processes and resolving their contradictions, mean that any leading socialist force really become capable of discovering and evaluating all aspects of the building of socialist society and of the term of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, and appear in the whole socialist period through a process of gradually advance of socialist relations.

Conditions of the building of socialist country, or deformities resulting from the leading socialist forces, or outlived in certain cases and under certain conditions and grave social and political problems their true causes are seen, even if act only as an incentive for the advance of socialism, a stronger and of the socialist consciousness of society for an invigorated renewal of the most progressive socialist forces.

Chapter II

THE STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM UNDER NEW CONDITIONS

Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia

1958
Social and Political Role of the Working Class and Its Influence on the Movement of Society

The conditions of the struggle of the working class and of the socialist forces in general for the fulfilment of their every-day demands, for the democratic rights of the working people, for power and for the construction of socialism, have changed considerably during the past few decades.

On the one hand, the tasks are more complex. The great concentration of economic and political power in the bourgeois state and its international ties tend to create a supranational class authority. This renders the use of certain former means and forms of the struggle of the working class more difficult and often ineffective. This is particularly true under present conditions of an unstable peace which rests on an unstable balance of power. In this situation, every revolutionary action of the working class and the anti-imperialist forces assumes an international character and mobilizes the most diverse forces in the world.

In addition, in the most developed capitalist countries the practice of the economic “bribing” of sections of the working class has greatly increased. This practice is the basis of the opportunist and reformist tendencies in the working class. It prevents the unity of the working class, beclouds its consciousness and class solidarity in the struggle for socialism, and presents parliamentary forms of struggle as something absolute, as the only correct method, neglecting other means of struggle which under given conditions and circumstances promise greater success.
In this situation, the ruling groups manage to consolidate and reinforce the bourgeois-democratic forms of the state and, during a certain period of social development, to direct the class struggle toward a compromise with the working class, by means of individual reforms and material concessions — and to create corresponding illusions. Processes of this kind sharpen the contradictions and the ideological struggle within the working class itself, endanger its unity and weaken its revolutionary forces. The negative consequences cause the more harm the more these forces have withdrawn into themselves, burdened by dogmatism and sectarianism; the less account they take of the objective sources and character of such processes and the less capable they are of adjusting the forms and methods of their political activity to the concrete conditions of a given phase of the class struggle.

Finally, these difficulties are aggravated by the fact that construction of socialism has so far been undertaken — through revolutionary action — mainly by the working class of comparatively backward countries. It is this that has accounted for the piling up of exceptionally great difficulties in the socialist practice so far, difficulties that also show many negative features and deformities in the development of socialism. These phenomena render more difficult the position of the revolutionary labour movement in the struggle for influence among the masses in capitalist countries.

All these and similar factors act as breaks on the political action and economic struggle of the working class, blunt its revolutionary spirit and, at the same time, produce a more or less negative effect on the rate and forms of the construction of society in socialist countries.

On the other hand, and despite all this, the balance of social forces in the world has substantially shifted in favour of socialism. The October Revolution, socialist revolutions in Yugoslavia, China and other countries, political and social changes in the world, have played an enormous role in the revolutionary transformation not only in the countries where they occurred but also in the whole world.

There is no more capitalist encirclement of an isolated socialist island, and the capitalist world itself is changing under the impact of the irresistible self-assertion of socialism. The working class of many capitalist countries, especially in Western Europe and America, has won many important political and social rights as a result of its own struggle and of revolutionary victories of socialism in many countries. All these social developments, brought about by the victory of a number of socialist revolutions, all the many revolutionary changes that have been and are taking place in various countries, all give rise to profound changes and reforms in other countries. They are interlinked and represent a single process of the revolutionary, socialist transformation of the world.

Because of all this, the social and political role of the working class and its influence on the movement of society have grown tremendously all over the world. The idea of socialism is becoming familiar to ever broader sections of the population, and the labour movement is gaining more and more opportunity to form political alliances with various sections of the population and with other progressive movements.

In these conditions, capitalism and its political system have become incomparably more unstable than ever before and subject to the pressure and social influence of the working and democratic masses.

It is obvious that at the present level of development of society the necessary material, social, political and cultural conditions exist for even greater successes of the socialist movement. Out of the great variety of all these conditions also arises the possibility of different paths and forms of the struggle for socialism.

Conditions and Forms of the Struggle of the Working Class for Socialism

The turbulent movement of contemporary humanity toward socialism has already made socialism an everyday practice of hundreds of millions of people, a practice incessantly enriched with new forms and new developments, either in socialist construction itself or in the
struggle of the working class and the socialist forces for influence on the movement of society in capitalist countries.

All this contributed to the fact that under contemporary conditions the struggle of the labour movement has gained more breadth and an incomparably greater variety of forms than it had in the past. It presents a constant interweaving of revolutionary and so-called peaceful political actions. The working class has forged its way as the leading social force both in sharp revolutionary and anti-imperialist conflicts and in parliamentary and other relatively peaceful forms of struggle. While under certain conditions the working class through revolutionary action razes the old system to its foundations, under some other it is willing or compelled to compromise, to accept mutual concessions, to be content with reforms.

Under the present conditions of struggle of the working class in capitalist countries, the awareness of its growing strength and social role is of tremendous importance. The pressures of the working class and of the process of economic development itself are responsible for some acceleration of the process of nationalization and for the introduction of various forms of state control of production, although these processes only brush against the existing social relations without changing them.

To put on the agenda the question of more nationalization of industry is to speed up the growing realization of the restricted nature and dwindling perspective of the present forms of bourgeois democracy. Ever wider discussions of the “broadening” of bourgeois democracy in the field of the so-called “economic democracy” testify to the growth of a process and to the ultimate crisis of bourgeois democracy. Actually all this ferment only reflects the fact that contemporary development in an increasingly sharp form poses the question of social ownership of the means of production and thus of power as a whole.

The struggle of the working class for participation of workers in the management of nationalized industry is becoming more and more important. On the successful development of this struggle depends the degree of the so-called economic democracy, the strengthening of the political and social positions of the working class, the reduction of the role of bureaucracy and the perception of the essentials of contemporary technocratic tendencies. The capitalist class is forced to make minor concessions even in this area, attempting to fill the various forms of workers’ participation in the management of the economy with a content that will not essentially limit the rights of the capitalist owners, and trying at the same time to use these concessions for weakening the struggle and pressure of the working class. The working class is becoming more conscious of its opportunities and of the limited nature of the concessions so far.

At the present time, in the course of the immediate daily struggle of the working masses for the solution of questions concerning their economic interests and democratic rights, questions are also raised such as nationalization and other forms of socialization of the means of production and of economic functions; management in enterprises and various forms of self-management; struggle against bureaucratism; development of democracy; status of the working people in production and society; participation of and control by workers, working people, consumers, in the bodies of economic management; and so forth.

All these questions are of vital importance to the entire labour movement as forms of the struggle for a stronger social influence of the working class, for its unification, for the development of its socialist consciousness, for its power.

In underdeveloped countries, the factor making for a quicker economic and social advance is the cooperation of the young working class with the broadest sections of the population engaged in the anti-imperialist struggle. This includes active struggle of the working class against the attempts of the bourgeois element to exploit, for their own enrichment and economic and political consolidation, the efforts of the liberated nations to overcome their backwardness and economic dependence. All this is reflected in the demands of the working class for a stronger hold on the position of command in society, for a stronger hand in the management of nationalized economic functions, and in its resistance to the attempts at returning the nationalized means of production to private hands.
The successes of the working class until now, the strengthening of the political and economic factors of socialism, the growing role of state-capitalist relations within contemporary capitalism, the birth of a world socialist system, and numerous other factors of contemporary social development—all afford, and will continue to afford, the working class more prospects than before of becoming, in certain countries and under certain conditions, the leading force in society by means of a relatively peaceful political struggle, winning decisive influence in power and gradually ensuring, according to objective conditions and its political strength, the birth and growth of socialism.

Interdependence of Different Forms of the Struggle of the Working Class

The possibility of peaceful transition to socialism does not at all mean that the working class should renounce revolutionary means in the struggle for socialism when the intensity of internal antagonisms and other conditions call for such means, that is, when the policies of the reactionary ruling circles make such a way out imperative. If the labour movement succumbed to opportunist views and practices, it would renounce not only its own social role but the previous victories of the socialist revolution which had, in fact, enabled it to use parliamentary and similar methods more successfully today in its struggle to win the leading social role.

Being a revolutionary class, the working class no doubt will also in the future break by revolutionary force the chains of capitalism, imperialism and all oppression, especially wherever reactionary ruling circles should try to arrest by violence the inexorable course of history and bar the working class and the progressive forces from the road to power. On the other hand, Marxists cannot permit any form or means of struggle to become a principle or dogma preventing the application, at a given time and place, of such forms of political action as would answer the concrete conditions of the struggle, life and concepts of the working class and the progressive social forces in general.

The contemporary development of the brief but very rich and instructive struggle for socialism shows that the paths of the working people to power and socialism are different; different not only in different countries but also in different periods. This also depends on the general relation of the social forces in the world and on the concrete material and general social conditions, the historic background and political traditions in each particular country, and on the strength of the concrete economic and social positions and concepts of the working class and working people generally.

On the other hand, in no country is the struggle for socialism isolated, separated from the development of international socialism. The experience of the socialist forces in one country becomes experience for all. The successes of socialism in the world strengthen the socialist forces in each particular country and make their own successes easier.

The interweaving, interlinking and supplementing of all the existing forms of struggle, the efforts of the working class and the socialist forces to free the already established socialist relations from the features of bureaucracy and to develop them still further—that is the basic characteristic of social developments in the world, the basic characteristic of the present-day struggle for socialism.

Some Experiences of the Socialist Development in the Soviet Union and in Other Socialist Countries up to the Present

The existence of socialist countries and, especially, further progressive development of social relations in these countries exercise a great influence on the movement of the whole society and on further development of
international relations toward the equality of nations and their peaceful mutual assistance and toward the further advance and strengthening of socialism in the world.

With the experience gained from the socialist development up to now, the theory and practice of socialism obtain a firmer foundation, and more facility for directing the socialist movement and curbing anarchy.

In this respect, a particularly valuable experience of international socialism has been the course of development of socialism in the Soviet Union, with its successes and victories which are also successes and victories of international socialism — as well as its difficulties and weaknesses.

Between the two World Wars, the Soviet Union was the first and only country where socialist forces had come to power and where socialist relations of society were being built. For this reason the revolutionary movements of the working class in other countries and the liberation movements in the colonies looked to the Soviet Union as a model for their actions. By the mere fact of its existence, the Soviet Union, between the two World Wars, was the chief bulwark of all socialist and progressive movements in the world. The revolutionary labour movement in Yugoslavia also received powerful inspiration from the October Revolution and socialist construction in the Soviet Union.

The construction of socialist relations in the Soviet Union was carried out under the complex conditions of extreme difficulties and obstacles.

The productive forces were greatly underdeveloped, besides being devastated by wars. Serious general backwardness reigned in a large part of this vast country.

Against the victory of the October Socialist Revolution, and later against the Soviet Union as the first socialist state, were directed the efforts of the united reactionary imperialist circles of the entire world.

On the meagre material foundations inherited from former Czariat Russia, it was not possible to develop further the socialist relations of society. An accelerated construction of the material basis of the new society imposed itself of necessity — above all, the creation of heavy industry, the basis of further industrial development. The international situation of the Soviet Union, plots, activities and threats on the part of the reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie against the first country of socialism made matters worse and influenced the well-known course of development.

In such circumstances, the entire social development in the Soviet Union had to begin with the concentration of all forces on the construction of the material basis of the new society. This was the only way to prevent a restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union. This general situation, however, required extraordinary efforts and great self-denial of the whole working class and the working people of the Soviet Union.

Thanks to extreme efforts, sacrifices and self-denials on the part of the Soviet working people, the Soviet Union achieved great results in this respect between the two World Wars. A powerful industrial basis was created, capable not only of safeguarding the achievements of the socialist revolution but also of securing further development of socialist relations. Thus, too, a material and political basis was created which made it much easier for socialism to develop in other countries. These successes, moreover, show in the creation of a numerically strong contemporary working class and intelligentsia, and so on, all of which has fundamentally changed both the internal social-economic structure of Soviet society and the subjective conditions of the further development of its productive forces.

The successes achieved were the basis which enabled the Soviet Union in the Second World War to win, in alliance with the other powers of the anti-Hitler coalition, victory over the bloc of fascist powers. This was of decisive influence on the further progressive development of contemporary society.

In this general situation, social development called for an emphasis on the organizing role of the leading forces of society — the Communist Party and the Soviet State — first in the fields of economic life, then in all life of society. This is what led to the great concentration of power in the hands of the state apparatus.

However, this concentration of power in the state apparatus began to be accompanied by bureaucratic-state tendencies, mistakes and deformities in the development
of the political system of the state. This, in turn, caused a sharper and more convulsive manifestation of the numerous contradictions typical of the transition period from capitalism to socialism.

In the long run, this practice gradually led not only to the ever stronger power of the state but to the rule by one man. This is the practice which produced the "personality cult" and attempts at its theoretical and ideological justification.

Despite the relentless pressure of the forces of capitalism and imperialism, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet working people managed during Stalin's leadership to preserve the achievements of the October Revolution, to consolidate them through successful industrialization and the raising of the general cultural and technical levels of the country, and to maintain and develop the Soviet Union as a support for all socialist and progressive movements. However, for objective and subjective reasons, Stalin did not oppose the bureaucratic-statist tendencies stemming from the great concentration of power in the hands of the state apparatus, from the merging of the Party and state apparatus and from one-sided centralism. On the contrary, he himself became their political and ideological champion.

Along these lines a pragmatist revision of certain fundamental scientific propositions of Marxism-Leninism was carried out, first in the theory of the state and the Party, then in philosophy, political economy and the social sciences generally.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a political system of government in a state, which is withering away and as an instrument of the struggle of the working class in the process of demolishing the economic foundations of capitalism, and creating the political and material conditions for a free development of new socialist relations — this Marxist-Leninist theory was transformed into Stalin's theory of the state which is not withering away, which has to grow ever stronger in all areas of social life. To the apparatus of this state is assigned too big a part in the construction of socialism and in the solution of the inner contradictions of the transition period, a part which sooner or later must begin

to obstruct the development of the socialist factors in society and economy.

On the international scene, that is, in certain aspects of the Soviet foreign policy and in relations among the socialist countries, phenomena of this kind also appeared after the Second World War. These showed most strikingly in Stalin's action against socialist Yugoslavia, action unanimously condemned at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as obviously contrary to the real interests of socialism.

In resisting this pressure and in fighting for the independence of their country, the Yugoslav Communists and the people of Yugoslavia not only fought for their right to free socialist development but contributed to the indispensable fight against statist-bureaucratic and other anti-socialist deformities in the development of socialism and in the relations among nations which have chosen the socialist path. This resistance, therefore, was socialist and progressive by definition, and precisely for this reason it contributed to the strengthening and advancing of socialism throughout the world.

All these and other well-known negative phenomena and errors caused damage both to international socialism and to socialist construction in the Soviet Union, particularly because they were taken over and repeated by certain socialist countries. They were unable, however, to deform or impede for a length of time the development of socialism in the Soviet Union, because socialist forces in this first country of socialism had so grown and become so strong that they even kept breaking through the barriers of bureaucratism and the "personality cult." This, precisely, was the reason why immediately upon the death of Stalin and the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union various deformities born under the influence of the above-mentioned negative tendencies gradually began to be removed. The high level of development of the productive forces in the Soviet Union, the dominant social influence of the working class and the formation of a numerous intelligentsia closely linked with the socialist system make possible the further successful development of this process, furnishing a new incentive in the advance of socialism.
Contemporary development and the results so far achieved enable the socialist forces to fight with even more consciousness, persistence and vision for further progress of socialist relations and for abolition, weakening or isolation of the sources of various deformities in socialist development. Theories and practices tending to preserve the transitional forms of socialist construction and to shut off the perspectives of the working class and the whole nation must be denounced, eliminated, rejected.

Questions of the greatest interest to the working people are becoming more and more pressing for the leading forces of the socialist countries and of socialism generally: questions of the form and method of managing the economic and other functions of society; of the democratization and gradual limitation of administrative and centralistic management; of steadily widening the participation of workers in the management of the means of production and of the economy in general; of constant expansion, both horizontally and vertically, of the scope of social self-management; of further promotion of the system of distribution in conformity with the socialist principle "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his work"; of continuous improvement of the standard of living; of ever broader development of the forms and methods of socialist democracy in all spheres of social life; of consolidation and further development of the democratic rights and the democratic social obligations of the individual citizen; and so forth.

Socialist countries cannot all proceed in the same manner and at the same rate in solving these and similar tasks in the development of socialist relations of society. The course, manner and rate depend on concrete conditions in each particular country; on the relation of class forces; on the degree of development of the economic prerequisites of socialism; and on the political structure, traditions, and social consciousness of the masses.

These problems, however, being part of the whole, represent one integral task of international socialism, and especially of those Communist parties and socialist forces generally that are in power or can substantially influence the movement of society. To resolve the contradictions of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism means, in the first place, to solve these problems and thus to secure an uninterrupted advance of all aspects of socialist construction. In following this course, Communists may sometimes err. Such errors are not difficult to correct because they are errors of progress. It is incomparably more difficult to correct errors and their consequences arising from hindering the socialist development of society and from stubborn clinging to outlived forms and methods.

Development of Socialist Thinking.
On Dogmatism and Revisionism

The advance of socialism does not depend alone on the objective conditions of social development and the determination of the working class to struggle concretely for the construction of socialist relations. It also depends on the subjective abilities of the leading political forces. Therefore, constant advances and enrichment of socialist scientific thinking are an inseparable component of the struggle for socialism and its construction.

The labour movement has achieved important results in this struggle, relying in its practice on the great scientific discoveries contained in the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. However, during the past few decades and under the influence of various social factors, Marxist thinking has lagged behind the development of contemporary society. Its later development has not always consistently followed from its basic scientific premises and results, and often even these premises themselves have been subjected to pragmatist revision.

Thus, many gaps have appeared in the further scientific Marxist elucidation of contemporary social problems, and especially of the laws and contradictions of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. Further development of socialism categorically demands that the laws and contradictions of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism be examined and that socialist scientific thinking soon be freed from the pragmatist pressure of
social factors obstructing its progress. Only under this condition will Marxist thinking be capable of undertaking a scientific explanation of the principal social problems of contemporary humanity, an explanation of the laws of the movement of the socialist society itself during the period of transition, thus still more successfully clearing the path for socialist practice.

Two social factors and, accordingly, two ideological tendencies within the labour movement have been chiefly responsible for obstructing socialist theoretical thinking, for revising certain basic Marxist scientific premises.

The first factor is the phenomenon of bureaucratism and statism. Intimately connected are tendencies toward an ideological monopoly and attempts to turn Marxist thinking — which remains alive and revolutionary only through its own further development and through constant gathering of experience by practice — into a static list of stagnant dogmas and abstract verities accommodated to certain pragmatic and transient needs. From this spring contemporary dogmatism and attempts at a specific statist-pragmatist revision of certain scientific propositions of Marxism and Leninism. It is this very dogmatism which, while effecting a profound antiscientific revision of Marxism and Leninism, declares as revisionism every genuine effort for actual further development of Marxist thought in contemporary social conditions.

The lag in Marxist thinking behind the developments was enhanced by the fact that Stalin, within the Communist movement and for several decades, in an authoritarian manner and without brooking objection, passed judgment on all contemporary processes. Some of Stalin’s evaluations proved correct, but a number of his theoretical concepts have been refuted by practice. In his theoretical analyses, Stalin used to deviate from the method of materialist dialectics toward subjectivism and metaphysics. Yet, even regardless of the character of his various theories, it is clear that such an ideological monopoly must have contributed to the dogmatization of Marxism and Leninism.

Dogmatism in the Communist movement has been accompanied by pseudo-revolutionary sectarianism, loss of confidence in the strength of the working class, and non-perception or underestimation of the results of the development of socialism so far. This situation also makes it impossible to see the full effect of socialist revolutions and of the results of socialist practice on social development in capitalist countries and on the policies of the ruling top circles — all of which has greatly changed the conditions of the struggle for socialism. Knowledge of these facts matured much too slowly within certain Communist parties, and this hampered the timely discovery of appropriate forms of struggle and helped weaken the links of the parties with the masses.

The second factor producing a negative effect on the development of socialist thinking has been the influence of bourgeois ideology, opportunism and reformism, of declasse anarchism, and so forth, on the labour movement. Such influences give rise to attempts at a bourgeois-liberal and reformist revision of the basic scientific propositions of socialism, of Marxism and Leninism. Revisionism of this kind actually is an ideological reflection of the abandonment of socialist positions and expresses tendencies toward the restoration of this or that form of bourgeois society. Revisionism of this kind strikes the revolutionary ideological foundations of the labour movement and, in the names of pseudo-liberal slogans, sacrifices the interests of the working class and socialism to the interests of the reactionary forces of society.

Within the Communist movement revisionism of this kind rests on vacillation in the face of difficulties, on disorientation caused by the subjective weaknesses of the movement or by deformities in the construction of socialism. In socialist countries, this revisionism appears as a reactionary brake on socialist development, as a factor in the deformation of the socialist state in the direction of the bourgeois political system, and as a factor of destructive anarchist undermining of the political basis of socialist society. This kind of revisionism is also one of the sources of bureaucratism, because it brings grist to the mill of the remnants of the bourgeoisie and reactionary ideologies. It becomes objectively the bulwark of anti-socialist forces, and thus obstructs the development of socialist relations, sharpens inner contradictions and helps fortify the role of the state and bureaucratism.
In order to remain the actual leading force of the most progressive conscious socialist action, the Communists must be able to fight both of these negative influences upon the development of socialist thinking and socialist construction. Persistent ideological struggle on two fronts, against both forms of revision of the scientific foundations of socialism as given by Marx, Engels and Lenin and confirmed by the entire practice of socialism so far, is one of the essential conditions of the advance of socialism in the transition period.

At the same time, however, the Communists should reject all attempts at warping the justified struggle against either form of revisionism and at exploiting it to thwart the efforts necessary for further development of the scientific foundations of Marxism and for a scientific, Marxist explanation of the new phenomena, which are characteristic of the contemporary world and according to which the Communists must determine their practical tasks.

Situation in the Labour Movement

In the face of the great task and opportunities presented by the contemporary relation of social forces, the labour movement stands disunited. This disunity arose, in the first place, because of the objective laws of the contemporary movement of society and the social position of the various strata of the working class, and thus it is objectively conditioned. Still, the working class should be at least as united as are the various factions of the bourgeoisie. Despite the different and often profoundly contradictory interests of its factions, the bourgeoisie has learned through long experience how to find those basic elements of co-operation which enable it to achieve unity in the essential questions of its class interests. The working class in many countries is still young and too inexperienced as an influential and especially as a ruling class.

So it happens that among the leading groups of the various sections of the labour movement a serious lack of understanding still prevails about the social significance of the struggle for some form of unity of the labour movement and progressive forces generally. This disunity is more often deepened than bridged. Instead of resisting the pressure of the antisocialist forces through mutual support of its various sections in essential questions of socialism and peace, the labour movement, often through blind, hostile pragmatism, throws the door open to alien influences and interests, while entire sections of it, in one form or another, climb upon the bandwagon of reaction.

The League of Communists of Yugoslavia believes it is one of the fundamental tasks of the leading socialist forces — if they really wish to contribute to the development of socialism — to fight persistently and constantly, regardless of their ideological views, for the creation of such an atmosphere and relations in the labour movement as will render possible various forms of common action and mutual or unilateral support, close the door to the enemy, and make for increasingly freer forms of a socialist contest of opinions within the labour movement itself.

Communist and Other Revolutionary Parties of the Working Class

The Communist and other revolutionary parties of the working class have played an enormous part in the development of socialism so far. The Communists, under the leadership of the great figure of Lenin, fought at the head of the October Revolution and opened a new epoch of history. The Communists were the only force capable of assuming the leadership of the revolutionary energies and cravings of the masses of the people of Yugoslavia, China and other countries, and of organizing them for struggle and victory. The Communists led in the revolutionary expropriation of the ruling classes in the many countries of the people's democracies. They have been as a rule the revolutionary core or the most determined ally in the many anti-imperialist movements and uprisings. They were the most militant core of the anti-fascist movement and the anti-Hitler war.
During the past few decades the Communists were at the head of the great processes that gave new substance and direction to the entire history of mankind. Rallying the most revolutionary parts of the labouring masses, training them in the spirit of class consciousness and knowledge of the historic role of the working class, and endeavouring to follow the revolutionary teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin in everyday struggle, the Communist parties have been the active leading force of the revolutionary process since the October Revolution.

This great historic role of the Communists can no longer be disputed or belittled by slander from the enemies of socialism — or by the malicious gossip of the opportunists, philistines or petty-bourgeois phrase-mongers. It cannot be diminished even by the Communists' own mistakes, however big. Without this role of the Communists, the world would not be what it is today and what inevitably it will be tomorrow.

In all these developments, the Communists represented and organized the living revolutionary socialist action such as the broad working masses understood, demanded and were willing to back. That is why they won victories. And they will win them in the future only under these conditions.

However, these victories were accompanied also by certain negative phenomena in the international Communist movement: bureaucratism, dogmatism, opportunism concealed by leftist slogans, sectarianism, exaggerated feeling of power, ideological and political monopoly, and so forth. As a result, certain Communist parties did not sufficiently realize that the conditions of the struggle of the working class had changed considerably. They failed to notice the consequences of the contemporary relation of social forces in the world. Therefore, they were not always capable of setting themselves tasks in accordance with actual developments.

Because of this lag and under the influence of bourgeois forces, certain Communist parties found themselves withdrawn into their own shells, isolated, especially in the countries where objective conditions were unfavourable to the development of a revolutionary labour movement. A direct consequence of this isolation, again in certain parts of the Communist movement, was the inclination to await passively the results of international developments. This brought some Communist parties to the danger point of ceasing to act as the revolutionary, creative, initiating factor of social development in their own countries.

This is the ground on which often grows the helpless attitude toward the opportunist and reformist disposition of a part of the working class. Here also, at times, the policy prevails of passively awaiting external developments in the hope that they will revolutionize the working class. In everyday practice this is revealed in sectarian revolutionary slogans concealing the inability to act or move from one spot.

The League of Communists of Yugoslavia believes that every Marxist party is always required to be capable of organizing or supporting the struggle of the working class for precisely those political and economic objectives that in a given situation the labouring masses can understand and fight for. Only by thus conducting the struggle can the Communists be linked with the working masses and train them through their own experience for further struggle and achievement of higher goals. However, many objectives for which the working class is willing to fight, or already is fighting, are not always given the needed attention or are treated in a dogmatic manner.

Communist Parties can assert themselves as the most progressive and, in this sense, the leading socialist factor by comprehending the socialist process as a whole despite the diversity of its proponents and tendencies, and by realizing that inevitably different factors come to the fore under different conditions. On the understanding of this fact mostly depends whether they will find their place in the whole of this process and act as initiators of conscious socialist action. The conception that Communist parties have a monopoly on every aspect of the movement toward socialism and that socialism is expressed only in them and through them is theoretically incorrect and very harmful in practice.

The fact that certain Communist parties are now passing through a process of emancipation from dogma and self-isolation, that they are undergoing a regeneration.
by reexamining past experience and by seeking their own paths toward socialism, expresses the need of getting in step with the time, with contemporary tasks.

Social Democratic Parties and Movements

A large part of the working class and other working masses, primarily in certain highly developed capitalist countries, follow the Social-Democratic and similar parties. Therefore, the situation within these parties should be taken as a component part of the situation within the present-day labour movement as a whole.

In countries where developed forces of production furnished the base for a rather strong economic position of the bourgeoisie, the labour movement mainly took the path of reformism which, in principle, denied the necessity of a revolutionary struggle of the working class for power and which foretold an automatic transformation of capitalism into socialism through a number of gradual reforms. The chief reason for this should be sought, among other things, in the fact that the bourgeoisie in these countries, under the revolutionary pressure of the working class and under the influence of the October Revolution and the entire subsequent development of socialism, was compelled and for familiar reasons also was in a position — to make certain material and political concessions to the working class. This situation explains why the Social-Democratic parties did not and cannot develop in backward countries.

Under the pressure of the working class in all fields of social and economic life, the bourgeoisie made a number of concessions to Social-Democratic movement. But along with this grew the influence of the bourgeoisie and imperialism on a section of the labour movement. In the end this resulted in a softening and deflecting of the pressures of the working class. But while this strengthened the Social-Democratic parties, it also fostered the tendency among them to address themselves more and more to the middle classes and the inclination of large numbers of their members to adopt the ideology and psychology of the middle classes. This is what chiefly accounts for the constant growth of trends in Social-Democratic parties to keep away from a conscious and systematic struggle for socialism and to become pragmatic instruments of reformism.

Accordingly, certain sections of Social Democracy have increasingly denied the right of the working class to independent policies and shut off the perspective of its independent political action, while at the same time supporting bureaucratic and technocratic tendencies in theory and in practice. The role of the administrative apparatus in the Social-Democratic parties, and especially in trade unions, has grown tremendously. This apparatus itself shows tendencies toward gradual fusion and coalescence with the state-capitalist apparatus. Such a situation creates favourable ground in the Social-Democratic parties for the strengthening of bureaucratism and of a specific reformist dogmatism.

History has already refuted many of these dogmas. Today, for instance, it is inane to deny the revolution when it is known that the revolution has changed the world. And the whole conception of political democracy, actually consisting in the mere maintenance and idealization of the bourgeois multi-party system under whatever conditions, is static and constantly refuted by experience. This conception does not take into account the basic laws of the movement of society. Above all, it does not see mutual inter-action of the material basis of society and the political forms built upon it. The sponsors of this conception do not realize, or do not wish to realize, that grafting the political forms of bourgeois democracy upon new economic relations created by the revolution, whether they wish it or not, means nothing but ideological preparation of the road for the forces of bourgeois restoration and, ultimately, of bureaucratic statism.

For all these reasons, various Social-Democratic parties which have come to power by parliamentary means are not in position to change social relations quickly and radically. They restrict themselves mainly to passing superficial or very limited reforms, primarily those which
the pressure of economic factors compels the capitalist order to accept anyway. And even these measures are burdened by bureaucratism and technocracy. Within these limits, in fact, Social-Democratic parties suffer the effects of the same laws of the transition period that act upon the entire labour movement.

The same reasons that determine a reformist-dogmatic line in the domestic policies of various Social-Democratic trends also determine their foreign policy views. Some of these trends give active support to acts of imperialist policies of their bourgeoisie, thus protecting the extra profits of their own nations at the expense of other nations, deepening the antagonisms of the contemporary world and feeding the sources of danger of new wars.

Under the influence of the profound changes in the present-day world, whose real causes and sources many Social-Democratic theorists do not see, all forms of the dogmatism grown out of the first stages of development of the labour movement and socialism have suffered severe blows. Thus, the dogmas of Social-Democracy also are beginning to crumble.

The dynamics of the contemporary social processes inevitably will be reflected also in the future development of the Social-Democratic parties. Those among them which have rallied a large part of the working class will face the alternative of either adopting socialism and unity of the working class or losing their social influence.

Role of Trade Unions

The working class does not fight for socialism through political parties alone. For more than a century, through strikes, big and small, the trade unions have waged a partisan war against the power of capital, continuously undermining it. The constant increase in the number of unionized workers and steady strengthening of the trade unions have made them the biggest organized mass force of the working class.

The mounting influence of the trade unions in a great part of the world is an important factor not only in the improvement of the momentary situation of the working class, but, objectively, also in the struggle for socialism. The labour movement as a whole is greatly interested in the development of the trade unions. This makes for a wider participation of the broad masses of the working class in social and political events and actions and for a more effective protection of their interests, although bureaucratism and opportunism in high places of the unions often weaken their strength, fetter the initiative of the working class and are responsible for neglect of objective opportunities for union activities.

It is characteristic of the present stage of the trade union struggle that the unions no longer confine themselves to demands of higher wages and shorter working hours but, with an ever stronger voice and determination, also demand participation in the management of production and control of certain social-economic key positions.

The role of the unions in the organized struggle of the working class both for the fulfilment of its current economic, social and cultural demands and for the strengthening of its social and political influence, is even greater. It has still broader perspectives in the countries whose specific internal development has created a situation where classic political parties of the working class do not exist despite a very high degree of economic development and despite a strong working class in these countries. This is the case, for instance, in the United States of America.

The role of the trade unions is also great in the socialist countries under social ownership of the means of production, and still greater where workers' self-management is in effect.

The fact that in a number of socialist countries the unions have, of late, played an increasingly important part in the management of enterprises testifies to the strengthening, not the weakening, of the role of the trade unions in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. With the change in the social position of the working class, abolition of the remnants of wage labour and increased direct participation of the working class in the distribution of the social product, the role, character
and tasks of the trade unions also are changing. Yet cer-
tain fundamental functions of the unions — for instance,
economic, protective or educational — remain and even
grow in importance.

The international trade union movement is as split
as is the international labour movement in general. The
League of Communists of Yugoslavia will fight also in
this area for every possible form of unity in the struggle
for the common interests of the international labour move-
ment. And it will support every act of co-operation of the
Yugoslav trade union movement with other union move-
ments in the common interest.

The League will take note of the fact that the same
negative influences that appear in the labour movement
generally also act on the international trade union move-
ment. In fighting for unity in the international trade
union movement, the League does not renounce the ideo-
logical and political struggle against all reactionary in-
fluences and anti-socialist tendencies within that move-
ment.

**People’s Anti-Imperialist Movements in Underdeveloped Countries**

A number of parties and movements, primarily in
underdeveloped countries, in certain periods of history
can play a positive role in the development of society and
even clear the path to socialist advance. In certain coun-
tries in Asia, Africa, Latin America, at a certain stage of
the movement of society toward socialism, a positive role
can be played by certain national movements of progres-
sive orientation, movements growing out of the struggle
against imperialism and capitalist monopolies. In this
respect, all anti-colonial movements also have a historically
progressive role. Workers’ movements, if freed from
dogmatism and opportunism, will take account of this.
Moreover, they will support these parties and movements
as forces of progress, as long as they remain such, and
will co-operate with them as with equal partners.
standing, and a broader and freer exchange of opinions and experiences.

The Yugoslav Communists will accept and encourage various forms of equal co-operation, not only with the Communists of other countries but also with the Socialist parties of various trends and with other progressive parties and movements — individually or collectively. They will do so whenever they feel that such co-operation may contribute to the consolidation of peace, rapprochement among the peoples and progressive movements, and advance of socialism.

However, while struggling with the utmost persistence and to the best of its ability for unity and co-operation among the workers' and progressive movements, the League of Communists of Yugoslavia believes that this co-operation should in no case lead to abandonment of its socialist positions of principle or to abolition of the ideological and political discussion and mutual criticism. The contemporary world movement toward socialism appears in many forms and trends which cannot be abolished, because they reflect the complexity of contemporary social conditions. The ideological struggle arising among these various trends is actually a struggle for the establishment of the most progressive tendencies in concrete circumstances. The Communists would abdicate their revolutionary social role if, in these conditions, they abandoned the ideological struggle against anti-socialist, opportunist, sectarian-dogmatic and other negative tendencies in the labour movement.

**On Bilateral and Multilateral Co-operation**

The Yugoslav Communists do not make an issue of the form of co-operation among the Communist parties or between these parties and the Socialist or other progressive movements. They make a point of its content. They favour both bilateral and multilateral co-operation provided it is always based on full equality, with no imposition of attitudes and no interference in the internal relations of the parties, and provided it serves the concrete interests of peace, socialism and social progress in general. The League of Communists of Yugoslavia believes that both forms of co-operation are indispensable elements in uniting the actions of the socialist forces and the progressive efforts of humanity. If, however, the Yugoslav Communists under present conditions assign primary importance to the various forms of bilateral co-operation, they do so first because of the altered objective conditions of the contemporary development of socialism; and, second, because the earlier forms of multilateral co-operation of the workers' parties — aside from their positive aspects whenever they corresponded to the given historic period — produced negative phenomena which caused considerable harm to the struggle for socialism and peace and which the labour movement must live down so that they may not again sully the democratic principles of socialist internationalism.

**Ideological Monopolism**

Among these phenomena one must first mention tendencies toward ideological monopoly.

Tendencies toward ideological monopoly have always been a barrier to the development of socialist thinking and a source of dogmatism and opportunist-revisionist reaction. These tendencies gave rise to aspirations toward unconditional leadership in the labour movement, which led to many negative consequences at a time when not one single working class party was in power. Tendencies toward ideological monopoly can cause even greater damage after the parties of the working class have assumed power. It is the task of the labour movement — especially of the Communists of the larger, stronger socialist countries, with greater responsibilities — to fight both in theory and in practice for an equality of relations, on the principle that the correctness and progressive character of an ideology or of certain forms of socialist construction...
depend exclusively on their vitality and verification by practice, not on the approval by some international forum. Every aspect of ideological monopoly that hampers free socialist development in socialist countries is a brake on international socialism in general. For this reason, the League of Communists of Yugoslavia regards as particularly useful today the creation of such forms of international co-operation as would on the broadest possible basis unite efforts toward solution of the common practical problems of peace and of the struggle for, and the building of socialism.

The interest of further socialist development demands free, socialist, democratic relations among the parties of the socialist countries. In the struggle for the victory of socialism, the working class of one country or another may for a certain period of time be the standard-bearer, may stand in the front ranks or have a superior material force at its disposal. But this does not mean that it thus acquires a monopoly position in the labour movement, least of all in ideology. Past experience has shown — and it is even clearer today — that co-operation in the labour movement is possible only among equals.

Also characteristic of contemporary development is the fact that in several countries Communist parties have come to power. Thus, the question of relations among the Communist parties assumes yet another, historically new, aspect.

The leadership of Communist parties in power is responsible for the work of these parties not only to its membership but to the entire people. This fact must be reflected in the character of their mutual relations.

In their mutual relations, the Communist parties in power cannot make decisions belonging to the jurisdiction of representative organs elected by all citizens. The Communist parties in the practice of their international relations have so far often failed to keep this in mind, thus restricting the importance and role of the above-mentioned representative organs.

To proclaim the path and form of the socialist development of any country as the only correct one is nothing but dogma, obstructing the process of the socialist transformation of the world. The general aims of socialism are common, but the rate and forms of the movement of society toward these aims are and must be different, depending on the concrete conditions in individual countries or parts of the world. Consequently, freedom of internal socialist development and absence of any imposition of various forms, non-interference in the internal life and progress of various movements, and a free and equal exchange of experience and socialist theoretical thought should be the basic principle of mutual relations among socialist countries and socialist movements.

Attempts at designating the recognition of diversity in forms of development of socialist processes as a "new" ideological phenomenon, as "national communism", have nothing in common with a scientific explanation of contemporary socialist development. Such theories can arise only in the minds of dogmatists, or are deliberately injected by the spokesmen of the bourgeoisie in order to introduce disorientation and ideological confusion into the labour movement. Such designs must not prevent the comprehension and working out of specific developments and the orientation of the working class primarily according to the problems and conditions of its own country.

On Proletarian Internationalism

In emphasizing the absolute necessity for Communists to fight for socialism and its construction according to the conditions of their countries, the League of Communists of Yugoslavia also fosters the idea of proletarian internationalism in its ranks and educates the Yugoslav working people in this spirit. Always, in its entire development, proletarian internationalism has been concrete. This principle includes, first, the determination of the labour movement to develop in its countries a consistent struggle for socialism and the daily interests of the working people; to utilize all forms of work and struggle to increase its influence; to prepare for taking over power and, after that, to undertake the construction of socialism in accordance with the interests of all working people in the
world and with the interests of peace and the progress of humanity. Second, the principle of proletarian internationalism includes support of the same struggle in all other countries, that is, solidarity with the labour movement and socialist forces of the world in their struggle for the fulfilment of their daily economic and political demands, for peace and for socialism.

During and after the October Revolution, when the Soviet Union was the only socialist country, defense of the U.S.S.R. as the main stronghold of international socialism was one of the principal criteria of proletarian internationalism. Today the criterion is broader. Proletarian internationalism demands correct relations and solidarity with and support of every socialist country and every socialist movement which truly fights for socialism, for peace and for peaceful, active coexistence among nations.

The idea of proletarian internationalism also demands of the Communists that they fight staunchly for peace; that they denounce and fight against all imperialist action; that they work relentlessly to ensure the conditions of all-round mutual acquaintance, knowledge of nations and their rapprochement; that they insist on the abolition of national and racial prejudices and of all forms of inequality, chauvinism and hegemony peculiar to the capitalist system; that they work for the strengthening of the independence and equality of the peoples and on mutual peaceful aid and all-round cooperation among all nations.

In our own case, in addition, the idea of proletarian internationalism demands of the Communists to work particularly on the constant strengthening of brotherhood and unity among the peoples of Yugoslavia, on their equality and their unhindered material and cultural progress.

In all its contacts with other Communists, Socialist, progressive and anti-imperialist movements and in all its international relations in general, the League of Communists of Yugoslavia has upheld and will continue to uphold the great idea of proletarian socialist internationalism as its guiding principle.