

Rosa Luxemburg's Contribution to the Current Debate on Strategies for Social Change

(Paper Prepared for Rosa Luxemburg International Workshop on „100th Anniversary of *The Accumulation of Capital: A Contribution to an Economic Explanation of Imperialism* : A Century-Old Work Remains Current, Provocative and Seminal“)

Berlin, March 7-9, 2014

Dominika Dinušová

Department of Philosophy and of History of Philosophy

Comenius University in Bratislava

Introduction

Anniversary of *The Accumulation of Capital* is an opportunity for reflection on contemporary situation due to parallels which associate our current socio-economic reality with reality of Rosa Luxemburg and her contemporaries. We live in a capitalist society, and thus the writings of Marx, Engels, Luxemburg and other theorists of the early twentieth century are up to date now while we try to understand the social, economic and political processes that affect our daily existence.

We are now witnessing the spreading crisis of capitalism that impinge our lives. Overwork of the population, the spread of unemployment which generates hunger and death, the decline of health care, education, and thus the high mortality and illiteracy of the rural population and expanding wars are all direct consequences of the capitalist social order. "Poverty can not be cured," as Jeremy Seabrook says, "it is not a symptom of the disease of capitalism. On the contrary, it is a proof of its hardy health and encourages it to even bigger accumulation and power."¹ Every year eighteen million people die because of the consequences of poverty and its causes.² For comparison, according to statistics over seventy-two million people died in the Second World War what makes an average of twelve million humans per year. Therefore just few of us are satisfied with this claim and will follow the doctrine of totalitarian rule without asking a question: Why are we forced to live in these structures? Is it really natural to live in a capitalist socio-economic arrangement? If not, is there another option?

1. Requirement of the Alternative to Capitalism

¹Seabrook,J.: *The No-Nonsense Guide to World Poverty*. New Internationalist 2007

²Hrubec, M.: *From Unacknowledgement to the Fairness*. Prague : FILOSOFIA – ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑ 2012, p. 157; OSN, New York – Prague, United Nations Information Centre Prague. 2005, p. 148

The very antithesis of capitalism in the public discourse, if you like the next evolutionary stage in the socio-economic history of mankind, is Communism. In that time Marx, Engels and Luxemburg worked with this term which "vexed Europe" back in the mid nineteenth century and the same term evokes fear and consternation on the faces of millions of people today.

In the context of considering the socialist society we could focus on many historical aspects, but if we remain in theoretical background of socialism (as the first phase of Communism), it is based on social ownership of capital goods.

Individual private ownership of capital goods is replaced by collective ownership and an objective of production in this type of society is not to make the highest profit, but to meet the needs of population. Abolition of private ownership of capital goods is the first step towards a socialist society. Capital goods are no longer the private property of a privileged class, but belong to everyone. The entire company participates on planning, manufacturing and consumption. Product of labour comes into its own utility value and belongs to everyone. As Engels adds, collective ownership pertains to land and other manufacturing resources, and individual ownership pertains to the consumer goods.³ People working in the associations of free people work with common capital goods. They consciously expend their individual labor on social purpose. Part of the collective commodities will again form capital goods, part will be consumed and therefore it needs to be redistributed.

Attempts to meet these conditions can be observed at the local level. Cooperative societies, participatory budgets, small communities are formed and they are trying to free themselves from the bondage of global market. Alternative models to capitalism fail at the first intervention into the untouchable structures of economy. It is therefore questionable to what extent will be the smaller communities, that introduce collective ownership, able to co-exist with the flowering capitalist market, which fundamental characteristics is one of expansiveness. Evidence of intolerance towards different type of economy is numerous military interventions into countries that tried to escape from nationwide impact of the global capitalist market.⁴

A backlash against the capitalist socio-economic system has been growing and demonstrating by a mass movement around the world since the early twentyfirst century. In 2002 the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre was formed and regions of countries of Latin America under the baton of Venezuela also made a significant coup in blind following of capitalist doctrine. The Latin American Alliance was formed and initiated by socialist countries for the reason of mutual economic support and assistance, but the alliance does not respect the regulation of the global market, ignores the Cuban blockade and, finally, it is formed without U.S. participation which gave modifying character of economy in these countries. This is a breakthrough in this

³ Engels, F.: *Anti-Duhring*. Bratislava : Pravda, 1976, p. 138

⁴ In this connection we may mention some examples from history as a military coup in Guatemala supported by the CIA which together with the company United Fruit and extreme right-wing policies in the Guatemalan army caused that democratically elected president Jacob Arbenz was assassinated and subsequently military regime was raised in 1954. Another example can be mentioned from Chile where the democratically elected president Salvador Allende was overthrown and the fascist regime of Agosta Pinoche emerged in 1973. There is more evidence of intolerance such as American mercenary soldiers's intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965 and the bombing of Grenada with the aim to destroy its revolutionary leadership in 1980 and its military occupation of the USA in 1983 and at last, but not least, subversive activities in Cuba and still continuing an economic blockade of the island.

region which has been at the hands of colonial powers for centuries. We can conclude that these and other impulses oppose the global capitalist economy were a response to neoliberal politics advocated by the Washington consensus. Therefore, it is time to ask if they called for elimination of capitalism itself or only its excesses – neoliberalism. Opposed attitude towards spreading global capitalism, which tends to be justified as the only possible, declares Social Forum's motto - "Another world is possible".⁵ Porto Alegre is a place for dissent, for discussion and criticism of the regime, but it hasn't implied any real social change so far. Contributors' focus is too heterogeneous to have an actual impact on social development.

The analysis of capitalist society includes also the question of its rebirth in socialist society. The question of social change can not disappear from the Marxist discourse. We can affirm that it is its fundamental feature. Founders of Marxism and later contemporaries emphasized the necessity of social change and its implementation. Philosophy and theory connects with everyday life, even it is constructively struck by them. Without social change and specific question "How put Marxism into practice," Marxism would remain only a dead analysis about other analyses, neutered science which would be kept closed at the cemetery of modern scholarship at the university. The mere Marx's expression, "philosophers hitherto have only explained the world, but this is about to change it"⁶ is a radical step from analysis to implementation of reality. Marx and Engels' work not only explains aspects of the functioning of the capitalist socio-economic relations, not only highlights the contradictions, but primarily from these contradictions reflects arising need to bridge the socio-economic relations. As in the past and as Marx and Engels in the nineteenth century, and Luxemburg in the twentieth century, we all ask what is needed to promote social change and how might be the capitalist socio-economic formation overcome. Is there an answer already from Marx, Engels or Luxemburg or is there still a room for dispute over strategies for overcoming capitalism? The opinions of the early last century are revolutionary. Luxemburg and Lenin, who followed the founders of Marxism, clearly demonstrate the need of the revolutionary transformation of society as the only possible way for social change. In contrast to the past, we are witnessing the decline of revolutionary opinions today. Revolution is called barbaric, outdated and no longer relevant, and social reform as a more human means of achieving the same priorities has been put in its place. But can be a desired change achieved through successive legislative amendments? And what should the desired change be like?

In this paper we focus on the problem of the social changes in some aspects of the analysis of the social situation. We will try to highlight the significant changes in the interpretation of social reality compared with Luxemburg's analysis of capitalism. Proposals to solve current situation arise from the interpretation of current socio-economic relations. How has our vision of society changed? Is it still valid to think in the categories of the last century? Is still Luxemburg's work *The Accumulation of Capital* actual work which has benefits for understanding reality?

⁵ Wallerstein defines "spirit" of Porto Alegre as a "worldwide, non-hierarchical connection of global unsystematic family movement for the purpose of enforcement of (a) intellectual clarity; (b) militant actions based on the popular mobilization that people will perceive as immediate useful for their own lives; (c) efforts to justify the longer-term needs and more substantial changes. (Wallerstein, I.: *The Decline of American Power*. Prague : SLON 2005, p. 223)

⁶ Marx, K.: *Theses on Feuerbach*. In : Selected Writings in Five Volumes, vol. 1. Bratislava: Pravda 1977, p. 211

2. To Some Aspects of Interpretation of the Socio-Economic Situation Yesterday and Nowadays

The state of our civilization is unsustainable and we face the scourge of society transformation. An analysis of the society and pointing to its mechanisms and functioning clearly reveals the strategy of applying the changes. The cause of the decline of the revolutionary positions can be explained by interpretations of functioning of so-called global capitalism. Since our civilization has been developed in tremendously rapid pace, we can not fully update essays from the past centuries. And here arises a space for reinterpretation of traditional Marxist ideas and for new social analyses.

The development of the capitalist system can be captured in some stages:

- Capitalism emerged in the fifteenth and sixteenth century in Europe when rural population was violently expropriated and situation also led to the expulsion of rural population, and domestic manufacturing industry was destroyed. This period is called "period of primary accumulation" and Marx referred to it as "pink dawn of capitalist production."⁷
- From 1789 until the second half of the nineteenth century we are generally talking about the second phase of capitalism, which is characterized by free competition, the industrial revolution, and forming the modern national state.
- Between years 1898 - 1914 capitalism was definitely formed into so-called corporate monopoly stage characterized by the dominance of financial and therefore no longer an industrial capital. This stage is referred to as the stage of international imperialism, that it is capitalism of monopoly, Lenin refers to it as parasitic capitalism, rotting and caduceus.⁸
- Despite these features we are today talking about the fourth stage, which is usually referred to as global capitalism. According to the American authors like W.I. Robinson, J. Harris, L. Sklair and others global capitalism is emerging in 1970's of twentieth century. It is symbolized by the rapid development of technology, total commodification, and the rise of transnational capital. According to him, global capitalism is the final stage of capitalism, which finally began by integrating former Soviet Bloc and countries of the Third World into the system in the early 90's.

We are therefore in a different stage of capitalism. Fundamental processes remain the same as in the past, only their manifestations have changed. The question is how to distinguish global capitalism from the previous stage of international imperialism and what consequences will bear this distinction in order to answer the question of social change.

As Luxemburg wrote, imperialism is the political expression of the process of capital's accumulation in its competitive struggle for remains of unoccupied non-capitalist world environment.⁹ In the early twentieth century this environment geographically occupied very large area of the Earth. It seems that capitalism covers the entire planet today. In previous period many theoretical works dealing with expanding and functioning of global capitalism were issued. In recent decades, numerous studies dealing with the functioning of global

⁷ Marx, K.: *The Capital*, vol. 1, Bratislava : Pravda 1985, p. 591, 617

⁸ Lenin, V.I.: *The Imperialism and Schism of Socialism* In: Lenin, V.I.: Selected Writings, vol. 23, Bratislava : Slovak Publishing of Political Literature 1956, p. 96

⁹ Luxemburg, R. : *The Accumulation of Capital*. Bratislava : Pravda 1979, p. 517

capitalism has been established. Among modern theorists of global capitalism who claim that the imperialist stage of capitalism has been overcome and today we face a new system which uses the latest information technologies to maintain their own power. Emancipating themselves from the domination of global capitalism is a new question which should be answered for these authors. But if you want to claim that the contemporary era of global capitalism is radically different from the phase of international imperialism, we must affect the moment when imperialism became global capitalism.

According to W. I. Robinson, an essential feature which clearly distinguishes the phase of international imperialism and global capitalism is total co-modification. Instead of extensive spread of capital, which was reflected in the imperialist colonial policy, intense spread of capitalism is coming. It means penetration of commodity relations into the spheres of social life which were beyond the logic of producing profits (privatization of health care, educational system, etc...). However, one of the fundamental features of capitalism is expansion not only geographical, but also expansion into all areas of society. Thus, if in the process of international imperialism capitalism spreads extensively – it means it widens its scope to include non-capitalist geographic areas, and once it becomes established in this area, this system economy gradually hit all social structures. We observe penetration of commodity relations not only in health care, educational system, culture, and science. All entities like service, people or things became the goods. Robinson puts extensive and intensive dissemination of commodity relations into time sequence. However, following the history as well as present, intensive dissemination of capital has always gone hand in hand with extensive spread. Although it appears that the capitalist expansionism field is diminished, even the system practices the imperialist policy in the present day. As Luxemburg continues in her explication: “specific operational methods of this phase are: foreign loans, construction of railways, revolutions and wars.”¹⁰ In the late 80’s capitalism occupied territory in the Eastern Bloc, as well as today we are witnessing a military campaign in the Middle Eastern countries. Despite attempts to lift the international phase of imperialism and efforts to capture social reality in a new light, Luxemburg’s scheme is still valid. Therefore, we ask if we have really bridged into a so radical different phase of capitalism. Capitalism must still accumulate capital. “Capitalism is the first economic form, which has the power of propaganda, is form, which tends to spread across the Earth and pushed all other economic forms and which can not coexist and tolerates others. But it is also the first economic form, which can not exist alone without other economic forms constituting its environment and breeding ground. Therefore, it is the economic form, which tendency to change the world-class production collapses on inside inability to become a world leader in this form of production. Capitalism itself is a living historical contradiction; the process of its accumulation is a manifestation of continuous solutions, while deepening the contradictions.”¹¹ We have found ourselves in the economic crisis of capitalism. The crisis of 1970’s was averted by an invasion of capital to the countries of the Eastern Bloc. The cure for the current crisis is being looked for in the war.

Interpretation of Luxemburg and modern social theory is despite some parallels different. To be able to point out the difference in relation to later interpretation of problems, we will try to outline the international imperialism in a sense of authors of the early twentieth century.

V.I. Lenin defines five basic characteristics of international imperialism. (a) The concentration of production and capital has reached such a stage in its development that it has

¹⁰ Luxemburg, R. : *The Accumulation of Capital*. Bratislava : Pravda 1979 p. 485

¹¹ Luxemburg, R.: *The Accumulation of Capital*. Bratislava : Pravda 1979, p. 541

created monopolies which have a decisive role in economic life . (b) Bank capital merged with industrial capital based on financial capital the financial oligarchy was established. (c) The export of capital in contrast with the export of goods takes on particular importance. (d) International monopolist capitalist associations are formed and they divide the world. (e) The territorial division of the world among the biggest capitalist powers is consummated.¹² And elsewhere he adds that the distribution of the world will continue in rearrangement of power in the form of spheres of influence between the individual powers. For Lenin, imperialism is dying capitalism in contrast to the perception of contemporary global capitalism, in which background we can watch changing social and production relations. As he writes : " ... when a large enterprise becomes huge and planned, and according to accurately detected by statistical data, organizes material supply of 2/3 or 3/4 of the amount of the original raw material needed for tens of millions of people; when a transportation of those materials is systematically organized into best centers of production ...; when one of the center govern all stages of a gradual material processing up to the manufacture of a wide variety of finished products; when the distribution of these products happens under a single plan among tens and hundreds of millions of consumers, then it is obvious that we have socialization of production – that private economic and private owners relations are just shell which no longer corresponds to the content, which must inevitably decay if its removal is postponed, but which will inevitably be removed.¹³ However, it did not happen and capitalism has found a rescue mechanism to overcome its own contradictions and crises. We are, therefore, entering a new phase of development of capitalist history. We found ourselves in a liquid reality, when phenomena occur before they could disappear; when the centers of power move and are in constant motion. Global capital is in constant motion, it is difficult to affect it, but how can it be overcome?

Global capitalism is characterized by the rise of transnational capital embodied by corporations; they imply the emergence of transnational capitalist class and as a result of power and action of this class, eventually rise of transnational nation. If there is a transnational capitalist class, there must be formed counterpart of the class, namely something “transnational proletariat”. But if transnational capitalist class transnationalized on the base of achievement of information and transport technologies, how can be proletariat transnationalized, to which are the scientific achievements of the social and economic status removed? What is the role of labor in the system of global capitalism? In order to face this system, if it is still true that the working class will be the bearer of system changes, how he will transform society? Nation state continues to fulfill the function of necessary superintendent of the working class. It scales back innovations that could damage inviolable economic relations to maintain the *status quo*. In doing so, for example W.I. Robinson stresses that it is important to strike transnational nation.¹⁴ But if we could face something, it must exist in the real world and we need to know it. How is our perception of socio-economic situation changing the strategies to overcome it?

3. The Question of Social Revolution in the Light of Current Theoretical Basis

¹²Lenin, V.I.: *Imperialism as a Highest Stage of Capitalism*. In: Lenin, V.I. : Selected Writings, vol. 22 Bratislava : Slovak Publishing of Political Literature 1956, p. 247

¹³Lenin, V.I.: *Imperialism as a Highest Stage of Capitalism*. In: Lenin, V.I. : Selected Writings, vol. 22 Bratislava : Slovak Publishing of Political Literature 1956 , p. 208

¹⁴ Robinson, W.I.: *The Theory of Global Capitalism*. Prague : FILOSOFIA - ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑ 2009, p. 313

Rosa Luxemburg's question - Social Reform or Social Revolution?, which bears the same name as her study, is timeliness in the observation of the current social discourse. It points to the contradiction of Marxist's polemic over the threshold of the last century. She finds present Marxist's discourse in similar position with the difference that with the knowledge of history of twentieth century we have become more sceptical of the ideas of socialism and revolution.

Socialism and idea of communism are marked by historians as cause of terrifying killing and wars which happened in Europe and in the world in the close past. Militarism is having its own capitalist right to occupy territory, where it can accumulate capital. It serves for occupation of new territory and maintain power needed to implement market relations. Revolution, where two class interests stands against each other, becomes repulsive. People in modern society voluntarily avoid open fight and try to find a more affordable, more convenient and life-preserving means how to achieve peace, freedom, dignity, vested happiness and he realizes that in these structures they can not be achieved. Perhaps this is also the reason why an individual recourse to the possibility of reform change. In fact, human history has been interwoven with murders, genocides and wars for centuries, and they have not become a barrier for individuals' fight. Individuals are also aware of their own dissonant existence with the social reality. Revolutionary struggle has always been a struggle for life. Man was determined to die as to continue to live in undignified conditions. As Marx writes, proletarians have nothing to lose, only their chains. However, the situation is more complicated today. Also a proletarian is a man who thinks of his loved ones, has its own privileges in the most developed countries, although scant, but he is grateful even for poor pay and for dishonouring position especially when he realizes that in developed countries, from which he might come, he would not survive. And so he will silently be satisfied with the conditions, maybe with the hope of improvement, or he will draw attention to the areas he thinks has more impact on.

Not only that society has become apathetic towards public affairs (which can be seen for example in still smaller participation in elections), it is thought that an individual has no impact on public matters that could influence his life. Disillusionment and disappointment forces us to straggle from the *res publicas* and focus on our own individual life, while repeat life automata, obey the order of the state, pay taxes and fees to monopolist. Self-realization is found individually and for an individual there are goods for consumption, for example shopping in the shopping centre, gutter press and so on. Where is the root of apathy and resignation that are rapidly spread throughout our civilization? Isn't a massive indifference also result of postmodern eclecticism which offers a wide range of explanations combining a variety of phenomena in one? Repressive measures against riots, rebellion occurring only rarely and only as an expression of disapproval without concrete political and economic requirements do not and can not produce any concrete results.

Finally, also those glimpses of people's reaction on the increasing oppression are ultimately suppressed, broken up or unheard. They are lost in the variety of opaque analysis, attempts and efforts to implement an utopian outbreaks out of society. Communes, cooperatives, small family communities are formed and they endeavor to ignore regulation of the world market and state economic, but instead of finding a desired escape they always face unyielding barrier which absorbs them and force them to respect their rules. Such an escape from social problems is impracticable in a given situation, does not have a long-term perspective and its duration is fully dependent on regulations of higher authorities. Land privatization, area of natural resource, highway construction and so on geographically limit the development of

isolated commune. Development of such communities is rather than starting point from razor edge an inspiration and proof that without outside influence and bureaucratic obstacles collective ownership of means of production is feasible.

Why do we withdraw from the revolutionary opinions? Why is more palatable solution to be considered as reformed? Why do we think we do not have an impact to hit the structures of global capitalism? If we want to answer the following questions, we must return to the interpretation of global capitalism and the status of the individual to society following the described capitalist society. To point out the differences in the perception of social reality in age of Luxemburg and today, we'll focus on W.I. Robinson's theory of global capitalism, who represents the modern stream of theorists of global capitalism. For our brief comparison we are not going to discuss differences vested by his contemporaries that are relevant to our question. Diversity of current and past theories that emphasized the revolution as the only way of establishing new socio-economic relations, we will try to capture in the three states.

(1) The distinction between revolutionary writers of the twentieth century and modern authors is seen in the terminological apparatus with which they work. Luxemburg and Lenin clearly express and empirically describe verifiable phenomena, concrete entities that shape their present as monopolies, cartels, trusts, financial capital, financial oligarchy, and unions and capitalists. Revolutionary class of salaried workers which will be the bearer of social change is opposed them. Imperialism itself contains elements of socialization, implying that it is the matter of time when capitalist product packaging will blow out. There is no way out and no way to avoid socialist revolution. Luxemburg clearly identifies capitalists and power mechanism sustaining and producing the socio-economic relations.

Contemporary theorists create new terminological apparatus for the description of global capitalism. Monopolies, in their conception corporations, consider transnational, so they no longer function internationally, but transnationally. A transnational capitalist class and transnational state are created from them.

Transnational state is formed above the level of the international exchange of capital. What does it represent in practice? How can it be grasped in reality when its processuality is emphasized? Modern writers create an idea of transcendental power, which is difficult to grasp theoretically in her early stage.

(2) The second shift compared to previously discussed Marxist theories we seen in the sense of socialism. While according to Marx communism is inevitable culmination of history, modern authors perceive communism as an idea of globally fair society that is born in the old structures. They are transformed by the evolutionary way into socialism. Globalization, which is the result of the progressive accumulation of capital, and which encompasses the entire planet, gives space to create a real world civilization based on a new universal notion of equality, while the outstanding humanitarian values of "liberty, equality and fraternity."¹⁵ Modern theories miss the moment of the abolition of private ownership of capital goods. The most painful aspects of Marxism, which criticize capitalist society in its constitutive point and see a change in the elimination of its fundamentals are omitted and replaced by universal ideas. Socialism emerges from itself, from the circumstances of global capitalism, and originates from the spontaneous way. The ethical dimension of the functioning system is

¹⁵ Robinson, W.I. : *The Theory of Global Capitalism*. Prague : FILOSOFIA – ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑ 2009, p. 286

highlighted before the transformation of economic. Ethical standards that would be reflected in the functioning of the governing system are offered as a solution to economic problems.

(3) Finally, the last difference stems from the previous two. A revolution was inevitable point for the preservation of civilization for Luxemburg. Similarly, Marx and Engels stressed the need for a revolution to overcome the capitalist socio-economic system. They underlined the revolutionary transformation of society not for the revolution itself, and not for indulgence for civil fights. Revolution is the only way to promote the necessary changes for the socialist society. To eliminate private ownership of the capital goods is not possible through any reforms. Also the exploitation of workers can not be eliminated by any statutory regulations, since the laws do not express exploitation. Finally, we can not intervene in the economy by reforms as the economy has become apolitical sphere. "What's left of politics lies, like the good old days, with the state, and in terms of economic life, the state does not have an impact on it. Any attempts in this direction are faced with immediate punitive measures by the world market."¹⁶ If we accept globalization as it is described by most contemporary writers, social reform will appear as a medicine enabling painless treatment of deadly disease. Rather as a mean to get healthy is hoping in social reforms a morphine that intoxicates population and deepens slavery at present, R.Luxemburg's thoughts, which were written over a century ago, are still relevant: "Legal reform and revolution are not two different methods of historical progress, which can be chosen as you like in the cafeteria of history, like hot and cold sausages, they are two different motives in the development of class society, which are interdependent and complementary, but also excluding, like north and south pole, like bourgeoisie and proletariat ... It is an unhistorical lapse to imagine a legal reformed labor just as pretty wordy revolution, and imagine a revolution as very intense reform. Social upheaval and legal reform are two different ways that differ in the essence, not in duration ... If someone decides for reform instead of conquest of political power and the upheaval in society; he does not actually choose safer and more protracted way to the same objective, but to different objective,; he does not want to bring about a new social order, but only to slightly modify the old one. Thus we come to the same conclusion from the political view of revisionism, as of its economic theories: they do not tend to make socialist order, but to correct capitalist order, they do not intend to eliminate the wage system, they want just less of exploitation, and they tend to eliminate capitalist excesses, not capitalism itself."¹⁷

Loosen the requirement for the abolition of private ownership of capital goods means a retreat from revolutionary opinions. The class conflict has disappeared. The consciousness of the proletariat is contaminated by socialreformist. Thus, we do not face political struggle today, but we face ideological struggle. Dreams and hopes for change through the law reinforce the hegemony of capitalist ideology. Is it possible to realize socialism without elimination of private ownership of capital goods? Is it possible to eliminate private ownership by law? Be hoping at gradual reform changes suppress any revolutionary potential. It is certain indeed that the revolution is dangerous way to which only few cast with enthusiasm, it is step into the unknown. A man tries everything to keep, fix, remedy, we can not destroy anything and to set it up again. We are afraid that the revolution would be a mistake, but is not false to persist in the current state?

¹⁶ Bauman, Z.: *Globalization*. Bratislava : Kalligram 2000, p. 65

¹⁷ Luxemburg, R. : *Social Reform or Social Revolution?* , In: http://www.demokratickalevice.cz/wp-content/uploads/Rosa_Luxemburgova-SocialniReformaNeboSocialniRevoluce1900.pdf ,p. 32

After all, just because the elimination of private ownership is a fundamental step towards the realization of communism, is "communism" still a ghost of bourgeois society. Thus the concept of socialism or communism is being reinterpreted or replaced. Thus it is maligned, thus it is given the most degenerate attributes, thus its threat is still present, has the capitalist ruling class a need to refuge against it. Not only critically and scientifically, but it curses it as a ghost, a witch and sinister myth predicting its destruction by rabid and extreme way; at the theoretical state by terminology labels or inability to scope, at the economic and political state by diversion, imprisonment, torture and militarism. Capitalism tolerates criticism to show its "democratic" and "free" mask. It does not mind the associations of activists declaring world peace or saving the planet from environmental threats of the governmental system. At the level of narrative, heterogeneous criticism is acceptable even publicly accepted. However, when there is a reference for the abolition of private ownership of the capital goods, similar forums or specific statements are deprecating. An information embargo is applied on them or they are marked as reactionary, communist, totalitarian, etc. by media.

Conclusion

This paper doesn't want to put a definitely statement in concrete way of transformation of capitalism. It wants only to put a questions which are important in critical thinking on our society. It is certain that society from the period of Rosa Luxemburg has changed, therefore also our analyses has to be reinterpreted and updated. In spite of all changes we can ask on aspects in our society which are common to our reality and to the previous period. Global capitalism is a new stage in evolution, but like in previously stages there are inherent fundamental aspects of capitalism. Therefore we cannot to say that the stage of international imperialism is definitely overcome. We don't must to understand imperialism only like a historical phenomenon with typical style of policy, but understanding imperialism also demands theoretical reflection on what makes the imperialism we encounter today historically distinctive.¹⁸

New technologies which mediate better exchange of cultural values, opinions, theories and experiences among the people open a new horizon for thinking on social change. One of many aspects of influence the technologies is that through them can people to join over the frontiers of national states and to organise their fight against negative impacts of capitalism without a patronage of political party. The modern informational technologies facilitate communication and collaboration among the nations and people in protest. A nowadays fight can be diversible and plural and so can avoid misappropriation of ideas of socialism. Also in this feature we could see an idea of the open democratic Left.

The rapid development of our civilization and the changes that come with everyday life can not be denied. In spite of all conversions that are daily transmuting civilization we can still ask for social structures that despite all the changes in their principle remained unchanged. It is not primary whether we will refer to the present as global capitalism or international imperialism, the importance is on consequences that will result from our analysis. Luxemburg's work, which has never resign the revolution, is as current as the relevance of revolutionary solution to contemporary situation.

Luxemburg's *The Accumulation of Capital* is not a work that would not keep up to date.

¹⁸ Callinicos, A.: *Imperialism and Global Political Economy*. Cambridge : Polity Press 2009, p. 6

G.Eckstein wrote in his review that it has with the phenomena of „the present vibrant economic life so little in common, that it also could be written over twenty years ago,“¹⁹ and he refutes a fact that even after one hundred year since the release of *The Accumulation of Capital*, it is still work to be discussed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bauman, Z.: *Globalization*. Bratislava : Kalligram 2000
2. Callinicos, A.: *Imperialism and Global Political Economy*. Cambridge : Polity Press 2009
3. Engels, F.: *Anti-Duhring*. Bratislava : Pravda 1976
4. Hrubec, M.: *From Unacknowledgement to the Fairness*. Prague : PHILOSOPHIA – ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑ 2012
5. Lenin, V.I.: *Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. In: Selected Writings, vol. 22, Bratislava : Slovak Publishing of Political Literature 1956
6. Lenin, V.I.: *Imperialism and Schism of Socialism*. In: Selected Writings, vol. 23, Bratislava : Slovak Publishing of Political Literature 1956
7. Luxemburg, R.: *The Accumulation of Capital*. Bratislava: Pravda 1979
8. Luxemburg, R.: *Social Reform or Social Revolution?* In: http://www.demokratickalevice.cz/wp-content/uploads/Rosa_Luxemburgova-SocialniReformaNeboSocialniRevoluce1900.pdf
9. Marx, K.: *Theses on Feuerbach*. In : Selected Writings in Five Volumes, vol. 1. Bratislava: Pravda 1977
10. Marx, K.: *The Capital. Vol. 1*. Bratislava : Pravda 1985
11. Robinson, W.I. : *The Theory of Global Capitalism*. Prague : PHILOSOPHIA - ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑ 2009
12. Seabrook, J.: *The No- Nonsense Guide to World Poverty*. New Internationalist 2007
13. Wallerstein, I.: *The Decline of American Power*. Prague : SLON 2005

¹⁹Luxemburg, R. : *The Accumulation of Capital*. Bratislava . Pravda 1979, p. 683