

Judith Dellheim/Frieder Otto Wolf

### **Building a specific theory of capitalist domination based on and extending Marx<sup>1</sup>**

Our argument addresses a central point of present critical and radical theory: We argue for the following twofold claim:

- (a) that under modern structures of domination (which, in contradistinction to traditional structures of domination, are not defined any more by personal relations of submission between individual persons, but by structural determinations of domination operated and institutionalized by impersonal role-takers) effective structural change can only be brought about by subverting and overcoming these very relations as such, and
- (b) that only a subversive and transformative, i.e. revolutionary practice (in the sense just implicitly defined) which is fully informed about these structures will be capable of addressing the task of such a transformation effectively.

In this perspective, our theoretical work is explicitly focused upon fully understanding specifically those singular historical conditions – which may be summarized by the existence of structures of domination within the human metabolism within nature – which do make such a revolutionary practice necessary and – in principle – also possible.<sup>2</sup>

It is to be, finally, admitted that Marx himself (or his critical continuators, like Luxemburg) have never been dominant within the Marxist tradition. Accordingly, the activities of theoretically explaining and of practically changing these realities, which differ in important ways, in their presuppositions, in their possibilities, and in their very structure of ‚grounding‘, have for the most time been conflated within the Marxist mainstream in a simplified postulate of the ‚unity of theory and practice‘, so that the critical dimension and potential of both has been destroyed or, at the very least, has been tendentially marginalized. This has been especially relevant in bringing about the kinds of reductionisms with Marxist claims which have later been criticized by feminist or post-

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is based upon and improves on two of our own papers on the issue of intersectionality (from 2016 and 2017 [https://www.academia.edu/34598971/Intersectionality\\_in\\_working\\_on\\_socio-ecological\\_transformation\\_II\\_](https://www.academia.edu/34598971/Intersectionality_in_working_on_socio-ecological_transformation_II_); [https://www.academia.edu/29446232/Intersectionality\\_in\\_working\\_on\\_socio-ecological\\_transformation](https://www.academia.edu/29446232/Intersectionality_in_working_on_socio-ecological_transformation) )

<sup>2</sup> In other words, in order to make our scientific contribution to “changing the world” in a non-trivial way, we are working to carry out the following operations: analyzing reality, criticizing theories and ideologies, building critical theories of societal and historical reality and its tendencies of development, reflecting available experiences of on-going or historical struggles against established societal power relations, deliberating on perspectives of radical practice and struggle, reflecting our own past practices relating to these struggles, while criticizing our own contributions to analyzing such processes and our participation in deliberations on future practice.

colonial theory. Engels and Luxemburg had criticized simplifications often read out of Marx' and their own theories, by always and again analyzing and critically discussing real struggles of emancipation, i.e. of liberation from specific forms of domination. The real Marxian (Marxist?) tradition, however, has not "only" been a theoretical venture, but also a very practical one. Marx, indeed, has been active both as a scientist and as a politician – as a member of the board of the IWA, the International Workingmen's Association. Its political existence has been a first historical example for a practice of intersectionality adequately defined. Especially thanks to Harriet Law, the women's question was permanently present, and, thanks to Marx and others, also the question of colonialism<sup>3</sup>. Marx has concentrated on analysing the structures of capitalist domination, as they realize the reproduction of the capitalist mode of production and of its determining role within modern societies. This concentration of Marx in his theoretical work has often been mis-understood to justify a kind of economic or class-reductionism which has, however, remained quite alien even to his and Engels's theoretical work, and, even more so, to their practice of political analysis and action.

Already in the *Communist Manifesto*, the general idea of modernization as a process of ‚liquidification‘ of all traditional kinds of social relations in the very process, by which the accumulation of capital has become dominant in modern bourgeois societies, has been clearly spelled out. This idea has then been central to Marx's further work in theoretically reconstructing the reproduction process of capital and its domination within modern bourgeois societies, based upon the systematic exploitation of labour power by capital. Since the late 19th century, this process of modernization has also brought forth modernized kinds of gender domination, after the dissolution of traditional structures of patriarchy, as well of the transnational relations of dependency after the defeat of traditional colonialism. Such developments have been already addressed *in practice* by Marx's International, as well as by the later internationals, but they have not been adequately taken up in further Marxist scientific analyses. For instance, we may underline that Marx and Engels have appreciated the translation by Helen Macfarlane in their preface to the Manifesto. In their preface from June 1872, Marx and Engels stated: „In view of the gigantic strides of Modern Industry since 1848, and of the accompanying improved and extended organization of the working class, in view of the practical experience gained, first in the February Revolution, and then, still more, in the Paris Commune, where the proletariat for the first time

---

3 William Pelz (2017), *Capital and the First International in: Reading 'Capital' Today. Marx after 150 Years*, Edited by Ingo Schmidt and Carlo Fanelli. PlutoPress, London, 2017, pp. 36-47. In parallel, the recent book of the historian Wolfgang Schieder on „Marx as a Politician“ (Marx als Politiker) deserves close scrutiny.

held political power for two whole months, this programme has in some details been antiquated. One thing especially was proved by the Commune, viz., that “the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.” ... Further, it is self-evident that the criticism of socialist literature is deficient in relation to the present time ...; also that the remarks on the relation of the Communists to the various opposition parties (Section IV) ... in practice are antiquated, because the political situation has been entirely changed, and the progress of history has swept from off the earth the greater portion of the political parties there enumerated.”<sup>4</sup>

A significant example for a political approach not limited to a reductionist class perspective can also be found in Rosa Luxemburg: In 1903, when she wrote "Dem Andenken des 'Proletariat'" (In Memory of the 'Proletariat' Party)<sup>5</sup>, she concentrated on the political perspectives articulated by this party in its programmatic document: She stated that „this document sees the socialist future of Poland finding a foothold on the ground of scientific socialism and in the principles of the class struggle and historical materialism. The character of the actual program is, however, not so easily determined. Here there are three parallel sections, namely demands of the party ‚in the economic area‘, ‚in the political area‘, and ‚in the area of moral life‘.<sup>6</sup> And she goes on to state, among other things, „they take so strongly into account the actual social order based on inequality of classes, sexes, and nationalities“<sup>7</sup>. These areas, which have been reflected in the political practice of Marxist parties, but not adequately taken up in theory, and then been marginalized in the later practice of Communist and Socialist parties, have been the main references in the justification for the neglect and exclusion of Marxist theory, as it started with the new social movements of the 1960s – at the price of finally replacing the critique of domination structures by the affirmation of identities.

In recent debates in the social and political sciences, the concept of intersectionality has been introduced in order to find a way of specifically criticising those practices in research (and in political life) which are marked by forms of unilateral reductionism (as e.g. in the over-stretching of the micro-economic utility function in neo-classical economic theory), insisting upon the distinctness and specificity of e.g. gender asymmetries and race discrimination. Especially feminist authors have made use of the concept of “intersectionality” simply to defend feminist theory

---

<sup>4</sup> Marx, Karl, Engels, Frederick (1872): Communist Manifesto, Preface to the German edition, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/communist-manifesto/preface.htm#preface-1872>

<sup>5</sup> Luxemburg, Rosa (1903/1968): In Memory of the Proletariat Party, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1903/02/proletariat-party.htm#foot-21>

<sup>6</sup> Quoted from Z Pola Walki, pp.30-31. Also, Przedświt, Year II No.4 (October 1882). (R.L.).

<sup>7</sup> Luxemburg, Rosa (1903/1968): In Memory of the Proletariat Party, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/luxemburg/1903/02/proletariat-party.htm#foot-21>

against various kinds of economic reductionism (within the Marxist, as well as within the neo-classical tradition) – often with the side effect of simply eliminating class domination and class struggle, so that their claims became fuzzy to the point of effectively only stating the truism that the complexity of socio-historical reality is constituted by different, more or less contradictory regularities, phenomenal developments, actions and structures. Marx did not make use of the concept of “intersectionality” – not even with a different terminology – in his referring to these hierarchies (or to their effects, e.g. in political struggles).

In the perspective we have just referred to, the very concept of “intersectionality”, if understood adequately, simply describes something which is rather typical for Marx’s effective “method of research”, something, which Althusser has undertaken to capture in theory by the concept of “over-determination”. The term “intersectionality” has been used only since the beginning of the nineties, when the feminist Kimberly Crenshaw has analysed the specific problems of women of black colour and when she has worked for a community building of women facing sexism and racism – in a practice of community building connected with the social movements against racism, on the one hand, and against sexism, on the other hand. Further Crenshaw has criticized that, in mainstream liberal discourse, race, gender, and other identity categories are most often treated as vestiges of bias or personal domination. She has brought out that the violence many women do experience is often also shaped by other dimensions of their identities, such as race and class. Some other motives for the introduction of the concept of intersectionality, however, do indeed deserve a critical discussion, before it will become possible to make a sustainable critical use of it: *On the one hand*, the concept has been instrumentalized in order to restrict politics to identity politics, and even to eliminate the struggle against structures of domination from the horizon of radical movements altogether. *On the other hand*, such an approach has, indeed, led to a radical elimination of class struggle from the debate – replacing it – as a maximum of presence – by class identity affirmation which is only a limited aspect of it.<sup>8</sup> Any constructive use of the underlying claim for plurality – more or less retroactively directed against Engels’s (misunderstood) claim for a „fundamental contradiction“<sup>9</sup> to be found in the relation between capital and the proletariat<sup>10</sup> – will have to fully take on board first Marx’s analysis of the impact of the capitalist mode of

---

<sup>8</sup> This operation is exemplified by Laclau/Mouffe’s treatment of the class issue, cf. Laclau/Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*, London 1985.

<sup>9</sup> „Fundamental contradiction, whence arise all the contradictions in which our present-day society moves, and which modern industry brings to light.“ Engels, Friederick (1880/1970): *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1880/soc-utop/ch03.htm>.

<sup>10</sup> While in reality directed against the Stalinist claim of „proletarian politics“ and its insufficient critique in Mao’s distinction between „main“ and „secondary“ contradictions.

production within modern bourgeois societies, and then take up the study of the specifically modern structures of domination indeed overdetermining it within these very same societies.<sup>11</sup> In this sense, the ‚intersectionality debate‘ has taken a quite anti-emancipatory turn: On the one hand, theories of intersectionality have had a strong tendency to lose sight of the role of the capital relation in the reproduction process of modern societies, while at the same time reducing the problematic of domination to mere inequalities of power. These weaknesses and destructive usages, however, do not eliminate the elementary and indubitable merit of this debate – i.e. that of calling attention to the theoretical and political insufficiencies of class-reductionism. In our perspective, the important and elementary fact that the articulation of different structures of domination overdetermining each other within modern bourgeois societies cannot be determined in general, but has to be analysed in the specific historical moments of actual modern societies, still constitutes a central starting point for converging analytical efforts, as well as a common orientation of struggles and for alliances. It would be counter-productive, however, to (mis-)direct the debate into a general discussion of the articulation of the existing structures of domination on the level of some ‚general theory of modern society‘, instead of addressing their specific articulations within given singular societies in their full plurality.

Instead of attempting to fully elaborating the relations between different concepts of “intersectionality”, we should, therefore, like to concentrate on a central issue in this problematic area – which we may introduce by a quote from Balibar: “Marx removed one of philosophy's most ancient taboos: the radical distinction between *praxis* and *poiesis*”<sup>12</sup> – thereby giving a new meaning to the notion of materialist critique, as combining an awareness of the effective material conditions and structures with a full understanding of the specificities of human history, especially with regard to the history of the struggles of liberation marking its dynamics. Marx’s method of critique (and of self-criticism) has been so radical, because it persistently asks the question of how relations of domination can be *specifically* overcome, based on the idea of making human individuals effectively free and on the insight into the need of overcoming specific structures of domination which have to be analyzed and understood as such. In the political practice developed on its basis so far (and still to be further developed) this calls for the readiness to organise societal forces in a sufficient and adequate way, for changing all societal relations which prevent human

---

<sup>11</sup> Marx, Engels, Kautsky, Bernstein, Luxemburg, Lenin, Gramsci, Hilferding, to name only some of the most significant theorists of historical Marxism have conducted their concrete analyses in a historical time, when the specifically modern gender structures had only begun to emerge, and the imperial structures still were in their older colonial mode – so that their modern shapes, as they have become dominant in the phase of „fordism“, were not yet relevant for their global analysis.

<sup>12</sup> Balibar, Étienne (1995), *The philosophy of Marx*, Verso, London, New York, 40.

beings from becoming free from the existing forms of domination, as they are constantly reproduced by all kinds of practices of violence, heteronomy, discrimination, exploitation, oppression, or constraint.

In his part of the book written in common with Wallerstein “Race, Nation, Class”, Étienne Balibar had considered to “form the preliminaries of an ‘anthropology of the nation form’ in modern times, involving at the same time a description of the model of subjectivity that could be called homo nationalis ... This was supposed ... to help ... understand how, in the wake of the constitution of ‘nations’ in the bourgeois sense ... a certain community-effect was produced and maintained, where racism was ... a necessary ‘internal supplement’.”<sup>13</sup> This quotation reflects not only a significant enlargement of the use of the term „intersectionality“, but leads also to our central question, i.e. to the issue of a comprehensive critique of all relations of domination overdetermining in the complex reality of modern society, in a way which neither excludes class-domination, nor falls back into the class-reductionism characteristic for large parts of the „Marxist“ tradition. Such a critique will most certainly not become a kind of „integral universalism“ which will be capable of tackling all relations of dominance by ONE comprehensive theory and result in ONE integrated practice of liberation. It will rather have to take on board the real material differences and the irreducible plurality of the existing structures and mechanisms of domination, while at the same time fully understanding their over-determination.

However, in a perspective of liberation, the central strategical question to be asked and to be answered is the following: How to make possible a mutually shared critique of all different kinds of domination and how to conceive and to develop a real and effective practice of liberation in which all these – very differently – oppressed and dominated forces – could get together in a combined political struggle against the politically maintained structures of reproduction of all these forms of domination which maintain people in a subaltern or subordinated position, i.e. without freedom or with limited freedom<sup>14</sup> – and how to make it effectively real.

A productive help for a further discussion of this question can be found in an analysis proposed by Patricia Hill Collins: She analyses „intersectionality as a knowledge project whose raison d’être lies in its attentiveness to power relations and social inequalities.” Collins examines “three interdependent sets of concerns: (a) intersectionality as a field of study that is situated within the power relations that it studies; (b) intersectionality as an analytical strategy that provides new

---

<sup>13</sup> Balibar (2011), *The Genealogical Scheme: Race or Culture?*, in *Trans-Scripts 1* (2011), 1-9, 2.

<sup>14</sup> Wolf, Frieder Otto (2011): in Louis Althusser, *Für Marx, mit einem Nachwort herausgegeben von Frieder Otto Wolf*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main, 371.

angles of vision on social phenomena; and (c) intersectionality as critical praxis that informs social justice projects.”<sup>15</sup> The specific grounds, reasons, causes of these structures and processes, and the responsible agencies and actors involved in such practices are certainly different, but ultimately they all go along with a specific kind of strong inequality – i.e. of a dominating and of a dominated element – between individuals and groups of them as members of their society, within their different social and societal contexts. This inequality is structural and it is connected to societal hierarchies in which the one can command the other, simply because of occupying a specific place in the structure of societal relations that stands in a relation of domination to the subservient place allotted to other members of society. Racism, sexism and the subordination or dependency of specific societies to other societies do indeed often intersect in the real lives of people, but they are not addressed as such by all feminist and anti-racist practices. Because of this lack of understanding and, therefore, addressing real intersectionality, with its effects of domination, such practices tend, in effect, mostly to relegate the identity of women of colour to a location that prevents any telling about their real, namely complex experiences of domination and violence. Crenshaw’s “focus on the intersections of race and gender ... highlights the need to account for multiple grounds of identity when considering how the social world is constructed.”<sup>16</sup> While sharing the desire with Crenshaw to understand the development of modern societies and the ways in which our common world presently operates, as well as to empower victims of violence to change that world, our efforts go beyond the horizon of “identity politics” within which Crenshaw has remained: We undertake to address the issues of structures and causal determinations for such specific relations of domination and the ways in which they are overdetermining each other. On this basis, we proceed to take up again the critique of political economy, as it has been theoretically developed by Marx, more generally as a model for reconstructing processes of reproduction of existing forms of domination, and thereby attempt to widen Crenshaw’s insistence on the intersectionality of violence to an analysis of the specific societal hierarchies which effectively function to reproduce them, while at the same time opening our analysis to class domination and class struggle beyond the current concentration on “race” and “gender” – thereby adding capitalist domination again to the specific structures of domination to be analysed, to be fought against and to be overcome.

The processes of ecological destruction could not meaningfully defined as being modern in this sense. They are the outcome of the entire complexity of modern, as well as still effective pre-

---

<sup>15</sup> Hill Collins, Patricia (2015): Intersectionality's Definitive Dilemmas, First published online as a Review in *Advances for Annual Review of Sociology* on March 23, 2015 at [soc.annualreviews.org](http://soc.annualreviews.org), 1.

<sup>16</sup> Crenshaw, Kimberly (1991): Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color, *Stanford Law Review*, Vol. 43, No. 6., S. 1241–1299, 1245.

modern structures of human and societal reproduction, filtered by the flexibilities of the terrestrial eco-sphere. Only the processes of reflecting and reacting to them within human societies have a specific modern dimension – and therefore certainly are an indispensable part of any political project adequate to modern realities.

In order to address strategically – and adequately – what is at stake in the globalizing bourgeois societies of the 21st century, it will not be sufficient to rediscover the realities of class domination and class struggle, as well as to decipher the overdetermination processes due to modern structures of gender domination or dependency, it will also be required critically to address the new structures of capitalist domination as they have emerged with ‚finance capital‘, i.e. in the process of further development leading to the emergence of globally operating capitalist oligarchies as a new modality of the domination of capital – in which credit relations and finance capital have taken a central role. It will have to be analyzed how this development of capitalist exploitation and domination has acted upon these relations of domination outside of the capital relation (capital-wage labour) emerging and crystallizing as a modern kind of ‚androcentrism‘, as well as a new, comprehensive kind of effective transnational dependency. The resulting complexification of the elementary structures of societal reproduction has been answered by a corresponding complexification of ideological and institutional ‚suprastructures‘: The modern state, civil society, and modern mass culture have ceased to retroact only or mainly on the class struggles in the economic basis of modern bourgeois societies – they have extended the ‚theatre of conflict‘ to all the existing structures of domination.

For us, who make use of past debates on ‚over-determination‘ (Althusser), as well as on the ‚politics of human rights‘ (Balibar) in order to resituate the experience of identity politics within a perspective of struggles of liberation addressing the plurality of structures and mechanisms effectively operative at once in the reproduction of domination, this is a challenge and an offer to cooperate. As we are strongly marked by the critique of the political economy elaborated by Marx as the science dealing with the capitalist mode of production and its domination within modern bourgeois societies<sup>17</sup>, as well as by Marx’s sketches of a *critique of politics*<sup>18</sup>, we do start to cooperate from our side, by taking up and widening the concept of intersectionality. Critically making use of Marx's heritage, we build our approach upon a specific understanding of society which also explains our approach to intersectionality: We understand ‚society‘ as the articulation

---

<sup>17</sup> Wolf, Frieder Otto (2011): in: Althusser ... , 370.

<sup>18</sup> cf. Balibar et al., Marx et sa critique de la politique, Paris 1979.

of individuals, belonging to and dealing with nature existing within a territory and at the same time as the complex of relations, especially power relations, as they exist between these individuals with their gender, their physical and mental constitution, their social, ethnic, cultural, confessional, national origin and affiliation. Accordingly, the metabolism of humankind is going on in a societal form based upon relations between individuals, who at the same time are embedded into specific societal contexts with their collective power relations and individual 'roles'. Within our contemporary societies, societal hierarchies are significantly determined by capitalist oligarchies, and by the specific interrelations they are capable of establishing – in a kind of 'intersectionality from above' – between class, gender, and ethnic issues and the underlying societal, social, ecological and global problems, *on the one hand*, and by the development of agencies like the EU (in its complex relations to the US, to NATO and to other global actors), *on the other*. Such an approach allows us to co-operate with individuals and collectives following Crenshaw's and Collins's understanding of intersectionality, but also with all those who deal with structural hierarchies, and their underlying trends and mechanisms in transnational and international relations.

Furthermore, our approach allows us, in an active and egalitarian way, to co-operate with critical ecologists - and with the many activists and groups who are getting involved in just, solidarity-based and democratic struggles with regard to the humanitarian, food, ecological, resources, financial, and economic crises, as well as with the waves of crisis concerning the Euro and the EU. For working towards such a co-operation it is worth-while to make use of the presently renewing discussion on Marx, in order to highlight the growing awareness of Marx for the ecological issue. Authors like Hannah Holleman and Kohei Saito have shown that Marx in his later years became ever more aware of the ecological problem<sup>19</sup>, whereas these learning processes of Marx have later been obscured and then marginalized by 'official' Marxists, as well as, of course, by the dominant forms of the bourgeois sciences of society and history.

Facing the enormous strength of the capitalist oligarchies as networks of the strongest owners of finance capital in industry and finance and of the ruling elites in politics, management, state administration, law, military and 'security', science, culture and media, accounting, consulting and lobbying and their international organisations on the one hand and the on-going political defensive of the left on the other hand, we argue for the further enlargement of the notion of intersectionality in the following directions:

---

<sup>19</sup> Hannah Holleman (2017), *Capital and Ecology in: Reading 'Capital' today ...*, 160-180; Kohei Saito (2016), *Natur gegen Kapital. Marx' Ökologie in seiner unvollendeten Kritik des Kapitalismus* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus).

- by searching for and exposing the causes and causers of the different crises, deepening the complex reproduction crisis of humankind – namely in exposing the ‘intersectionality from above’ in the strategies of the capitalist oligarchies,
  - in analysing conceptions and concepts for alternatives and in elaborating our own proposals and conceptions, which aim to build a broad alliance of societal forces, in the form of an extended ‘intersectionality from below’,
  - in searching for agents and agencies capable of dealing with causes and consequences of the crises, i.e. of violence against people and nature, as counter-powers with the capability of struggling for the emergence of alternative structures,
  - in organising new political alliances capable of struggling for hegemony within the political processes within civil society, as well as within national or trans-national state structures.
- In thinking, researching and acting on this basis, we propose to extend Collins's orientation on power relations and social inequalities to the ecological and global dimensions of justice in a complex way.

Doing so, we focus on

- building a politics against the capitalist oligarchies as the main causers of the crises who are based in the energy, transportation, finance and high-tech spheres, in the military-industrial “security” complex and in agribusiness, and who effectively put into practice a strategy of “intersectionality from above”,
  - taking up and reinforcing the on-going struggles to protect and to strengthen existing democratic, social, ecological standards,
  - helping to develop on-going struggles to protect, to democratise and to enlarge the public spheres,
  - organising solidarity-based emancipatory forces on the local and regional levels, while at the same time working on their intersectional co-operation on the levels of the (member) states, of the EU, of Europe and of global politics, and working to bring them together in broad alliances admitting of plurality.

In sum: We propose to take up the common work for an “intersectionality of the struggles!”<sup>20</sup>, i.e. for a common work towards supporting the multitude in becoming capable to change the world. In this connection, it is necessary to stress at least the central questions concerning the organisation of agents and agencies. These are slightly contradictory and very complicated:

- 1) An organisation that should change power relations has to respond to societal power structures but while doing so, these structures have a strong negative impact on democracy in the framework of this very organisation – and, therefore, on its attractiveness for members and for interested, “sympathising” people – how can this be avoided?
- 2) How can these forces learn to be politically and culturally very different, but at the same time really effective in terms of changing societal reality?
- 3) How can these forces learn to respect and respond fully the existing different individual interests and desires, while still being capable to protect the socially and globally weakest – and to respond immediately to actions and reactions by the other, dominating side?
- 4) How can these forces learn to be a party and a movement at the same time?
- 5) How can these forces learn to cooperate sincerely and fully with grass roots movements, while developing co- operation with trade unions and other agents of organized societal resistance, while at the same time seeing and dealing with the important limitations of their present capacity to act?
- 6) How can these forces learn to make use of all possibilities to act, while establishing and keeping one’s own durability and resilience as a political organisation and as an effective alliance?
- 7) How can these forces learn to realise the continuity, durability and flexibility of struggling organisations and especially of political alliances, with a perspective of dealing adequately with the underlying contradictions and their backgrounds in the very structures of interest of all participants?

---

<sup>20</sup> Wolf, Frieder Otto (2010/2011), Die Rückkehr des Staates, die Intersektionalität der Kämpfe, das Gemeinsame der Neuen Zeit und die Suche nach gemeinsamen Perspektiven, in: Rückkehr in die Zukunft – Krisen und Alternativen, Beiträge zur radikalen Philosophie, Westfälisches Dampfboot, Münster, 2012, 366-424.

Or, in one word, we propose to ask again:

How to be radically democratical, but able to act in a really radical, revolutionary and transformative way?

See also:

Brangsch, Lutz, Dellheim, Judith, Spangenberg, Joachim H. and Wolf, Frieder Otto (2012), *Den Krisen entkommen. Sozialökologische Transformation* [Escaping the Crises. Socio-Ecological Transformation], rls Manuskripte 99, Karl Dietz Verlag, Berlin.

Dellheim, Judith, Wolf Frieder Otto Wolf (2018), *The Unfinished System of Karl Marx. Critically Reading Capital as a Challenge for our Times*, palgrave macmillan.

Dellheim, Judith, Wolf Frieder Otto Wolf (2016), *Rosa Luxemburg: A Permanent Challenge for Political Economy. On the History and the Present of Luxemburg's 'Accumulation of Capital'* palgrave macmillan.

Dellheim, Judith (2016), *In search of possibilities for action*, in: *Int. J. Sustainable Development*, Vol. 19, No. 2, 2016, 201-215.