search process with an open outcome." (Hopfmann; Wolf, 2002: 27). Yet, the participants have notions about goals, ways, and values in this process of which they expect solutions of those problems that cannot be solved in the rigidified present structures. The programmes of CDU/CSU, FDP, SPD and Greens all come down to different variants of the reform of capitalism. The PDS in its draft for a new party programme presents a transformation project that links change in bourgeois society with a future beyond capitalism.

This dialectic of change in the framework of the given conditions and their questioning at the same time sees itself confronted to critical objections by two sides that solve the connections between these two sides in their respectively own way. Some seem to recognise, wrongly, in the interpretation of democratic socialism as transformational project an old-left renunciation to the gains in civilisation of bourgeois society. Others read this project according to the old pattern just described as "just reform" and fear the giving up of socialist ideals. It has to be held against this

that the politics of the PDS also in the future must link socialist opposition with the claim to act as a reform force forming, shaping and designing in the daily life of the women and men citizens and with a graspable use value for the improvement of their lives. Without a lasting emancipative process of change anchored in the life world of people, it will never come to a transgression of the borders of capitalism.

However, the transformative claim of a democratic, socialist party will do justice to its socialist claims and criteria only, if it integrates into itself the protest of the concerned against the deterioration of their situation, against the heartlessness of many decisions, against the insecurities and fears imposed on them, if it scandalises things that are scandalous in a way that cannot be ignored publicly, if compromises are refused there, where they damage the dignity of people. Responsible forming of policies and protest against everything unconscionable, socialist opposition and trying to shape the existing conditions in other words belong together. In the **middle** of the first decade of the 21st century, the voting out of social democratically- led governments in a number of countries shows that the tendency that had emerged in the mid-90s of a turning-away from neoliberalism, has been reversed. Right-wing populism, right-wing radicalism and nationalism show more openly internationally and also in Germany. Even anti-Semitic voices are becoming louder. The policy by CDU/CSU and **SPD** does not correct the social and democracy deficits of social-democratic and green policy, but pushes them further. Resistance against that and against the neoliberal components of the policies of the Third Way must, therefore, flow more actively into the policy designing aspiration of the **Left Party**. *PDS. Both at the same time are the task of democratic women and men socialists: recognisable socialist opposition and more convincing concrete policy offerings.* Without continued development of our own competence on the various policy fields, protest would get into the disrepute of being mere empty hue and cry. Without lasting opposition against profit dominance, losses in democracy and social demolition, the direction of individual reform steps would no longer be recognisable. Democratic socialism as transformation process requires the qualification of both sides of the PDS – as unity full of tension. Only both together can counteract threatening dangers, crisis, environmental and social catastrophes.

Fifth Thesis

Women and men socialists expect emancipation and lasting socio-ecological effects not as a result of large-scale catastrophes, but work for emancipation, socio-ecological sustainability and socialist developments in a democratic process that will lead to more justice, freedom, equality, and solidarity. This process will not be a harmonic growing into another society, but it will take place in heavy battles over the change of social relationships, power, and property structures. It will entail a number of ruptures, small and large.

The attempts at socialism of the 20th century, however, hardly emerged from the development and the ripening of democratic-socialist elements. They took place mainly as attempts to give liberating answers to great catastrophes. It was the battles and pains of the First World War that ushered into the October revolution of 1917. It was the horror, the genocide and the strategy of scorched earth in the Second World War that ended with the expansion of the Soviet system to the Central and South-East European countries liberated by the Red Army from fascism. Yet the deficits of, the lack of or the complete destruction of democracy already before these great breaks in Imperial Germany, in Tsarist Russia, in the brittle Weimar Republic, under

the conditions of fascism, of Japanese military dictatorship and of semi-feudal China were not compensated by a catching up of state socialism and least of all were they replaced by a socialist democracy for each and everyone. Its basic structures were unwieldy for the solution of the ripened problems in a democratic way.

What, however, if humanity succeeded in no longer permitting such large catastrophes as in the 20th century, if socialism no longer got onto the agenda of history in response to a clear relapse into barbarity? Then it becomes more probable that majorities in the modern bourgeois societies in the best case will give their approval to alternative reforms with openings towards socialist partial steps rather than choosing a socialist revolution – all the more so since in the meantime a large part of the society has to safeguard its own property against too great uncertainties.

Then efforts for the theoretical founding of democratic socialism as project of transformation will become a first-rank challenge to critical social theories. Then a politics of socialist opposition against the ruling relationships will have to bring forward practical reform steps that can push forward an emancipative process of social-ecological change.

Thesis Six

An emancipative transformation process can rely on the elementary circumstance that modern bourgeois societies have a multi-dimensional basic structure. Their basic structures are capitalist; they are beholden to the extraction of capital. Despite the respectively different individual criteria of development of all other social spheres - politics, education, culture, and the social systems – the former also to a high degree determines their development. But bourgeois societies are more than pure patriarchal capital processing societies. From the bourgeois revolution cycle, and later on from the struggles of the worker movement and other social movements, there have grown indispensable civilisational qualities of these societies. Under the pre-conditions of changed social relationship of forces, they offer scopes for movement and possibilities for alternative change.

This optimistic expectation is opposed by the fact that since the 70s, in several waves, there rather have progressed the subjugation of society under profit, the retraction of already achieved social and cultural standards and a weakening of solidary elements in society. The social polarisation continues.

The property of 358 billionaires, already in 1996, according to UNDP data, exceeded the overall income of the countries with the poorest 45 percent of the world population. 1.5 billion men, women, and children live in absolute poverty. 85 of the billionaires are German, 1.1 million children, according to governmental data, even in the rich Federal Republic live under conditions of poverty. Profit thinking made the US government veto the climate agreement at Kyoto. Patients in need of care in an increasingly commercialised health system mutate to cost factors. Culture must pay off. Money is missing for schools. In the struggle for top viewing ratings of the media, profit thinking finishes off with humanistic contents and non-sensational substance. Profitable under-payment of women and the first-in-line status of women when envisaging dismissals are an expression of the interrelationship of capital interests and patriarchal rule.

And still bourgeois societies are more than profit ltds. They have produced civilisational gains that are indispensable for democratic, economically efficient, social, ecological, and cultural change. The pluralistic character of democracy, state of law, human rights and international law, competition as selection and innovation mechanism, solidary elements in the social security systems, first steps in the direction of ecological sustainability, an educational system developed despite all of its deficits, humanistic values in art and culture despite all commercialisation, individualisation and peaceful inter-state relations in many parts of the world can become resources for more democracy, justice, freedom, social equality and solidarity. In these civilisational gains, there is hidden a transformative potential.

It is not contained in them in pure form. Just like coal, gold and precious stones must first be extracted from their original, powerful embrace, this also holds for the setting free of transformative potentials from their encapsulation in the dominance of the profit system and in the present structures of rule. The civilisational qualities of bourgeois modernity can and must be unfolded far beyond their contemporary constitutionality. But, therefore, they should not remain like they are. They now function predominantly as elements of a profit-dominated society – the global markets are marked by transnational concerns, internationally operating banks and investment funds, democracy is strongly under their influence and dominated by political elites instead of by plebiscite, education and culture function more as locational factors rather than as freedom goods for each and every one. *Alternative reforms would continue to develop and fulfil the civilisational potentials of society according to the measure of the self-determined life of free women and men citizens.*

In this sense, the PDS wants to surmount capitalism. Cheap polemics allege that it wants to do away with everything that constitutes modern bourgeois society. That is a lie – that, however, feeds on the dogmas of Marxism- Leninism and on the practice of the October revolution as the smashing of everything existing.

Overcoming of capitalism means ending the dominance of capital over society, breaking the dominance of profit, and holding on to the civilisational potentials of the bourgeois societies by tearing them out of the subordination under profit as the measure of development decisive in the last instance. Interests in profits would be conditioned in such a way that they do not originate in the starvation of millions of people, not from armament and commercialisation of health, education, and culture, not from the split of society in rich and poor ones and do not lead to progressive destruction of the environment.

Such a change in direction can only be imposed by the strengthening of counter-power and can only be made valid face to mighty capital interests. However, the capital interests are not monolithically structured. Capital extraction in turn very much requires, for instance, well-trained workers, who can solve their tasks creatively, independently and in a communicative way. Precisely the dangers for the functioning of structures of rule caused by social polarisation certainly provoke an interest in social integration of the majority of the population in society and in a good operating climate. The pre-eminence of profit destroys the environment, but resource efficiency, avoidance of extremely high insurance costs that are linked to environmentally hazardous technologies, a company image friendly to the environment and the scooping out of the market for environmental technologies are countervailing interests of the firms. Poverty in large regions of the world and financial crash as the consequence of uncontrolled moves on the international

capital, bond and currency markets are experienced by far-reaching entrepreneurs and politicians as serious threats, against which something must be done also in their own interest (compare Soros, 1998; Stiglitz, 2002).

The bourgeoisie constructed its political rule in the name of liberty, equality, and fraternity and partly actually redeemed a part of these large promises. In part it did that, because it was forced to do so by countervailing powers, partly also because important civilisational processes are in its own interest – and then again are questioned by the bourgeoisie itself.

Taking into account these ambivalences, it is a matter of fashioning the general conditions also for private entrepreneurs in such a way that profit is engendered by things that serve the common weal and the improvement of the lives of the individuals. Where no profit is to be made by such criteria, there is no legitimation for private property of capital and other forms of property to become necessary. (compare Klein, 2002, in: Socialism as the order of the day, Dietz 2002; Klein, 2000: 54 ff.)

Future-oriented transformation of bourgeois society means unfolding and renewal of all of its sides that are open for emancipation, justice, and ecological restructuring, by putting in the place of profit as economic objective stamping society the free development of the individuals as the meaning of social development and by also subordinating the economy to this higher meaning.

However, already any thought of such a developmental goal seems to be hit by the completely contrary tendency of increasing incorporation of all new developments into the concentration of international capital power and into the reinforced determination of the present world era by dominance and geo-strategic interests by the leadership of the USA and by the employment of military force.

Thesis Seven

A theoretical foundation of democratic socialism as transformation project and as practical politics that discovers this project in alternative reforms and carries it to realisation must be worked out inevitably in confrontation with the now existing paths of development.

The essential in an emancipative transformation process will consist in reversing the weight between the conditions of rule imprinted by capital extraction, patriarchal rule, dominance of the “North” over the “South” and destruction of nature and emancipative, social, ecological, and solidary tendencies of social developments. The relationships of dominance must be turned so as to finish with the rule of people over people.

At present, there compete two paths of development in the Western world. The crisis of Fordism – of social state capitalism in the two-and-a-half decades after the Second World War – led to a neoliberally marked capitalism in various variants. This kind of capitalism is interpreted as the inevitable consequence of globalisation pressure. The Third Ways of new social democracy are an attempt at splits between neoliberal adaptation to the constraints of the world market and the attempt at social alleviation of the destructive consequences of world economic capital logic. Social democracy arrived at a point, which the leading theoretician of their Third Ways, Anthony

Giddens, brought to the point that “capitalism has no alternative”. (Giddens, 1999: 36). The conservative forces have had no doubt of that anyhow.

The conflict potential of both potential paths threatens their discharge into yet an additional future developmental variant. A relapse into a largely de-civilised, more strongly militarised capitalism with markedly authoritarian, police state features and mafia character is not excluded.

A historical fork has been reached. The great breaks of our time – high-technology upheavals, globalisation and the global environmental crisis, the erosion of the work world as it existed up to now and the social security systems resting on that, the conflict-laden polarisation between “North” and “South” and a new turn towards war as apparently unforsakable means for the solution of problems – require setting of the tracks for the future course of history. In this situation, in the light of the unsolved global and inner-social large-scale problems, it is unacceptable that there is no alternative to capitalism. In practical policy, we must look for emancipative answers to the breaks of the present (see, for instance: Rosa Luxemburg Foundation, 2000; WG Economic Policy at the Party Executive of the PDS, 2002; Huffs Schmid 1999; Lehndorf, 2001; Crossover, 2000; Löwy, Betto and others, 2002). Theoretically, we must examine what speaks in favour of a democratic socialism as an alternative transformative project.

This can, as in Thesis 3, link up to certain ways of thinking in Marx’ work, but also to Engels’ later insights. Friedrich Engels already pointed to the possibility and the advantages of a longer way of step-by-step wriggling out of bourgeois society.

Engels wrote in the year 1895, generalising the experiences of the socialists since the revolution of 1848 “that the state institutions, in which the rule of the bourgeoisie gets organised, still offer additional handles by way of which the working class can struggle against these very state institutions.” (Engels, MEW, vol. 22, p. 519). And in a pointed way, Engels stated: “The irony of world history puts everything on its head. We the ‘revolutionaries’, the ‘rebels’ thrive much better by legal means than by illegal means and by rebellion.” (Engels, MEW, vol. 22, p. 525). He put his stakes on exhausting the law and also on elections as “one of the sharpest weapons” of the workers. In other words, Engels held on to the assumption that modern bourgeois society maybe is marked primarily by an economy of capital extraction, however, he added to that that it had nonetheless brought forth potentials of evolution that could be scooped out for social and democratic struggles against capital, that were, however, in no way identical to it, and in no way determined by capital alone. He described approximately, without calling them this way, the process of articulation and differentiation of modern societies and pointed to the chances for social progress contained in them.

He referred to the fact that this was also the experience in other European countries: “In France, where after all the soil for over hundred years has been turned over by one revolution following upon the other... and where in general, the conditions for an insurrectional coup de main lie much more propitiously than in Germany – even in France, the socialists increasingly come to see that they won’t be capable of a lasting victory, except if they are able to first win the large mass of the people... Slow work of propaganda and parliamentary activity has been recognised here as well as the next task of the party. The results did not let themselves be waited for.” (Engels, MEW, vol. 22, p. 523). In Germany, Engels hoped to keep the

growth of the then revolutionary German social democracy “uninterruptedly in motion, until it grows over the head of the ruling system of government by itself...” (Engels, MEW, vol. 22, p. 525) It was the conviction of old Engels that the proletariat, far from having been able to win victory by *one* great blow, has to slowly advance in a hard, tough struggle from position to position.” (Engels, MEW, vol. 22, p. 515).

Antonio Gramsci hooked up to such thoughts of Friedrich Engels, when he wrote: “Modern political technique has changed since 1848. Since the development of the parliamentary system, the regimes of association of trade unions and parties, the development of broad state and ‘private’ bureaucracies (of political and private nature, of parties and trade unions).” (Gramsci 1983, pp. 1566/1567) Gramsci recognised that growing economic potentials of modern, bourgeois societies change the mechanisms of bourgeois rule. (Kebir 1991a, 1991b; Heiseler 1991; Neubert 2001). In that way, they also dispose of possibilities of social integration. Bourgeois democracy, which as before acts as a guarantor of rules, acquires stronger legitimacy in this way. The hegemony of the rulers can rely on gains in welfare for population majorities. Less than in former times and unlike in pre-bourgeois societies, it is dependent on the immediate apparatus of violence. The state apparatus is preceded by civil society, linked to social-state development. It encompasses those institutions and organisations in between economy and the state, in which the individuals move as a result of their own decisions: trade unions, initiatives, associations, federations, churches and parties, but also literature and the media. Gramsci wrote: “In between the economic basis and the state with its legislation and its apparatus of compulsion, there stands ‘civil society’.” (Gramsci 1975, p. 1253) With their commitment in this non-state sphere, the individuals accommodate themselves in the society as well as acquire possibilities to act towards its change. Civil society is an extremely ambivalent component of modern societies. It permits it to the rulers to reach consensus, with considerable parts of the population, on the maintenance of the existing and to stabilise their hegemony in this way. Yet, at the same time, it offers scopes of actions to contrary actors.

From the – be it contradictory – anchoring of bourgeois societies in civil society, Gramsci drew far-reaching conclusions for an anti-capitalist strategy. He wrote “In the East (in Russia – D.K.), the state was everything, civil society was not really well-articulated and amorphous; in the West, by contrast, there existed a real relationship between the state and civil society, and when shattering the state, there revealed itself immediately a robust structure of civil society.” (Gramsci 1991, vol. 4, p. 874) He compared civil society with fortresses and barracks of bourgeois societies and concluded from this constellation of the Western world that here socialism could not be reached as in Russia by an eruptive kind of revolutionary act, not in a “fast-moving war” for the coup-like seizure of central state power but in a more lengthy “war of position” for the occupation of the “fortresses” and “trench warfare” of bourgeois society. He expected this struggle as a presumably very long process. (Gramsci 1991, vol. 4, p. 888).

Thesis Eight

The understanding of democratic socialism as a goal being looked for in a transformative process raises the question, whether there is a logic of the social, a social logic that would act in bourgeois society as counter-process to capital logic. The assumption defended here is that there exists such a social

logic that encompasses objective and subjective processes in the direction of emancipation, of social and ecological sustainability.

The notion of social logic is introduced here as a *working concept*, not as a ready theoretical category. It points to the fact that the tendency to the subjugation of the whole society under capital and its extraction logic is counteracted by another tendency – to be precise: a bundle of tendencies pointing in a different direction – namely, a growth of social and emancipative claims and their realisation. However, this tendency is up to now decidedly weaker than the logic of capital extraction that dominates in bourgeois society. Moreover, the tendencies called social logic are not such a completely closed connection, not an economic law like capital extraction. *It is rather the resulting vector of quite different processes and interests that are more or less opposed to capital logic* or can counteract it under the pre-condition of considerably changed social relationships of forces. Maybe in the course of substantive discussion, a better name for this counter-logic will be found. Here it is a matter of emphasising *that* it exists and can be strengthened. As a general rule, conditions and processes that are in a contradictory relationship to the rule of capital, patriarchal repression and other relationships of domination, however, are at the same time embedded in them. Moreover, potential counter-powers have different specific interests. The notion of social logic, therefore, points to internally contradictory or potential processes that only with great efforts of the actors linked with them could put into question the present structures of power. Different theoretical approaches and practical observation speak in favour of the presence of a social logic that may be sketched in the following theses. A politics of transformation that contributes to the present-day changes of bourgeois societies and at the same time points beyond their borders can be substantiated with different approaches that supplement one another. These are a theoretical approach focusing on productive forces and one focusing on reproduction, an approach of system theory, an approach oriented towards individuality relying on the living world, the empirical analysis of the ambivalences of public consciousness and an actor-theoretical approach. The real processes that these different approaches refer to, in their entirety, point to the fact that in the modern bourgeois societies capital logic and social logic are in contradiction to one another.

Thesis Nine

The development of modern productive forces offers promise for a transformation project in a double way. It encompasses an unfolding of subjective abilities and creative potentials that are required for capital extraction, however, at the same time collide with it and for that reason point beyond it. And the productive forces of society bring forth such an increase in productivity and wealth that from the standpoint of supply with material goods the employment of a growing part of the working population in social and cultural sectors beyond capital profitability becomes possible.

The development of the modern productive forces means last but not least the development of subjective capabilities of a large part of the population. The modern technologies brought forth by human creativity and economic forms of organisation in their turn bring forth growing demands to the capabilities of the majority of the employed. In the modern economy determined increasingly by information and communication, a great number of the dependently employed, the self-employed and the free professionals are required to produce a high level of creativity, cooperation

and ability to communicate, creative team work, self-motivation and responsibility for one's own self. This becomes a functional condition for highly complex technologies, the organisation of firms, and for the across-enterprise division of work in the form of flexible networks as well as for capital extraction. Yet in a contradictory way, such requirements at the same time collide with the determination from outside conditioned by capital processing and inter-human competition, with reinforced recourse to Taylorist forms of labour, social insecurity, and the tendency to the reduction of the human being to a subject of labour marketing him- or herself. Emancipative demands that run against such narrowing down can nonetheless hook up with developmental requirements that the system of productive forces itself provokes.

At the same time, the development of modern productive forces in a different sense creates prerequisites for the reinforcement of the social in society. It makes it possible to prepare more goods and services with fewer workers. Actually, this "should" allow to a growing part of the population to take over tasks that are not "profitable" from the business economic point of view, however, that mean considerable social progress for the society – for health, for care, for education, culture, inter-personal relationships and for a self-determined life. Practical experiences show that such a development takes place really, that it hits, however, upon constant resistance and blockages, because such a change in the proportions of the economy may be important for the distribution of the total social labour, but is unattractive for capital investments. Because considerable parts of these social areas are not profitable. The development of productive forces, nevertheless, offers the possibility of its widening and real prerequisites for the struggle for really progressive social change. It makes possible the strengthening and the reproduction of general conditions of development of the society and its individual members.

Thesis Ten: Reproduction-theory approach

From the reproduction-theoretical point of view, two things speak in favour of the possibility of the strengthening of the social logic against the capital logic. Stability in societies, first of all, requires the extended reproduction of general conditions of development beyond the mere reproduction of capital relationships. Second, reproduction-theoretical reflections reveal that also an accelerated development of non-profitable social sectors is compatible with market-economic regulation of production – even if not autonomously.

Extended reproduction of general developmental conditions of society:

The possible transformation of civilisational goods from props of the present-day system of rule into potentials of a democratic, social, and ecological transformation process pointing beyond capitalism, treated in thesis six, can hook on to the extraordinarily important circumstance that the reproduction of modern societies is necessarily a multi-dimensional process. Only under these conditions can they uphold their social coherence and relative stability. Not the reproduction of capital following the formula "M – C – M'" by itself, but at the same time the reproduction of general development conditions of society, of education, science, health, culture, energy supply, mobility, communication, social security and not last of nature form the condition sine qua non of modern bourgeois society. And the reproduction of the whole requires categorically – even if in the interest of the entrepreneurial class – the

restriction of the excesses of utilisation proper to the individual capitals in the competition.

Marx already pointed to this connection in his description of the battle for the legal reduction of the work-day (Marx, MEW, vol. 23, p. 279 ff.). He castigated the original, elemental inclination of the factory-owner to extend the work day beyond all bounds: "Yet in his blind, excessive drive, its werewolf craving for additional labour, capital does not only exceed the moral, but also the purely physical maximal boundaries of the work day. It usurps the time for growth, development, and healthy upkeep of the body. It robs the time needed for the consumption of free air and sunlight... Capital is not concerned about the length of life of the worker. Its only interest is solely and alone the maximum in labour time that can be made liquid in one work-day." (Ibidem, p. 280). Yet this undermines the existential conditions of capital itself. It needs to reproduce itself the reproduction of its counter-poles, the working class and the development of social institutions that make this possible – ranging from schools, elementary protection at the work place, hygiene and health institutions. However, these extended individual reproduction interests must first be forced onto the firms by the struggles of the workers' movement (just there, p. 286). Yet Marx also pointed to the fact that – once laws for the reduction of work time had been conquered by this struggle – part of the entrepreneurs themselves for reasons of competitiveness pushed for their actual implementation: "A part of the factory-owners themselves who had regulated the day at the factory according to the act of 1833, threw printed matter at the parliament concerning the 'immoral competition' by the 'false brethren', to whom greater brazenness or luckier local circumstances permitted the breach of law." (Just there, p. 298)

It is this basic pattern that ever again determines the mutual interaction of capital reproduction and general social conditions of reproduction and as a result of the social confrontations in the course of capital accumulation also leads to the accumulation of civilisation potentials. It was the '68 movement that against the limitation of the individual capitals and rigid state guidelines forced through educational and university reform. It was – even following the admission of prominent top managers - the ecological movement that forced onto the enterprises an opening, be it up to now modest – for ecological standards (Schmidheiny, 1992). It is the women's movement that persisted until it got emancipation steps from patriarchal society. And international non-governmental organisations and movements such as Attac with their struggle for a just world economic and world order are pushing for change with a future in North-South relationships.

Over longer periods, it has shown itself in history: those societies in which the relationships of forces and the historical circumstances have forced the rulers to respect to a certain extent also the interests of the ruled and to bear account to the reproduction requirements of the society as a whole, have turned out superior to other societies that pushed through interests of rule without any attention to the lower classes, strata, social groups and to the social coherence of society. *The capital logic requires its own counter-pole, a social logic.*

Most Latin American countries offer an example for the instability of societies, where this connection did not or hardly came to expression. In Latin America as well, capitalism has a long history. Yet, in contradistinction to continental Western Europe in the second half of the 20th century, this, until the most recent period, was a history of sequences of dictatorship and the barely restrained and most brutal exploitation of

the majority of the population. The catastrophic situation of Argentina is a most recent example for the destabilisation of a capitalist country, where profit, oligarchic power by capital magnates, large-scale property holders and the military led to the people being plundered down to its blood.

In such cases, it is not to be excluded – because history is always open that revolts can pass over into revolutionary upheavals. Even then, however, it holds that the rebellion of the exploited can only have long-term chances, when it is directed towards a democratic course of the necessary upheavals.

Antonio Gramsci dwelt on the tendencies among the rulers in bourgeois societies to take account not only of their own interests in the utilisation of their capital and in exercising their rule but also of the reproduction requirements of the majority of the population and therefore of the society as a whole, in particular in connection with the treatment of questions of hegemony. He distinguished between pure exercise of power by the employment of (state) force and hegemony as the expression of leadership: “The fact of hegemony undoubtedly requires that one has taken full account of the interests and tendencies with the group, over which hegemony is exercised, that a certain balance of compromise emerges, in other words that the leading group brings sacrifices of an economic-corporative kind, but there is also no doubt that these victims and this compromise cannot concern the essential, because, if the hegemony is ethical and political, it also must be economic, it can have its foundation only in the decisive function that the leading group exercises in the decisive core area of economic activity.” (Gramsci 1975, p. 1066; Kebir, 1991a, p. 87).

In other words, Gramsci as well emphasised that in the interest of more stable rule, hegemony on the side of the powerful required compromises with the majority, the victims of narrower egotistic interests. It is the very characteristic of hegemony that it must admit for gain of terrain for the ruled. Yet, Gramsci also pointed to the limits of these gains, which are opposed by the economic relationships of power. When the gains that are possible for other groups within the bourgeois hegemony are to be made use of, to be developed and in the ultimate analysis to be turned against this hegemony, quite consequentially, the power of disposition of the economically mighty itself should be put into question. At the latest at this point, spirits divide. From the neoliberal point of view, already the subsidisation of non-profitable spheres is a structural policy infraction of the first order.

The battle cry of the neoliberals sounds with reference to globalisation: Take back the social! Only on this condition could international competitiveness be upheld. Only in this way could unemployment be reduced so as to get to welfare also for the disadvantaged. Make the rich even richer so that the poorer may be better off – after having travelled through a valley of tears. This is indeed the tendency in the social reality of the Federal Republic that is only partly held in check by steps in the opposite direction. Among such steps of the recent period, there belongs the law on renewable energies, elements of a basic security against poverty in old age, the increase of child benefits for parents in the tax and social legislation and the part-time labour law. Much of it is insufficient; however, it shows possibilities that should be made use of much more thoroughly. Precisely this is denied, however, by the side of the market radicalisers. Already the mentioned small steps, they say, will worsen the competitiveness of the Federal Republic as location and squander the perspective for more growth and employment. Ronald Reagan’s favourite economist, George Gilder,

brought this conviction to a head: "We must resign ourselves to the fact that in spite of the abundance that the capitalist economy serves us with, we shall always live in a world of poor people." (Gilder 1981, p. 87) Does this really have to be the case from the reproduction-theoretical point of view?

Reproduction and extension of non-profitable sectors of the economy:

To the subject of reproduction-theoretical reflections, there belongs the question how the use value structure of the Gross Domestic Product must look like, so that the whole offer corresponds in tendency to demand, so that every part of it can be realised on the markets or mediated by way of transfers. With reference to the matter dealt with here, the task is, as a counter-movement to the retraction of social services, to the closure of hospitals and theatres, to the insufficient equipment of educational institutions, to the lack of children's day-care centres and youth clubs, to make it economically possible to extend such sectors decisively, to enable far more people to meaningful work there, and to satisfy their demand for goods and services.

With view to the productivity achieved by modern bourgeois societies and to the possible use-value structure of the GDP, this question must be answered with an unconditional yes. The development of the productive forces of society, when employing a decreasing number of workers, enables an extension of the available volume of goods and services. With 20 percent of the current work volume, there could be covered in the near future of the OECD countries, the need of their whole population in physical-material goods, while before, a far larger number of workers had to be employed to that end. That means that step by step, 80 percent of the volume of work could be also put into such social and cultural spheres of society, where this did not yet seem possible up to now, because the productivity level in the producing economic sectors was not sufficient in order to pay, by way of reproduction, existence-guaranteeing incomes in these sectors.

The part of work volume that right now was still used for the production of traditional needs need no longer be employed to that end in a respectively following production period. However, production, as a rule even when employing less labour not only remains equal, but even increases. It can suffice, given an appropriate structure and distribution of the produced domestic product, for investments into the social and cultural infrastructure, and also for the consumption of the number of workers set free for a time being. However, their income would now no longer be paid in the branches where they were active up to then, but by the way of extended redistribution. The needs of those who have become superfluous in production can be covered, because the growing labour productivity of those who continue to be employed there increases the volume and structure of use values, of goods and services.

Reproduction, however, has a double character. It supposes, on the one hand, the necessary volume of *use values in proportions/equilibria corresponding to demand* so as to guarantee the continued development of economy and society. On the other hand, reproduction is also always reconstitution and continuation of the given economic and social *relationships*. This makes structural change in favour of social areas without or with only small productivity of capital extremely difficult. It appears like an economically almost abnormal wrong development, as already a look at the empty state cash registers seems to prove.

The profit-dominated relationships in the bourgeois societies may well require the development of education, science, culture and health. Their stability and capacity of development is to a high degree dependent on these and on the extension of the infrastructure for mobility, energy supply, communication and housing. But as long as these spheres do not offer any profitable investment possibilities, but mean capital depreciation instead of capital upgrading and expenses, at least in the short term, instead of receipts, the extension of these areas is limited by the operation of the capital and competition logic. They are indispensable for capital reproduction and at the same time, stand frequently in contrast to capital extraction.

This contradictory effect of social relationships has a resolution that is positive for the extension of social services, where the strengthening of the social can take place in a way conforming to the market: Insofar growing incomes of those continuing to be active in material production are realised as growing and profitable demand for additional services, those liberated from material production tasks can find new employment there by the operation of market mechanism alone. Precisely this for a long time has been a real process in the change of the structure of those employed.

Insofar, however, those pushed out of production now have to get their incomes that earlier reached them as a result of the primary distribution of new value in production as wage or income by way of a secondary distribution or respectively redistribution, the affair becomes more problematic. Their income will reach them in this case either by way of the expansion of the public service, in the guise of public promotion of autonomous projects in a Third Sector, or in the form of social transfers. It could in the future also be paid as a need-oriented basic income to be introduced step by step. This would enable its recipients during certain periods of life to engage into socially insured individual labour, work with family members or voluntary work to the benefit of the community.

It has already always held in modern societies that incomes do not only result from the primary distribution of new values in the form of profits, wages and incomes. Already for a very long time and since the end of the 19th century in an increasing way, means for public employment and for transfer incomes are prepared by way of taxes, fees, and contributions. This also allows those to make a living that do not participate in production – those active in the public service, those encouraged by public means and, for instance, the sick, the old, children, those training or studying and the unemployed.

Reproduction for long stretches takes place solely by way of market mechanisms, but increasingly by way of mediation by the state or by social institutions. The share of the GDP of the Federal Republic that is redistributed by way of the state budgets and the legal social systems, increased from 11.4% in the year 1900 and 25.4% in 1925 to roughly 33% in the year 1960, and to about 49% at the end of the 1990s. 2.3 million people in Germany have a paid job in organisations without profit motive.⁴ The

⁴ In his work “The state quota and transformation tendencies in economy and society“, Horst Müller does not only stress the increase in the state quota (meaning the relationship between budgetary expenditures of the federation, regions and communities and the expenditures of the legal social systems to the Gross Domestic Product). But also in the household of an average German family, we must assume that around 50 percent of the services claimed are not paid from personal income. In Denmark and Sweden, the share of the benefits mediated by the state in 1995 lay at over 50 percent, in France and Austria at 43 percent, in Great Britain at 34 percent, and in the USA at 30 percent. Viewed over a longer period, there acts a tendency for the state quota to increase. Müller sums up: “The central economic functions of the state and the state and social quota, therefore, do not stand

capital logic was not able to halt the expansion of production beyond the profitability of capital expenditure.

The increase of employment relationships carried by growing productive, goods, and services outside of capital profitability, viewed over the decades, is a real trend. In comparison to the first steps of the social state in the 19th century and to the social standards in the first half of the 20th century, it cannot be overlooked. Yet since the 70s, it is not eliminated, however, but partly overpowered by a strong counter-tendency. The deep reason consists in that the Fordist way of production of the post-war decades no longer functions and that there have imposed themselves mainly neoliberal answers to the crisis of Fordism.

Profit interests, but also the independent interests of core work teams in growth sectors with growing productivity result in that mostly branch profits and if absolutely needed also wage incomes grow there, where they were produced, rather than additional profits and over-proportional incomes being redistributed by way of taxes to new or not very profitable areas of production. Resistance against a high state quota, meaning against increasing redistribution processes by way of the public authorities, is great and is constantly being kindled.

In fact, however, it comes down to either the social remaining underdeveloped, or to a point where, instead of the payment of taxes and fees for the financing of social and cultural services, these have to be paid as commodity-type services and without

(alone – D.K.) for a parasitic state apparatus, for pure tasks of redistribution, for the subsidisation of pure capital interests, for the keeping up of the most necessary social functions or for the serving of any kind of lobby. They are in the first line a positive expression for socially necessary work at life purposes beyond the capitalist commodity form: For the production of civilisational life, for developmental and future conditions of the social individuals and of the whole community. They stand for the historically newly unfolded sphere of socio-economic services.” (Müller 2001, p. 921). Surely, this statement must be qualified with view to the expenditures for armaments and the apparatus of repression, for interest payment to mostly big capitalist creditors and for other tasks in their interest. At the same time it holds that social expenditures have a large share in the public budgets and that for a long time already, large parts of the social product are no longer directly subjugated to the dictate of capital extraction/utilisation but have to be invested at the condition of depreciation of growing parts of the overall social capital. The capital logic is no longer unbroken.

This finding is reinforced by the significance of non-remunerated reproductive labour in the family and voluntary socially useful activity, by alternative forms of work and life beyond the profit economy and by the growing share of the non-profit sector. For instance, around 60% of the British Gross Domestic Product according to market prices – to take one example – are produced in the household, informal, non-profit-oriented sector. Following investigations in Sweden, there are spent there 7 billion of hours of family labour in comparison to 6 billion hours in the private and public economic sector (Davey 1990: 42). In the Federal Republic, the Society for Social Marketing, Bad Honnef, counts about 20,000 voluntary associations and around 80,000 institutions that are active in social areas. The Prognos AG estimates that 2.3 mln. people have a paid job in organisations without a profit motive. This does not contain those active in voluntary projects and projects carried by citizens' initiatives themselves, whose unpaid work hours are calculated for 1998 at more than 60 Bln. DM (Afheldt 2001) In multi-shaped alternative life and work forms, there has developed a space for social experiments that supplies contributions to a new social logic. (Foundation Bauhaus, 1996) Already in the 30s, there surfaced local exchange circles which in the last decades of the 20th century experienced a renaissance. In the LETS (Local Exchange and Trading Systems), a controllable exchange of goods and mainly also of services takes place outside of the official monetary system. In Great Britain, around 400 exchange circles are counted (Douthwaite/Keller/Turner, 1996). In Switzerland, about 60,000 small and medium-sized firms belong to a cooperative credit association that makes it possible to obtain credits at interest rates of about 1.5 percent, that means at mediation costs (Douthwaite 1996: 200). In the USA, the contribution of the non-profit-sector is estimated at 25 percent of the social product.

a solidary compensation taking place for those with low incomes. That tends to a situation, where socially and culturally desirable developments are realisable mainly for the rich and the well-to-do and large parts of the population weak in payment capacity share in them not at all or only insufficiently (two class medicine, private old-age insurance, private schools, private universities, exclusive cultural offerings).

This seems unavoidable, because the public tills are empty. We have to save. Social standards that had already once been reached at lower wealth in society and lower productivity level have been taken back. The overall volume of social expenditures grows, then sinks back, however, in many cases for the individual needy, mainly because many more people than under conditions of Fordism are without work or precariously employed.

The prevailing orientation for dealing with this situation sounds as follows: employment by way of growth, by extension of the low-wage sector and by an income differentiation such that the rich and famous can employ an army of badly paid servants. Lowered social services for those, who then still cannot find any work. Relief mainly of the large firms from taxes, fees and social contributions, so that their chances on the world markets at the expense of those weaker in the competition and of the environment rises; credits for the economically weak countries, so that they may import – but at the cost of their getting indebted and impoverished as a result of debt payment.

The reinforcement of the social component in the development of the bourgeois societies has gotten under extreme pressure. For whole decades after the Second World War, capital logic was linked with a strengthening of the social logic, with social developments that opened emancipative perspectives. Along with the reproduction of capital, there went the reproduction of general, last but not least social conditions of social development. Since the 70s, it is open, whether this tendency will be turned backwards or whether alternative ways to a just society of emancipation and socio-ecological sustainability will be tread. In this situation, alternative developments must hook on to the fact that the capital logic despite all its power of imposition does not act unrestrictedly and not without bouncing into other logics of social development that also become apparent by a system-theoretical perspective.

Thesis 11: System-theoretical approach

Modern societies are very diverse. Relatively autonomous partial systems with their own inner yardsticks of development – economy, politics, law, social sphere, culture, science, and religion – have emerged. They follow their own respective criteria of development. This harbours a tendency to the limitation of capital logic and profit dominance, even though profit at this point not in the economy alone, but in the whole society, is the determining standard of development.

That does not mean that these subsystems are developed according to the criterion of the social needs of the society. They are programmed according to their own criteria. In politics, it is a matter of power gain or power loss – but without social concessions to the majority of the population. In the bargaining processes, no elite is insured against losing its power. In legislation, it is a matter of setting and respecting social norms and of sanctions in the case of their violation. This takes place,

influenced by capital power, but human rights point beyond that. In science, it is a matter of an addition to enlightenment, often dependent on the financing of economically profitable projects conducive to the contemporary relationships of rule. But inherent to the search for scientific truth, there are also tendencies critical of rule.

Each of the social partial systems is invested with a relative independence face to capital logic. This autonomy is not to be set equal to the pursuit of emancipative, social goals. Yet, the logic of social development against capital logic has pillars in the relative independence of the differentiated social partial systems. A look at the development of education, science, social security system, public existential services and culture provides evidence of that.

- Even if the notion is disputed: the category of human capital points to the significance of human capabilities for capital. More than ever, this holds under the conditions of knowledge-based societies. Therefore, expenditures for education, culture, and science gain growing importance. More than ever, the development of education and science becomes an elementary prerequisite of capital extraction. The fierce debates over the results of the PISA study are an expression of that. Yet, the part of means used for that by way of the business tax is a subtraction from private capital accumulation. A large part of the expenditures for education and culture, moreover, meets with blockages from the entrepreneurial side, because there act tendencies in these spheres that go beyond the horizon of capital extraction. Education harbours emancipative potentials. Capital logic and social logic find themselves in conflict in the areas of education, training, science, and culture.

- The social expenditures for health, for care, for an active employment policy, wage substitution payments in the case of unemployment, social aid, housing money, protected employment and other transfers are always disputed in the budgetary debate, because they may be indispensable for the cohesion of society, at the same time, however, they entail a restriction of the private economic sphere and of profit dominance. The social logic comes into the way of capital logic. Against that, there is mobilised with the argument that too high social costs would hinder growth and hence prevent a reduction of unemployment.

- A large part of infrastructure for public existential services, mobility and communication is also a condition of functioning of the capitalist economy. Investment in these fields would, therefore, because of the high expenditures and the long capital turnover times, frequently mean capital depreciation rather than capital gain for the private capitalist owners. Therefore, they are being charged on the community by the public authorities and therefore are subject to more direct political influence of democratic counter- powers than private capital. They are, like public short-distance traffic, water supply and sewage, and energy supply subject to the dispute between capital logic (with the tendency towards privatisation and/or the reduction of services) and social logic (extension of services at socially affordable conditions).

Since the state certainly is not an instrument of the rulers, but at the same time, an arena of bargaining processes among the many, many interest groups and at the same time guarantor of the general conditions of functioning of the community, budgetary policy is also influenced by social, cultural, and emancipative claims. Economic and financial policy, social and employment policy, technology, education and science policy must take account of these claims, depending on the social

relationships of forces. Legislation includes the setting of social, ecological, cultural, and democratic norms that are marked, certainly, predominantly by the economically and politically powerful, but depending on the influence of counter-powers also tend to integrate these interests.

The differentiation of modern societies is linked closely to a further character trait of bourgeois societies, to their individualisation. The individuals are integrated into the various social partial systems in very different ways and in different combinations that result in different biographies.

Thesis 12: Individualisation and life world approach

One of the basic features of bourgeois societies is the process of individualisation. To fill one's own life with self-determined meaning, to live by one's own measure, to strive for individual freedom for each and everyone – this contradicts the logic of capital. Here a social logic has its deepest roots, even though the individualisation processes at the same time often lead to isolation, loneliness and competition of people among each other.

Higher incomes, better education, greater mobility, progresses in the emancipation of women and also of children, more social acceptance of various sexual orientations and other processes in modern societies open new scopes to the individuality of the individuals in comparison to pre-capitalist societies. It is a strength of neoliberalism that it picks up this tendency and in the liberal tradition proclaims the liberty of the individuals as its trade mark. Yet, in fact, there is meant by that overwhelmingly a limited individuality, entrepreneurial liberty, the freedom of market participants to market themselves. The neoliberal guiding image is that of the human being marketing him- or herself, of the person as the entrepreneur of his or her own labour power and existential needs who has to function as *homo oeconomicus*. Individuality is to a large extent reduced to functionality.

The spirit of the times is torn apart by contradictions. That all – compelled by globalisation – have to dance to the fiddle of the world markets – that is generally considered as our fate. That justice, however, has already for a long time come under the wheels in that process, yet that without justice, no self-determined life is possible – this, however, is also the opinion of most people. In Seattle, where 60,000 people demonstrated against the capitalist globalisation, in Genoa, where 200,000 people from all parts of the world prolonged this protest, **and in numerous other international protests since then**, the two viewpoints have collided with each other. “There is in the West of the world, however, hardly any wish more widespread than that to lead an independent life. Who travels around today in England, Germany, Hungary, in the USA, and in Canada and asks what really moves the people, what they are striving for, what they are struggling for, and where they are no longer quite so amused, if one wants to take it from them, he or she will encounter money, job, power, love, God etc., but more and more frequently the promise of one's own life. Money, meaning one's own money, space meaning own space, precisely in the sense of elementary prerequisites of being able to lead one's own life.” (Beck 1997, p. 9)

Precisely these elementary prerequisites of leading one's own life are refused to the majority of the people in the so-called South. Precisely, these liberty goods are scandalously unequally distributed also in the rich countries of the “North”. Socially

equal participation in democratic decisions, existence-securing work, education, knowledge, culture, and social security is also nothing but a dream for the majority of the population in these countries. Peace as the most elementary condition of life is threatened in periods where war is considered a well-advised remedy for the solution of social and ethnic problems, for the maintenance of rule, for the appropriation of natural resources, and as internal political glue. The natural foundations of the life of humanity are threatened in a dramatic way. Yet, war and destruction of the environment concern the people in quite different ways.

Therefore, individualisation processes are a nurturing ground for demands for a justice that includes freedom, social equality, and solidarity. Individualisation tends to the strengthening of a social logic and is on a war-footing with capital logic. This holds, although individualisation has up to now been integrated to an overwhelming extent into precisely this kind of capital logic. Individuals are facing each other in the competitive society as competitors for jobs, income shares and life claims. Individualisation also runs its course as loneliness, leads to the loss of social cohesion and of capacity for collective action.

Be flexible and mobile – thus sounds the demand of the economy to the people as market actors. Richard Sennett wrote in his book “Flexible man”; “‘Nothing long-term’ is an ominous concept for the development of trust, loyalty, and mutual obligation.” – “Transferred to the family, these values of a flexible society mean: Stay in movement, don’t incur any ties, make no sacrifices.” “In this way, capitalism acting in a short-term perspective is threatening... especially those character traits that bring people closer to one another and give a stable feeling of one’s own worth to each individual.” (Sennett 1998, p. 27, 28, 21, 31)

On the other side, there stands the fact that the individuals are rooted in their life worlds. These harbour a sense of their own that cannot be reduced to the functioning in the partial systems of society. The understandable family, neighbourly, and friendship ties within certain milieus, the direct living environment, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the integration of the individual into work, education, culture and into political processes beyond the immediate personal life conditions together form the life world of the individuals.

One’s own life means that the individuals must combine the diverse, very personal relationships in their narrower social environment and their involvement in work, political processes, culture and also religious life in such a way that in this way, there develops a respectively unique life construction and biography. A meaningful own life will not result by its reduction to self-marketing in the economy, not by opportunistic adaptation to ruling policy, and not by thoughtless consumption of the information offering in the mass media. An independent meaning of life results, when the individuals find the power to act despite of the compulsion to which they are opposed in society, to look for the standards of their lives and implement as much of them as they can.

In society and in its partial systems, it is always a matter of functioning in such a way as demanded by the criteria of the markets, the stabilisation of certain political conditions, the cultural mainstream etc. Certainly, the individuals bear responsibility towards the society as a whole. Yet, their legitimate elementary interests are in the conditions for a free and self-determined life. However, this will only succeed, if they

act in solidarity with others, because otherwise, they cannot build on solidarity also in their own lives.

From the standpoint of the political economy, the expansion of the low wage sector and precarious employment may be functional for the highest possible profits. From an emancipative, life-world standpoint, we should look for existence-securing work for everybody, and one should ask, for instance, for a gradual introduction of a citizen's right to a need-oriented social basic income, so that each and everyone gets the possibility to say "no" to intolerable work conditions, without putting one's own social existence on line. In the life-world of individuals, there lives the longing for happiness, for being able to decide on one's own life, and for guarantees to be allowed to do that. The women and men citizens want to be able to influence something in society and not be dependent on foreign powers. In the life worlds - however much they may at present be colonised, according to a finding by Jürgen Habermas, by the system's world – resistance against the logics of the ruling conditions is inherent. The conflict between capital logic and social logic is omnipresent. A transformative project of socio-ecological and emancipative change of society finds important bases in the sides of individualisation going against profit dominance and the headstrongness of the life-worlds.

Thesis Thirteen: Empirical Approach: Analysis of public consciousness

Empirical surveys on feelings, problem perceptions, and attitudes in the population of the Federal Republic point to favourable prospects for a transformative project.

Large parts of the population wish the society to be different than it is – more just, more democratic, more social and more secure. Yet, they also experience the society of the Federal Republic as one, where they can furnish their life very well. 93 percent of the West Germans and 79 percent of the East Germans say "yes", or rather "yes" than "no" to the opinion that Germany is a good country to live in. Yet, at the same time, 71 percent of all Germans expect that the society will become cold and more egotistic. Only 6 percent count upon more solidarity and cohesion in society (Allensbach Institute for Opinion Research, 2000). In particular for the poorer people, the situation is going to deteriorate, assume 71% of the West Germans and 81% of the East Germans. 64 percent of the West German and 85 percent of the East German electoral population, therefore think: "In the future, much will have to change in society in a fundamental way." 70 percent of West Germans and 82 percent of East Germans wish for more possibilities for democratic influence also in between the elections (Chrapa, Wittich 2001). The statement "Socialism is a good idea that was badly realised up to now" is approved by 47.8 percent of the West Germans and 72.2 percent of the East Germans wholly or in part (Chrapa, Wittich 2001). Yet, only 23 percent of the Germans in West and East say that they are very active politically in line with their possibilities. 26 percent of those asked that they would engage for changes if they could recognise prospects of success.

Such findings point to the fact that a majority of the population perceives grave social deficits, wishes for democratic and social change, yet at the same time, feels rather deeply integrated into the given relationships. Even according to personal assessment, the actual action for changes in society is decisively more weakly developed than the critical consciousness of their unsolved problems.

Such a constitution – only roughly sketched here – is reflected in the current weakness of alternative actors and must be taken into account in a democratic-socialist transformation strategy. That happens by aiming such a strategy towards a process of gradual change. It aims at a sequence of partial steps that are carried and autonomously determined by the activity of many and which adopts their certainly far-reaching demands by linking the feasible in the present with the vision of socio-ecological development to a just society with emancipative constitution. Linked in such a way that into the partial reforms to be realised, there is integrated an opening towards more far-reaching transformative steps.

For the gradual introduction of a need-oriented social basic income, there are many models in already existing social-state guarantees, in the programmes of several parties, and in the efforts of social associations. At first, not very spectacular steps yet – for instance the decided, even if inadequate introduction of measures such as basic security against old age, an age-unrelated basic income for children, and a need-aligned basic income in periods of continuing education – could win an anti-capitalist dimension though, if they were taken to finally offer the dependently employed a chance to say “no” to intolerably low wages and unconscionable working conditions, without making real the danger of bottomless social crash, and a chance to change, in this way, the relationship of forces between the employers and the employees in a lasting way. Change, however, is only imaginable in a course of deep-reaching cultural processes of transformation.

Thesis 14: Cultural change as a start

Social upheavals are set in motion by people. What they do is dependent to a large extent on their values, on the change in values and cultural perceptions. The empirically provable rise of sensitivity to justice in the value conceptions of people might be interpreted, very carefully, as a chance for transformational developments inherent in cultural change.

Talcott Parsons saw fundamental change in society as being driven forward strongly by cultural breaks and formulated as the condition of social upheavals: “It has to be a matter of changes in the definition of the meaning of life and of changes in the definition of the character of society itself.” (Parsons, 1969, p. 51)

Max Weber investigated a classical example for that. He described in the year 1904 in his work “The Protestant Ethic”, how much this religious motivation to disciplined work founded by the new ethic contributed to the emergence of capitalism. Following Calvin’s teaching and Protestant conception, the lonely individual, for whom God is no longer reachable, was nonetheless capable of determining whether it would be among the chosen. Relentless labour and disdain of superfluous consumption was supposed to bring the assurance of eternal bliss of the soul. The “ghost of capitalist calculation” and of accumulation appeared as God’s will. Max Weber wrote that the “idea of the religious significance of worldly daily labour had as its consequence”, “(to consider) as the only means to live in a way pleasing to God, not the outdoing of this-worldly meaning by monkish asceticism, but solely the fulfilment of this-worldly duties as they followed from the life positions of the individuals.” (Weber, 1991, p. 67) And Weber pointed to the depth of this cultural break in the transition to capitalism: “Man depends on gaining money as the purpose of its life, gaining money is no longer a means for the person to satisfy his or her material conditions of life. This, to natural perception outright absurd reversal of the

'natural' fact, as we would say, now is just as unconditionally a guiding motive of capitalism as it is strange to the person yet untouched by its spirit." (Weber, 1991, p. 44) "The 'capitalist spirit' would have been proscribed in antiquity just as in the middle age as the expression of the most indecent stinginess and a blatantly indecent way of thinking as this is still done regularly by all those groups that are the least intertwined with the specifically modern capitalist economy and are the least adapted to it."

The American cultural sociologist Daniel Bell wrote in 1976 about the change of cultural basic pattern taking place once again: "The Protestant ethic had served to limit the accumulation of luxury – however, not the accumulation of capital. Yet, when the Protestant ethics was pushed out of the bourgeois society, nothing but hedonism (...) remained, and in this way, the capitalist system lost its transcendent ethic... then the lack of a transcendent bond, the feeling that a society was failing at its task to offer by way of its character structure, its work and culture, an ensemble of 'basic contents of meaning' (might certainly) get a social system into turmoil. Hedonism (of the privileged in the socially split world – D.K.) is the cultural, if not even the moral justification of capitalism – pleasure as life style." (Bell, 1977, p. 30)

The social movements in the last quarter of the 20th century, the ecological movement, the women's movement and the Third World movement have made clear that this justification is already long discredited in light of the unsolved global problems. The new global movement Attac with its guiding idea "Another world is possible" continues this criticism in a new practical way. It was initiated by French journalists, who refused themselves to the rule-buttredding mainstream in the media world. In France, it hit upon a ground in the cultural and scientific sphere that had already been prepared by Pierre Bourdieu's criticism of the anti-social character of current globalisation.

The explosive attractiveness of Attac shows that an emancipative cultural and social change can experience an intensive push relatively quickly and in an unforeseen way. As of now, it does not determine the spirit of the times. Yet, when the disintegration of bourgeois values in the first half of the 20th century had ushered into the Second World War and in fascist barbarity, capitalism had already gotten once into a situation of general disrepute. Joseph A. Schumpeter, the eminent Austrian bourgeois economist of the 20th century, in 1942, in New York, wrote about the "atmosphere of hostility face to capitalism": "Public opinion is altogether so angry at it that the condemnation of capitalism and of all of its deeds is a foregone conclusion – almost a requirement of the etiquette of any discussion. Whatever may be the political preference of the respective author or speaker, all of them rush to adapt to this codex and to stress their critical disposition, the author's freedom of any kind of 'satisfying himself', his belief in the inadequacy of capitalist offerings, his aversion against the capitalist and his sympathy for the anti-capitalist interests. Any other attitude is not only considered crazy but anti-social and judged as sign of immoral libertarianism." (Schumpeter, 1987, p. 107) Even the CDU, in its Ahlen programme of 1946, played with the thought of a socialist future.

Capitalism for the time being has gotten over this phase of its condemnation by cultured society. Yet, the magnitude of the unsolved problems is at least at the level of those of the middle of the last century. Why shouldn't the capitalist origins for the gap in between billionaires and millions of starving on the earth, the pulling out of the USA from the Kyoto climate protocol, billion heavy arms exports, mass

unemployment, the hunt of death squadrons on street children in Brazil, and the flight of 5 billion Dollars world-wide from the co-financing of urgent social tasks into tax oases not again usher into a lasting public scandalising of profit dominance as the decisive measure of all things? Are the structural deficits and crimes of capitalism not sufficient to reverse the cultural break described by Weber? Do more than 40,000 people have to starve every day in order to really make sure that the appreciation of a person according to his or her functionality for the market instead of his or her individuality again would come to be seen as “outright undignified” and as “meaningless reversal of the natural facts”?

Such a cultural change is possible. It would endow an anti-capitalist transformation with spiritual and moral wings. Yet, do the capitalist property relationships and the power disequilibria based on them do not set insurmountable obstacles to such expectations?

Thesis 15: Property-theoretical approach

In the tradition of the theory of orthodox socialism and communism, capital ownership was the decisive blockade against any socialist-inspired politics that might mean more than the “new Old” (Bertolt Brecht). The imagined firm contours of capital property – owner or non-owner and no transition in between – would exclude transformational processes. This seemed to be sure. By contrast, here, the thesis is argued that while the very existence of private capital ownership is the competition for the highest possible profit and that profit on this basis forms the central axis of society, capital ownership, however, already in bourgeois society is subject to a process of erosion. This process contains chances for alternative reforms.

This conception does not entail approval to Jeremy Rifkin’s thesis of the disappearance of capital income (Rifkin 2001). The international wave of corporate fusions, the policy of privatisation of corporations by the public authorities, and last but not least the new forms of capitalist disposal over social resources on the contrary point to a yet unknown wealth of power especially for the large capital owners.

Yet, with the reproduction of capital ownership, there goes along a real tendency, up to now, however, always weaker counter-tendency to the limitation of the power of disposal of the capital-income holders over their property. The trade union struggles and the struggles of other movements, who by the way of social legislation force the entrepreneurs to transform part of their profits into contributions to social ends, are an expression of that. Taxation of entrepreneurial profits – unjust as it may be in comparison to the tax charge on wage incomes – means intervention into the disposal over property. Interdictions and prohibitions as well as market-conforming instruments of environmental policy also act on the disposal over capital property. That also hold, furthermore, for large areas of monetary and currency policy, labour market policy, research and technology policy, structural policy and local policy, foreign economic policy and development policy. Certainly, while these interventions typically take place in favour of the entrepreneurial side, they also sometimes limit their power over employment of resources and social relationships (**written in 2002**).

Marx wrote against Proudhon: “In each historical era, property has developed differently and under completely different social conditions. To define bourgeois

property, therefore, means nothing else but to describe all social relationships of bourgeois production. A definition of property as an independent relationship, a special category, an abstract... idea, can be nothing else but an illusion of metaphysics or of jurisprudence.” (Marx, MEW, vol. 4, p. 165). In other words, property, as process of appropriation of the pre-conditions of production, the determination or disposal over organisation and social quality of the reproduction process and the appropriation of its results – so much marks all social relationships that conversely their transformation also means transformation of the property relationships themselves.

Renewal of democracy, growing influence of various counter-powers on essential social decisions over the directions of development of economy and society and over individual steps towards lasting social and ecological development would lead to property itself changing to the degree that it is possible to obligate it to over-arching interests of the common weal in more justice, security, and socio-ecological transformation (Klein 2000).

Thesis 16: Actor-oriented approach

There is only one chance to obligate any form of property to action for the common good corresponding to the Basic Law. There is only one single way to finish the subjugation of the social logic under the capital logic and to reverse the relationship between both logics of development. That would be a change in the social relationship of forces that would make it possible to break the dogma of the lack of alternatives of current development and to get alternatives to express themselves. This is the self-encouragement of many women and men citizens, of their initiatives and social movements, of the trade unions and other organisations, in brief, of counter-powers of various forms and of parties that are solidary with them, for the treading of new paths. That is the networking of alternative actors in alliances for more democracy, freedom, justice, peace and solidarity.

The struggle between capital logic and social logic, between ruling elites and counter-powers leads to one central question: How can we make possible that the considerable civilisational and evolutionary potentials of bourgeois societies and the tendencies that were characterised here by the notion of social logic do not remain embodied in the processes of capital utilisation and the rigidity of the given relationships of rule but are picked up in democratic alternatives, meaning kept and unfolded in a new way? The answer is that this is possible only in the social struggles for another better society. Of their outcome, there depends the decision over future developmental paths.

Any social development takes place in the conflict between various classes, social groups, strata and individual personalities for the pushing through of different interests and political convictions or programmatic aspirations. Ralf Dahrendorf's theory of social change is at its core a theory of social conflict between different social actors whose open waging of their conflicts drives ahead social development (Dahrendorf 1991).

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels introduced their “Manifesto of the Communist Party” with the sentence: “The history of all societies up to now is the history of class struggles.” (MEW, vol. 4, p. 462) When Karl Marx analysed the movement of the

profit rate, he wrote: “The fixing of its factual grade only takes place in the incessant wrestling of capital and labour... the question resolves itself in the question for the relationship of forces of those struggling.” (MEW, vol. 25, p. 149)

Today capital is not simply a social relationship between entrepreneurs and wage labourers. The dominance of profit in society collides with the interests of other classes groups and strata as well. Next to the adaptation to capital interests, it also provokes resistance against them and constitutes in the reality of social confrontation a counter-logic, a social logic. Without the struggles of the trade unions, no social state would have emerged, there would be no social security systems – however much their achieved level may be put into question. The women’s movement has changed the face of modern societies considerably – even if patriarchal power and its intermingling with entrepreneurial interests endure obstinately. The environmental movement has lifted global dangers into the conscience of the public and introduced a change in the relationship of people to their natural foundations of life – while of course environmental destruction continues to rage dramatically. The new global movement of opponents to the rule of the financial markets and of transnational companies over life on earth will show effect - however unequal the relationships of forces will remain in the foreseeable future. The fast-growing influence of “Attac” that in mid-2002 counted 55,000 individual and organisational members on a world scale points to the attractiveness and mobilising force of the idea of a just world order.

A turning towards the evolutionary potential of the bourgeois society that is not linked with efforts for the strengthening of democratic counter-powers makes no sense for alternative change. Theoretical references to possibilities of pushing backward and surmounting of capital despotism inherent in bourgeois society might be scooped out for the transcending of its borders but must have as their consequence the practical leaning towards those forces that can actually change society and want to. The transformation project outlined here should not be understood as euphemising a society of continued capitalist exploitation with patriarchal and environment destroying structures that at a global level deepens the gap between Rich and Poor ever further. The plea for democratic socialism as a project of transformation aims at strengthening, by the boosting of many different individual sides of a social logic in bourgeois society those forces, initiatives, and movements that are in a position to take forward the transformation of these approaches towards deep-reaching emancipative change. It obliges us to learn together with the most diverse actors and actresses of democratic development and to look for solutions together.

For the level of programmatic work, it is a first-rank task to link this work more strongly with the practical experiences of the trade unions, the women’s movement, eco-initiatives but also the **Left Party.PDS** and **WASG, for instance**, in joint governmental **and parliamentary** responsibility **in coalitions** at the regional level. This holds at the federal level, where for instance the IG Metal has engaged in an intensive discussion of the future as well as internationally. The World Social Forum of Porto Alegre has brought together an extraordinary number of movements and actors in the resistance against the outrageous injustice of the current course of globalisation (IG Metal Future Report; Löwy, Wallerstein, Bischoff, Detje, Wahl, 2002). Civilisational gains of modern bourgeois societies do not automatically become starting points and potentials for reform alternatives and transformational processes. However, they can become this in the social struggles for another better society. A transformational project of socio-ecological change of bourgeois societies

in the present era that points beyond their borders is not mere wishful thinking. It has prerequisites in a social logic already existing at present that opposes profit dominance. By the linking of partial solutions of current problems with the introduction of more deep-reaching social change in order to strengthen alternative actors, to win new forces of change, to help them networking, and to encourage the development of broad alliances for common transgressing of the borders of present relationships of property and rule.

Outlook

In the 90s, the Republicans in the US and conservative parties in 13 West European countries had been voted out in favour of social-democratically marked governments. The anti-social answers of neoliberalism to the great breaks of the present had lost the approval of the majority. In summer of the year 2002, the leaf had turned again in 7 of these 13 states. This time around, the women and men voters were disappointed by the Third Ways of social democracy. And the bourgeois parties only recently punished by withdrawals of votes were voted in once again – even if without much hope for a sudden social vein in their old neoliberal recipes.

The switching of the two main answers to the crisis of the social-state post-war capitalism – of neoliberalism against Third Ways and of Third Ways against neoliberalism – had its logic. Since the opinion predominates that there is no real alternative to both roads, there remained after the disappointment of the respectively recent experiences only the harking back to the politics voted out last time. And those who consider this game to be meaningless increase the number of the non-voters or – even worse – they turn toward right-wing radicalism and populism. **The grand coalition in Germany of 2005 is a new phenomenon, born out of the perceived necessity to have to continue the same type of anti-social policies (Hartz, Agenda 2010) and by no means to want to admit the left alternative in the form of the Left Party into the government (Schröder already on the evening of the election). Last time there was a grand coalition in the Federal Republic, by the way, this subsequently nevertheless led to the sharpest left-wing turn in the history of the Republic: two consecutive SPD chancellors and a decidedly more left-wing policy than that of Schröder (Eastern treaties, educational reform, co-determination at the firm level).**

Since the implosion of state socialism, transformation as change within one social order that can usher into a transgression of its frontiers and into the emergence of a new society, only seemed possible in one direction: as transition from state socialism to capitalist-bourgeois society. For the bourgeois societies themselves, such transformation processes seem done with.

The standpoint defended here, by contrast, is that there are many good reasons to integrate the guiding idea of the new, social movements acting against the imperial and unjust course of globalisation into the Federal Republic: “Another world is possible!” – a more just, more peaceful world founded on solidarity. It will come by different ways and be carried by very different social forces.

In the party system of the Federal Republic, the PDS has been the only party, whose programme aims at a deep, transformative change of the Federal Republic. Democratic socialism itself is a transformational project. It is *a project, whose life blood and function is the changing of the relationship of forces in society and the*

reaching at majorities for a new politics – in favour of “more”: more jobs up to and including a new type of full employment, more education and culture, more social security and a more healthy environment for each and everyone. Rejection of war, just distribution of the constantly growing wealth, and an authentic representative of East German interests has a party label in Germany: PDS.

The use value of the politics of democratic women and men socialists consists in scooping out without lapse any chance inherent in the given relationships for a more in conditions of self-determined life in social security and dignity – not only the possibilities that can be achieved in the framework of profit dominance and of subjection under the constraints of global markets, but increasingly also those that bring about a pushing backward of this dominance and ultimately result in subjugating entrepreneurial profit interests to emancipative, social, and ecological objectives.

Such a transformative policy unites the arduous acting for the small steps of democratic change today and in the nearer future, and socialist opposition against the relationships of power and rule that tend to keep these steps small.

The result of the reflections presented here is that the modern bourgeois society of the Federal Republic itself harbours tendencies, possibilities and starting points for an emancipative process of transformation. The conclusion from this finding is that it is a matter of bringing to full expression those tendencies that might be summarised under the working notion of social logic against privatisation, deregulation and liberalisation of the economy. However, that requires a piece of vision in order to shake off the prevailing belief that the way into the future must be plastered with the acceptance of the given distribution of power and wealth, with the losses and anxieties of large sections of the population. The use value of the PDS – if it understands democratic socialism consequently as transformation process and implements it in real policies – *is to link practical reform policy with the perspective of another just society living in peace with other people and with the environment*. Its use value could be such a strong linkage with various critical democratic actors, social movements and initiatives that this would contribute considerably to a broad alliance for emancipative, socio-ecological change. The use value of the PDS lies precisely in its contrast to the SPD and Greens, and it could become their partner if these parties, under pressure from the left, from below, and from a critical middle were to finally free themselves from their present neoliberal embrace and open themselves to real alternatives in a project of the left centre.

Translated by Carla Krüger, April 9, 2006

Literature

Afheldt, Heik, 2001: Die Wohltäter kommen (Charitable donors are coming), in Die Zeit, October 31.

Beck, Ulrich; Erdmann Ziegler, Ulf, 1997: Eigenes Leben. Ausflüge in die unbekannte Gesellschaft, in der wir leben (Your own life. Excursions into the unknown society we live in). Munich.

Bell, Daniel, 1977: The Future of the Western World, New York.

Brecht, Bertolt, 1981: Briefe (Letters), Frankfurt/Main.

- Brie, Michael, 2002: Demokratischer Sozialismus als transformatorisches Projekt (Democratic Socialism as a transformative project), manuscript, Berlin.
- Chrapa, Michael; Wittich, Dietmar, 2001: Zwischen den Wahlen (In between the elections), Berlin, Halle.
- Crossover (ed.), 2000: Regionales Wirtschaften als linke Reformperspektive (Regional economies as left-wing reform perspective), Münster.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf, 1992: Der moderne soziale Konflikt (The modern social conflict), Stuttgart/London.
- Davey, Brian, 1996: Strategie gegen Armut und Umweltzerstörung in Europa (Strategy against poverty and environmental destruction in Europe). In: Stiftung Bauhaus/Europäisches Netzwerk für ökonomische Selbsthilfe und lokale Entwicklung: Wirtschaft von unten (Bauhaus Foundation /European Network for economic self-help and local development: Economics from below), Dessau.
- Douthwaite, Richard, 1996: Lokale Ökonomie – lokale Währungen (Local economy – local currencies), In: Wirtschaft von unten (Economy from below), opus cit.
- Engels, Friedrich, 1963: Einleitung zu Marx' „Klassenkämpfe in Frankreich“ (Introduction to Marx' "Class struggles in France"), in: MEW, vol. 22, Berlin.
- Fukuyama, Francis: The End of History, New York, 1992.
- Gesellschaftsanalyse und politische Bildung e.V. , ed. (Societal analysis and political education, reg. ass.), 1997: Zur Programmatik der Partei des demokratischen Sozialismus. Ein Kommentar (On the programme of the Party of Democratic Socialism. A commentary), Berlin.
- Giddens, Anthony, 1999: Der dritte Weg (The third way), London, New York.
- Gilder, George, 1981: Reichtum und Armut (Wealth and poverty), Washington, D.C.
- Gramsci, Antonio, 1975: Quaderni dell carcere. Turin (The Prison Notebooks, New York), quoted in Kebir, Sabine, 1991: Gramscis Zivilgesellschaft (Gramsci's civil society), Hamburg.
- Gramsci, Antonio, 1983: Quaderni dell carcere. Turin (The Prison Notebooks, New York), quoted in Kebir, Sabine, 1991: Gramscis Zivilgesellschaft (Gramsci's civil society), Hamburg.
- von Heiseler, Johannes Henrich, 1991: Bürgerliche Gesellschaft, Zivilgesellschaft, Demokratie (Bourgeois society, civil society, democracy), In: Z. Zeitschrift für marxistische Erneuerung (Journal for Marxist Renewal), no. 7.
- Hopfmann, Arendt; Wolf, Michael, 2001: Was heißt und zu welchem Ende betreibt man Transformationsforschung? (What does it mean and to what end does one practice transformation research?), In: The same: Transformationstheorie – Stand, Defizite, Perspektiven (Transformation theory – state, deficits, perspectives), Münster.
- Huffschild, Jörg, 1999: Political economy of financial markets, Hamburg/London.
- IG Metall, 2001: IG-Metall-Zukunftsreport (Future Report), Frankfurt-am-Main.
- Institut für Demoskopie Allensbach (Institute for Opinion Research Allensbach), 2000: Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, August 16.

- Kebir, Sabine, 1991a: Gramscis Zivilgesellschaft (Gramsci's civil society), Hamburg.
- Kebir, Sabine, 1991b: Gramscis Zivilgesellschaft – eine neoliberale Theorie? (Gramsci's civil society – a neoliberal theory?), in Z. Zeitschrift für marxistische Erneuerung (Z. Journal for Marxist Renewal), no. 7, September.
- Keller, Tanio, 1996: Talente, Kreuzer und New Berries – über LET-Systeme und Tauschringe (Talents, kreutzers and new berries – on LET systems and exchange rings), in: Wirtschaft von unten (Economy from below), opus cit.
- Kinner, Klaus, 1999: Der deutsche Kommunismus. Selbstverständnis und Realität (German Communism. Self-understanding and reality) Band 1. Die Weimarer Zeit (Volume 1. The Weimar time), Berlin.
- Klein, Dieter, 2000: Die Linke und die Moderne (The left and modernity), In: Z. Zeitschrift für Marxistische Erneuerung (Z. Journal for Marxist Renewal), no. 44, December.
- Lehndorff, Steffen, 2001: Weniger ist mehr. Arbeitszeitverkürzung als Gesellschaftspolitik (Less is more. Reduction of work-time as social policy), Hamburg.
- Löwy, Michel; Betto, Frei; Wallerstein, Immanuel; Bischoff, Joachim; Detje, Richard; Asbjorn; Wahl: Der Geist von Porto Alegre und die Strategie der Linken (The spirit of Porto Alegre and the strategy of the left), In: Supplement of the journal Sozialismus (Socialism) 3/2002, Hamburg.
- Marx, Karl; Engels, Friedrich, 1959: Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei (Manifesto of the Communist Party), MEW, vol. 4, Berlin.
- Marx, Karl, 1953: Grundrisse zur Kritik der politischen Ökonomie (Outlines for a criticism of political economy), MEW, vol. 42, Berlin.
- Marx, Karl, 1962: Der Bürgerkrieg in Frankreich (Civil war in France), in: MEW, vol. 17, Berlin.
- Marx, Karl, 1962: Das Kapital. Band 1 (Capital. Volume 1), in: MEW, vol. 23, Berlin.
- Marx, Karl, 1973: Das Kapital. Band 3 (Capital. Volume 3), in: MEW, vol. 25, Berlin.
- Müller, Horst, 2001: Die Staatsquote und Transformationstendenzen in Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft (The state quota and transformation tendencies in economics and society), in: Utopie kreativ (Creative utopia), October.
- Neubert, Harald, 2001: Antonio Gramsci: Hegemonie – Zivilgesellschaft – Partei (Antonio Gramsci: Hegemony – civil society – party), Hamburg.
- Parsons, Talcott, 1969: Das Problem des Strukturwandels: Eine theoretische Skizze (The problem of structural change: a theoretical sketch), in: Zapf, Wolfgang: Theorie des sozialen Wandels (Theory of social change).
- Redlow, Götz; Fromknecht, Helmut; Klein, Matthäus, 1977: Einführung in den dialektischen und historischen Materialismus (Introduction into dialectical and historical materialism), Berlin.
- Rifkin, Jeremy, 2000: Access. The disappearance of property, Frankfurt am Main/New York.

Rosa Luxemburg Foundation (ed.): 2000: ReformAlternativen sozial – ökologisch – zivil (Reform alternatives social – ecological – civil), Berlin.

Schmidheiny, Stephan, 1992: Kurswechsel. Globale unternehmerische Perspektiven für Entwicklung und Umwelt (Change of course. Global entrepreneurial perspectives for development and environment), Munich.

Schumpeter, Joseph A., 1987: Sozialismus, Kapitalismus und Demokratie, Munich (Capitalism, socialism, and democracy, New York).

Sennett, Richard, 1998: Der flexible Mensch (Flexible man), Berlin.

Soros, George, 1998: The crisis of global capitalism, London, New York.

Stiftung Bauhaus/Europäisches Netzwerk für ökonomische Selbsthilfe und lokale Entwicklung (Bauhaus Foundation/European network for economic self-help and local development), 1996: Wirtschaft von unten (Economy from below), Dessau.

Stiglitz, Joseph, 2002: The shadow of globalisation, New York.

Turner, Harry, 1996: Let's link: Die gegenseitige Fürsorge im Gemeinwesen beleben (Let's link: Revive mutual help in the community), in: Wirtschaft von unten (Economy from below), opus cit.

Von Heiseler, Johannes H., 1991: Bürgerliche Gesellschaft, Zivilgesellschaft, Demokratie (Bourgeois society, civil society, democracy), in Z. Zeitschrift marxistische Erneuerung (Z. Journal for Marxist Renewal), no. 7, September.

Weber, Max, 1991: Die protestantische Ethik (The Protestant Ethic), Gütersloh.

Werner, Klaus; Weiss, Hans, 2001: Schwarzbuch Markenfirmen. Die Machenschaften der Weltkonzerne (Black Book Brand-name firms. The sinister dealings of the world corporations), Vienna/Frankfurt am Main.