

Historical barriers of capital economy and suggestions about alternatives

»If the material conditions of production and the corresponding relations of circulation for a classless society do not already exist in a latent state, all attempts at exploding the society would be Don Quixotism« (Marx). Along these lines Horst Müller tries to substantiate a post-capitalistic perspective of transformation. The contribution to the present discussion about alternatives of reforms and drafts of socialism for the 21st century oversteps the horizon of leftwing-keynesian economy and thinks ahead Marx`s analysis of capitalism.

*The system comes to an end, the question is: What`s next?
Immanuel Wallerstein*

In recent time the number of critical studies and statements concerning the system-related predicament, the crises and catastrophes of the capitalistic economy and society increased. The corresponding affirmative economic science sees itself also called into question. But even the most pointed, urgent criticisms suffer from the fact, that a substantiated, precise alternative can not be named. This lack of alternative became evident in particular with the collapse of the socialism experiments of the 20th century. Nowadays the question about the concrete possible alternative becomes literally existential in view of the neo-liberal globalization and threatening civilizing symptoms of decline, in view of the development of a new imperialism and a continuous world-crisis scenario.

Method and the subject of the political economy

Concerning the question about an alternative it is hardly purposive simply to conclude to alternative institutions throughout abstract negation or to construct an image of the future society like a puzzle from a theory-historical well-stocked reservoir of current visions of socialism. In my opinion, a workable historical-materialistical attempt can be found only by a value- and reproduction-theoretical model of the capitalistic-economic core shape itself, which tells us about its constitution characteristics and process tendencies and represents in this way the realistic starting point of a movement of development. You can tie up to that with dialectical imagination and a social-historical contentful question in order to form at last a transformation of the capitalistic-economic reproduction order. In fact, this proceeding means to get over the traditional kind of criticism of the political economy throughout not speculative but practical- and history-materialistical well substantiated utopianism of political economy.

This alternative of perspective of research might seem unfamiliar to capital-logicians and marxistic crisis-theorists. But there is already a great number of contributions in this way of thinking, for example Immanuel Wallerstein`s »Utopistik«, several different contributions concerning the question of a »socialism in the 21st century« or Walden Bello`s »De-Globalisierung«. Additionally there are suggestions from the itself at present intensifying discussion about questions of a »solidarity economics« or »economic democracy«, after all thoughts of a conception of an »alternative world economy order«. Own analyses concerning these topics are entitled »social-economy as an alternative to the capital-economy system«.

»Social-economy« [Sozialwirtschaft], as I use it, on the one hand ties on an usual term for a broad field of social and economic activities, especially alternative forms of economy, on the other side gets here a new and precise sense of a post-capitalistic system of reproduction which traditionally is called or intended as »socialistic economy«. The well-founded main argument for this is, that »socialistic economy« or rather »socialism« as well as »capitalistic economy« or rather »capitalism« are »totalising« categories and therefore not suitable to identify the concrete elements and situation in a transforming society [Übergangsgesellschaft], where various forms of reproduction are present and build a contradictory processing and itself transforming social praxis [gesellschaftliche Praxis]. I also prefer Marx' term »praxis« from his Thesis on Feuerbach, which has as a fundamental concept of human reality another dimensions and consequences as the usual term »practice«, or I use »practice« according to this in a sophisticated manner.

Of course, the desired dialectical change of social practice remains an abstract idea, wouldn't the in any case stated material aspects of that novelty of an economic and civilizing higher form of reproduction and society be conceived. That is the centre of it all, it is the implicate aim of the criticism of capitalism and finally means the solution of the enigma which the marxist and the marxistic inspired criticism of capitalism left until today.

Research strength and deficiencies in the marxist analytics

In my opinion the main reason why Marx, who tried to look ahead again and again to further views, finally didn't come or wasn't able to come to a positive alternative in his situation is the at that time obvious but historically specified draft of industrial-economical production of goods as a totality of the relation of reproduction. In this context, Marx identified other not insignificant spheres of social labour [gesellschaftliche Arbeit], which were still marginal at that time, as unproductive for the increase of the surplus value. Latters played no more important role for the marxist and following marxistic system- and tendency analyses.

In fact, only work in relation with the capital-economic production of goods is declared as productive for the surplus value at present time, which includes with today's understanding also enterprise-near services. In opposite to this, other social necessary or suggestive activities, above all social-cultural and infrastructural productions, which I designate in summary as »social-economic services« [sozialwirtschaftliche Dienste], are treated as more or less endured public expenditures, meaning rather as waste and luxury, and nowadays - finally consequently capitalistic, but generic socially regarded senseless and absurdly - more and more pressed into capitalistic forms. The present discussions about scooping out the welfare state, about lowering of the non-wage labour costs and privatisation of the public sector, concerns exactly this point: Behind the confusing phenomena of the economic life a systemically inherent, socially highly effective miscalculation and problematic allokation function of the capital economy becomes visible.

This system-deficit gets obviously an important meaning under the nowadays further developed historical conditions: The highest-developed economies show to the top driven organic composition throughout automation and informatization, they tend to over-accumulation of capital and the related fall of the rate of profit, which draws a chronic weakness of growth in the inland. The relative overproduction forces to globality and exporting, where special chances of utilization can be found, even throughout increasing economical disproportionizing, like it is especially in the case of Germany. Under the conditions of home-made growth dilemma and an in the foreseeable future more and more

keen international rivalry the pressure on the working class and, at the same time on the social-economic services and the government as their guarantor has to increase. We are witnesses of a degeneration of social and civilizing achievements, an extensive deformation of the social, which is called modernization and reform in our present new colloquial, ideological usage.

The short sketch refers to Marx' basic analysis of capitalistic economy. He identifies the historical character of this way of production, which is based on abstract value-realisation [*Verwertung des Kapitalwerts*]. So Marx' theory remains a relevant source of all reliable economical and social sciences: Due to his disclosure of the system core, by its criticism of the alienation of the modern form of life and society, by the explanation of the convolutions of reproduction, also the tendentious repressive treatment of the social-economic services under the regiment of capital, as well as by the exposure of the driving powers of globalization. All in all valuable insights!

But in other regard Marx' modelling of the capitalistic conditions of real economical and historical development, which remained since that time more or less an unchanged fund in traditional political economy, is not up to date in decisive aspects: In the proceeding and late 20th century, the so called unproductive parts of social necessary or meaningful work became evidently something like a »second half of economy«. The state and the social ratio of all better-developed economies amounts to 40-60 % and presents itself as an indicator of an bilateral mega-trend. This trend leads on the one hand to an enormous decrease of social labour [*gesellschaftliche Arbeit*] within the range of the industrial-economical production of goods and on the other hand to a tendentious expansion of labour on the general, institutional and infrastructural, welfare-state and culture-social bases. In another context to this it was also noticed that the actual result of industrialization exists in urbanisation. It is a civilizing main tendency of the capitalistic way of production.

However, the concrete situation at the beginning of the 21st century is characterized by the fact that the capital-economic system cannot continue following the pushed historical tendency due to its limited economic calculation and the outlined, in the meantime reached state of accumulation. Therefore we witness the drift of the population, which is redundant in the sight of capitalistic practice, to an offside, the extortion of the welfare state, the search for system conformal solutions throughout privatisations and above all the use of not yet blocked utilization chances throughout expansion into the global market, valorization by mutual exchange and an aggressively competing infiltration of all world regions.

Considering the contradictory tendencies it becomes evident that the historical social-economical development in the progressive 20th century brought a fundamental change of the reproduction structure. But this change is represented inappropriately by the classical, industrial-centered modelling and seems to be considered insufficiently by the conventional interpretation of the welfare-state capitalism as a setteled economy-historical episode and only temporary concession of the power of capital.

On the other hand I want to point out that the crucial point for a possible system change and for the abolition of a whole bundle of other dilemmas, which the reigning economics rank among natural constants, confirm as fate-given conditions and speak like faith articles, exists just in the possible opening for the historically progressive tendency, which is systematically prevented at present. Perhaps in this way can be found a confidential starting point concerning the question, how an appropriate transformation of the system can oppose against the capital-economic, neoliberal intensified globalization.

Towards a re-conceptualization of economic reproduction

For the analysis of the altered circumstances and new possibilities, I suggest a substantially extended, new conceptualization of the economic reproduction process:

The work on the general and common conditions of the economic and social life has to be aggregated to a new department of economic process, meaning the one of the social-economic services, in contrast to the industrial-economical production of goods. Only latter considered Marx, inspired by Quesnay, in his binominal model of reproduction. Including the state, who nowadays necessarily obtains and disposes the economic circle throughout taxes and budgets, a new, three-figure business cycle configures itself. Crossing in this way the conventional figure of capital reproduction, we get a new base for the analysis of economic praxis.

In the pure basic form which is supposed for the analysis, as a matter of fact apart from the often utilized economical mixed-forms and real different possibilities of economic organization, social-economic services are financed by social funds such as public budgets or the social insurance. For example, it is about making available general infrastructures of supply and disposal, public traffic, communication or science and research, for the fulfilment of civilizing requirements concerning education, learning and cultural life, about common needs regarding welfare, health and care, especially social integration, about the founding of a positive environmental situation of the society, about tasks of social self-organizing such as total administration by the government, juridical system, municipal and local self-administration, not least about self-given tasks regarding international institutions and concerning international partnerships.

Regarding the reconfigured scenario, there is the task of analytics, which are inspired by Marx' value- and reproduction-theoretical research and which focusses on the contradictions of social praxis [Widersprüchlichkeit im Sinne der Dialektik der gesellschaftlichen Praxis] at the same time. This analytics cannot be discussed here in detail, more about see the references to other studies. All considerations led to a central hypothesis, which can guide the research in future: In the outlined three-figured-configuration, two different practice perspectives, which are in fact antagonistic, are processing and competing at the same time. On the one hand, there is the still prevailing capital-economical-perspective, in which the function mode and operation types of the dominant form of production becomes visible with all noticeable consequences, as well as another more or less latent but to economical consolidation and more powerful development forcing, social-economic process figure, in which a form-blowing up tendency and emancipatory force determines: We are dealing with a hybrid economy, which interior processes are hidden in mixed phenomenons.

The real-utopian lies therefore not beyond a historical gap and does not have to be build as an *apriori*-construction of a new system. There is rather a potential of transformation establishing in the lap of the given forms and praxis, in the sense of a subjective-objective ensemble of productive forces. However, this is not visible in the point of view of traditional criticism or by taking the classical modeling of reproduction as a basis. We must refer to a higher organized and nowadays real scenario of reproduction and need the extended methodological toolbox of a modern »philosophy and science of social praxis« [Philosophie und Wissenschaft gesellschaftlicher Praxis].

A leading thesis for advanced research

With the developed exposition of the problem, the question is not answered concretely: What marks the specific economic shaping which perhaps could be set free in the course of a large emancipation of a social-economic ensemble of the productive forces, contrary to the dilemma-like industrial- and capital-economical process. But from considering the extended scenario of reproduction, with a view on the directly visible capital-economically functional downgrading of the social-economic sphere and her simultaneous tendency for relative expansion and increase of meaning as foundation or housing for the whole, a fundamental thesis can be formulated:

The desired deliverance of the social productive forces from the capital-economics straitjacket cannot only be realized on the basis of a reorganisation of the production of goods, the core of the industrial-economical capital-economy, because of their narrowness in relation to the complete fund of social labour.

It rather requires a new, civilizing higher-standing self-organisation of the entire system of the social labour and economy, i.e. the installation of an order of reproduction, in which every kind of social necessary, as useful or meaningful recognised labour gets its realization according to its relevant and social character and withal the same socially and economically regarded value-validity.

Considering this basic thesis more exactly, the restrictions of the capital-economic way of production and economical ideology as well as an extreme density of the neoliberal programs becomes evident. But a specific narrow-mindedness of the marxist value- and capital analysis also becomes evident one more time. One can recognize it as a problematic prior arrangement in the attempts to organize a socialist economy as a centrally planned production of goods or command economy. The problem is also inherent in the arrangement to finance the social-cultural ranges from derived funds of income in the context of industrial-economical production of goods, meaning to maintain that in a secondary way.

The basic thesis also allows to become aware of the more or less only updated theory of capitalism and imperialism which remained - in addition to the criticism of the political economics fragmentary left by Marx - a mostly negative capital-, crisis- and also revolution-theory. This criticism - so far otherwise always justified and necessary - leaves the better future in the fog of well-known crisis- and catastrophe folders. But where in this way the barriers of conceptual thinking concerning the future become noticeable and the utopian intentions push beyond that, there begin exceeding visions such as the »end of labour« [Ende der Arbeit], or the view over the wall is only enough for abstract ideas like the one of a »solidary an solar economy« [Solidarische und solare Ökonomie].

In this confusing situation it is reasonable that a various number of so called alternative projects or alternative social-territorial experiments get more attractive, which seem to be more obvious. But they cannot untie directly the problem-knot of the value-directed utilization economics which is implied in the social reproduction order. Does the possibility exist that they find themselves in reverse placed in another connection of reproduction after the knot has been untied? Could they intensify the present political-economic tendencies of transformation with such a concrete perspective?

Regarding such tendencies and movements, the entering-thesis expresses implicitly the necessity for an economic-political break with the present conditions. To that extent the current suggestions for a leftwing-keynesian reversal of the economic policy are at the best only an approach for an outstanding real solution for the problem. Would we turn the steering wheel 180 degrees, figuratively speaking, towards an inquiry- and social orientation, a stronger social steering and economic adjustment, then this would perhaps lead us out of the dead ends of neoliberal policy and would moderate some distresses temporarily. But then we still would find ourselves on the same road, and the question would be again: Where and how can a new path be runned?

Constitutional aspects of another mode of economy

Tying up to the basic thesis for an alternative way of economy which I formulated earlier, I try to explain some aspects of constitution and their consequences. In the shape of a scenic- and form-analytically completed, mathematically precised and perhaps with modern media presented movement of the transformation of praxis, these aspects may be more understandable. An operational concretizing with refers to real economical developments and national accounts would be a necessary future step. Additionally two annotations:

Firstly, it is obvious that an analysis which for the present aims the proof of the practical possibility and the fundamental mode of a non-capitalistic economy cannot begin with a global context such as a financial-runned accumulation-regime or from the abstractum of a world-capital or a world-society. In fact, the type of a highly-developed economic society must be supposed and modelled first of all in order to be able to answer the questions in the further, which arise in the international and global context and also in view of different levels of development and special social surroundings.

Secondly, it is to be noted that the basic reproduction modelling must be historically specified. Corresponding to this it ties up to economic-historical existing conditions, which belong apparently to the signature of transitional society: An economic process with high organic composition characterised by automation and computer science, tendentious overproduction and a big part of redundantly made people which were excluded from the production process. It also ties up to highly developed social-economic functions of the state, which presents itself as a complex ensemble of social entities. Furthermore it ties up to the significance and a fundamental importance of the urban-civilizing living conditions and welfare-state achievements, to which an institutionally developed local level also belongs.

Therefore the basic idea can approximately be outlined:

The new mode of economy which is really possible, a »social-economy as a system alternative to capital-economy«, is based on an obtained equal valorization of all kinds of labour, induced and mediated by economic-democratic organs on all levels and in all institutional ranges on the base of appropriate taxes and budgets. This arrangement includes an emancipation of the social-economic services from their precarious position, on a release of the social-economic form as a more emancipatory and common-economical mode of management and coming along with that on a re-tuning of the entire reproduction system, including the industrial-economical production of goods and its necessary market forms.

The mentioned equal valorization and social emancipation of the social-economic services are the direct political-economical antagonists to the capital-economical tendency to

lower the so-called social charges, to restrain the welfare-state adjustment and to denationalize the social-economic services, that means to put them on the rack of the utilization economics. Practically the new-organising means in short to let the entire department of the social-economic services rank neither as a factor of expenses nor as a fit source of profit of the industrial-economical utilization of capital, but to bring it to bear as equal worth-producing, and to found in this way the actually expansionable field of social work, production and practises.

For example, the public educating system, as well as the supply of the infrastructure for traffic and communication and the running of public media like also the administration of public affairs were representing a social advance for the industrial-economical production of goods which however is to be passed to its account. But this already real context can only be admitted by a practical break from the primary financing by income taxes: The incontestable necessity to tax in addition the constant capital of the industrial producers directly, in accurately the economical ratio which the transfer to the appropriate supply and equipment of the other department requires, results from the interconnections of the entire circulatory system of reproduction: Notice that in this department are not services in its usual meaning rendered. There rather take place social-economic works and attainments with enormous means of production equipments like in a modern hospital, a traffic system, a university or a city administration.

The outlined conversion does not only concern a simple taxation or financial act, but this empirical act confirms a fundamental change inside the new forming. It means the transgressing of the broken or disfunctional capital economy calculation of social-economic work, which is also based on the argumentation that higher taxes harm the economy and an expansion of public services cannot be financed. This usually as crucially regarded argument, a proper cult figure of the usual mass-indoctrination, has however only in the capital economic perspective a real background. In contrast to this the mechanism of the social-economic order of reproduction creates - in counteraction and excess of capital economical over-accumulation and overproduction - new value-conditions, which permit a displacement of the weight to social-economic services without rising national indebtedness and even with balanced business economic and national economic balances.

It is not possible to discuss the substantial consequences arising from the changed praxis forming [Praxisformierung], concerning the new value functionalities which are coming to effect and in particular also the ownership structures and the society conditions. But some references may make the meaning clearer:

For example, if the capital owners or their scientific traitors would lodge a complaint that the new tax strangles the enterprises, it should be answered that it does not serve to blow up a state bureaucracy. But it is indispensable concerning the equal valorization of the necessary and meaningful work of the social-economic services which are also important for the »large industry«. And it transforms itself into a social-economic demand, which contributes crucially to the safety of existence of the industrial productions.

Maybe it's argued that the substantial taxation of the constant capital is an inadmissible interference into the property. The answer is, that nothing is taken which was not given by a direct free social-civilizing advance. Quite the contrary: It must be reproached realistically from the social-economic point of view that the according values of the apparatus of production of goods are socially mediated and because of that they are not supposed to belong to the capital owners. That means they would perhaps be better embedded in a social

order, which would use them with charitable business management and under public control. To that extent the complaint about an excluding capitalistic private property of the means of production is a self-deception under modern conditions and it is a large fraud on the society which is actually not to be justified both practically and legally.

The decisive point of all that is in the thesis that a fundamental system-break can be initialized by the new configuration and the thereby released reformatting, which leads to an internal and basically changed formation of economy and new economic practices:

The solution of the problem of a post-capitalistic, or even socialistic economy is a new order of reproduction, which integrates the main sections of the industrial-economical production of goods and the social-economic services complementary and as equally worth-building in the context of an economic and political total-budget. This formation of social praxis is no longer based on the antagonistic relationship between capital and labour, but on a socially controlable exchange between two hands of social labour. It represents - together with the simultaneous switching role of democratically legitimized social-economical organs, due to appropriate labor management relations and accounts, municipal constitutions, statutes of budget and adjustments - a new self-organization of the system of social labour or a new state of economy and society.

The suggested real-possible reform can lead to a shape of the economic life which is liberated from the connection to the preservation of capital and the cancerlike economical obligation of growth. This implies practical-objectively a different inherent economical calculation [ökonomisches Kalkül] and other modes of value-validity [Wertgeltung] and economical accounts [Wirtschaftsrechnung].

It is qualitatively regarded something completely different whether the economical calculation of the itself utilizing worth governs the economic calculation and the economical activity, or whether production of value and the household of values are adjusted by a transparent system of self-organization of the social labour fund. In latter case it can be disposed in material, contentwise regard according to social needs and requirements, without the old system-forced obligations.

Or it is something else when capitalistic competition is determining the scene as if democratically constituted collectives of producers, which were given the means of production for responsible utilization from the society, compete for more compatible and better solutions, or also for rewards. Or whether a surplus of production, which presents itself as an increased worth [Mehrwert], represents a private profit or a part of a entire-social saving.

However: Everything depends on a systemic form-changing of the social-economical basic processes, which breaks the obligation of accumulation and expansion arising from the cancerlike calculation of the capital economy, and refutes at the same time the still advertised, but pseudo-concrete economic accounts [Wirtschaftsrechnungen] and the apparently advertised economic-political »necessities« and »inevitablenesses«. Moreover, without this neither the possibilities nor the acute problems of the globalization can be put under social control, nor international conditions and institutions can be new-arranged.

The wrestle between capital economy and social-economy

It should have got clearer that social-economy is a latently and contrary playing process in the present economic life. Their material potentials, economic form elements and subjective class forces, which are existing in their beginnings, could be developed and set free in the course of a historically longer political-economic process of transformation. This means at the same time a basic conflict with the still powerful and superior, social and ecologically precarious practices of capital-economy.

A totalising [totalisierender] term of »capitalism« can divert from the political-economic basic situation of such »contradictory social praxis«. The ambiguous, shady social situation presents itself as an expression of a period of transition with unknown duration, which was opened with the turn to the 21st century. The ecological trouble spots and existence problems which break open in the course of the capital-economically advanced globalization strengthen in fact the uncertainty of final perspectives.

This analysis of the situation does not only confirm leftwing criticism of economy and society regarding the problems of a capital-economic over-accumulation and hopelessly redundant made groups of society, regarding a progressive social polarization and destruction of the environment, regarding the obligation to unyielding global expansion, to world-wide plundering of resources as well as economic potentials of other areas, last not least concerning a new imperialism.

The analysis refers at the same time to the systemically disadvantaged position of the social-economic services under the regiment of the capital and to the consequences of the non-equal organising between the today's economic head department of the industrial production of goods and the social-economic services: The required equipment of the social-economic sphere with means of production cannot be financed sufficiently from income taxes, even on the capital-economic reduced level. The thesis says that a substantial source of the rising national indebtedness, which is today still accepted as an unexplainable fate, which strangles the community and continues to polarize the society throughout the subsequent effects of an unfair distribution of property, is to find in that.

The constructional defects and social deficits of the capital economy which burst open increasingly, can at least not be intercepted by a keynesian-reformistic policy, but requires to set free another order of reproduction as a consequent solution, meaning the break with the still prevailing economy and its inherent logic of economic acting.

The social-economic concept of transformation aims in contrast to the capital-economic tendency of the privatisation of public property and public productions an emancipation of the social-economic services as the other half of the economy and allows in this way to recognise a strategic sense in the public disturbances and strikes within the social and public range and in the fights against neoliberal privatisations. »Emancipation« means their development as in common-worthwhile economic form and as an equal worth-shaping department of economy. In this displacement of weight and change of character, apart from the additionally possible and necessary general shorting of the working time, lies the fundamental solution for the employment problem which cannot be redressed capital-economically.

In the social-economic scenario an unabridged transfer of value to social, cultural and infrastructural productions of the social-economic services can be organized by the state, i.e.

throughout the taxes and the budgets of a whole ensemble of democratic social organs. This transfer of value transforms to an effective demand, which manufactures the economic balance. It also secures the existence of industrial producers as it is done without increasing public debt. In this constellation the social-economic productions play a role not only as totaleconomic and civilizing advance, but particularly as an expansionable field of labour and emancipation. In the context of such a basic structure remain or open also areas and possibilities for ranges of the economic life, which can be differently organized, for example as special capital-shaped productions or as various personal services [persönliche Dienstleistungen].

The systemic-historical break induced by the new basic figuration consists of the fact that an equal, balanced or also equivalence-economic self-organization of two hands of the social working substitutes the old system which is based on the contradictory relation of capital and labour with its inherent obligation of utilization, growth and expansion. Cooperative non-profit and public property forms and business constitutions are adequate to them, while the general context can be mediated by democratic economic-social organs on all levels and within all ranges and in this way can and must be arranged and controlled substantially by their budget-decisions. The local and regional level, the direct area of the conduct of life of the social individuals, can then play a completely new role as the fundamental unit of social praxis.

With such a »democratic economic society on social-economic basis« [demokratische Wirtschaftsgesellschaft auf sozialwirtschaftlicher Grundlage], which is inspired from a new calculation in the sense of an »economy of time« [Ökonomie der Zeit] which is no more programmed for utilization of capital [Kapitalverwertung] and plundering of resources, a »de-globalization« is also imaginable: So far as the distorting and aggressive capital economic obligation of expansion and export loses its power and a new social-economic connection of reproduction unifies itself, in the matter in which the international trade and the inter-social relations can be put on the basis of reciprocity and partnership.

Prospect

Following the ideas about social-economy we are leaving the concepts of traditional, linear history process order of system crisis, political upheaval and the on it following political-economic reestablishment: The alternative exists already latently as a forceful reality in the given praxis formation [Praxisformierung] and can possibly be set free with acts of birth assistance in the process of a historical period of transformation. Conscious social acting in this sense cannot rely however alone on internal crises or on outside impacts. It is necessary to identify the new itself further in eminent scientific, collective efforts and to initialize it throughout a political-historical struggle between social forces.

The missing point is indeed the formulation of an according social-historical project which is well-founded, confident and uniting. Otherwise the modern social movements and forces run the risk to continue to cultivate critical consciousness, but remain a protest-community whose mere size does not necessarily impress the opponents because of the lack of a positive perspective.

On the way to a deeper understanding of the social and historical situation and to a trustworthy aim there is however no need for large proclamations, but for intensified common efforts of research in most difficult basic questions and in the range of concrete analyses of

economy and society. The thoughts of a »social-economy as a system alternative« are supposed as a prototheoretical or also provoking contribution to that.

First published as: Die Schranken der Kapitalwirtschaft und die Frage nach der konkreten Alternative. In: Zeitschrift Sozialismus, Heft 2/2007. VSA-Verlag, Hamburg. S. 49-56.

Other selected contributions of the author:

Karl Marx, der Marxismus und die Philosophie der Praxis. Zur Re-Konzeptualisierung der politischen Philosophie, in: Aufklärung und Kritik, Sonderheft 10/2005, S. 179-193. Online www.praxisphilosophie.de/muemarx.pdf

Bloch, Kofler und das Projekt einer utopisch-kritischen Wissenschaft gesellschaftlicher Praxis, in: Jünke Christoph (Hrsg.), Am Beispiel Leo Koflers. Marxismus im 20. Jahrhundert, Münster 2001, S. 212-235.

Die Staatsquote und Transformationstendenzen in Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft, in: UTOPIE kreativ, Nr. 132, Oktober 2001, S. 909-924.

Zur Neuordnung des theoretischen Feldes der politischen Ökonomie, in: Ders. (Hrsg.), Das PRAXIS-Konzept im Zentrum gesellschaftskritischer Wissenschaft, Norderstedt 2005, S. 182-206.

Sozialwirtschaft als Systemalternative, in: Ders. (Hrsg.), Das PRAXIS-Konzept im Zentrum gesellschaftskritischer Wissenschaft, Norderstedt 2005, S. 254-289. Most important article, online www.praxisphilosophie.de/sozialwirtschaft.pdf

Alternativkonzepte der politischen Ökonomie – Sozialismus des 21. Jahrhunderts? In: Ders. (Hrsg.), Die Übergangsgesellschaft des 21. Jahrhunderts. Kritik, Analytik, Alternativen. Norderstedt 2007, S. 204-266.

Dr. phil. Horst Müller, works as social-information specialist in the municipal administration of Nuernberg and is editor of the portal www.praxisphilosophie.de