

1969

# TEORIJA in PRAKSA

international  
colloquium  
socialism and  
democracy

---

Review for social questions

●

## in this number

- For a New Model of Socialism in Czechoslovakia ●
- Socialism and the Human Factor ● Socialist Democracy — the Highest Socio-political Value of Our Time ●
- The Dilemmas of a Communist Party "in Power" ● Experiences of "Non-parliamentary Opposition" (APO) and other papers and discussions by editors and collaborators of reviews from six states ●



special edition in english

# TEORIJA in PRAKSA

186613  
+

Review for social questions

1969 YEAR VI

PUBLISHED BY THE HIGHER  
SCHOOL FOR SOCIOLOGY,  
POLITICAL SCIENCES AND  
JOURNALISM

**BOARD OF EDITORS:**

Vlado Benko, Vlado Beznik, Adolf Bibič, France Hočevar, Dragana Kraigher, Stane Kranjc, Boris Majer, Lev Modic, Mitja Ribičič, Zdenko Roter, Rino Simoneti, Lojze Skok, Majda Strobl, Mitja Švab, Zvonimir Tanko, Ivo Tavčar, Boris Zihert

**EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

STANE KRANJC

**MANAGING EDITOR**

ZDENKO ROTER

**EDITORIAL SECRETARIAT**

Vlado Benko, Adolf Bibič, Albin Mahkovec, Zdenko Roter, Ruža Tekavec, Vinko Trinkaus

**LAYOUT**

Jure Cihlař

**TRANSLATORS**

Miša Grčar, Meta Grosman, Heda Ivanuš, Mirko Jurak, Franc Slivnik

**EDITORIAL OFFICE**

Ljubljana, Titova c. 102, teleph. 311-039 and 311-377

**MANAGEMENT**

Ljubljana, Titova c. 102, teleph. 311-039, ext. 232

**SUBSCRIPTION**

The price of special issue in English is 50 dinars in Yugoslavia and 4.00 US dollars in foreign countries with postage included.

**BANK ACCOUNT NUMBER**

501-3-386/2, Higher School for Sociology, Political Sciences and Journalism, for the review *Teorija in praksa*; foreign currency account: VŠSPVN: 501-620-7-3204-10-646, for the review *Teorija in Praksa*

PRINTED BY the Printing Office of Učne delavnice in Ljubljana and ČGP »Delo«, in Ljubljana 1969.



PO 892/1970



# Contents

Participants in the Colloquium . . . . .	3
STANE KRANJC: Introductory Words . . . . .	6
PAPERS WRITTEN FOR THIS COLLOQUIUM:	
IRENA DUBSKA: For a New Model of Socialism in Czechoslovakia . . . . .	10
JAN HYSEK: Selfmanagement in Production as the Immediate Task of the Development of Socialism in Czechoslovakia . . . . .	19
JAN KAMARYT: The Significance of the Discussion on Democratic Socialism in Czechoslovakia . . . . .	25
JAROSLAVA KRYLOVA: To the Relations among Socialist Countries . . . . .	38
JAKUB NETOPILIK: Formation of the Democratic and Humanistic Features of Socialism . . . . .	41
DUŠAN ROZEHNAL: Topical Problems of the International Communist Movement . . . . .	59
VINCENT ŠABIK: Socialism and the Human Factor . . . . .	65
ZDENEK ŠTASTNY: Some Functions of the Political Relations and Institutions in the Social System of an Agricultural-Economic Enterprise . . . . .	72
FRIEDRICH TOMBERG: Experiences of APO . . . . .	83
OCTAVIAN CHETAN: Socialist Democracy — the Highest Socio-political Value of our Time . . . . .	93
ION MITRAN: The Communist Party in the System of Socialist Democracy . . . . .	100
ALEXANDER TANASE: Democracy — Humanity — Personality . . . . .	108
VLADO BENKO: Internationalism Today . . . . .	118
ADOLF BIBIĆ: Dialectic between »Society and State« in a Socialist Political System . . . . .	125
JANEZ JEROVŠEK: Efficiency of Participational Social System in Working Organizations . . . . .	134
PETER KLINAR: The Leading Role of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in Self-government Pluralism . . . . .	138
IVAN KRISTAN: Socialism and Direct Democracy . . . . .	143

BOSTJAN MARKIĆ: Elections and Socialist Democracy	147
SLAVKO MILOSAVLEVSKI: The League of the Communists of Yugoslavia in the System of Self-government . . . . .	150
ZDRAVKO MLINAR: Conflicting Interests and Participation	159
NAJDAN PAŠIĆ: An Approach to the Discussion about Socialist Democracy . . . . .	163
ERNEST PETRIĆ: Some Dilemmas of Socialist Democracy in Connection with the National Problem . . . . .	170
ŽIVOJIN RAKOČEVIĆ: Planing as a General Link in social Work in Socialism . . . . .	173
ZDENKO ROTER: The Dilemmas of a Communist Party »In Power« . . . . .	184
VOJISLAV STANOVČIĆ: Some Principal Problems of the Construction of Socialist Political System on Democratic Bases . . . . .	187
ZORAN VIDAKOVIĆ: The False and the True Problems of Socialist Democracy . . . . .	199
FRANCE VREG: Socialist Democracy and Opinion Pluralism	209
I. SOCIALISM AND DIRECT DEMOCRACY: Participants in the discussion: Najdan Pašić: 218, 225, 260; Wolfgang Haug: 224, 225, 247; Mario Spinella: 226, 234; Alexander Tanase: 227, 229, 256; Meino Büning: 228, 229, 341; Adolf Bibić: 230; Detlev Claussen: 231, 233, 249; Miroslav Jodl: 233; Čazim Sadiković: 235; Irena Dubska: 238; Zdenek Št'astny: 239; Jan Hysak: 242; Vojislav Stanovčić: 243; Ivan Babić: 252; Quintin Hoare: 255; Ivan Kristan: 257;	
II. POLITICAL SYSTEM IN SOCIALIST COUNTRIES: Participants in the discussion: Irena Dubska: 262, 267; Adolf Bibić: 263; Ion Mitran: 270; France Vreg: 272; Alexander Tanase: 275; Rudi Supek: 277, 292; Mario Spinella: 284; Čazim Sadiković: 286; Monika Steffen: 289; Miroslav Kusy: 295; Zdenko Roter: 295; Detlev Claussen: 299; Zdravko Mlinar: 303; Peter Klinar: 306; Vojislav Stanovčić: 308; Vinko Trček: 311; Božidar Debenjak: 315; Jakub Netopilik: 317; Boštjan Markič: 319; Ivan Kristan: 321; Ivan Babić: 324; Zdenek Št'astny: 325;	
III. THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND PROGRESSIVE FORCES IN THE STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM: Participants in the discussion: Mario Spinella: 330, 348, 381; Ion Mitran: 320; Jaroslava Krylova: 333; Octavian Chetan: 335; Zdenko Roter: 340, 375; Zdenek Št'astny: 342; Peter Klinar: 343; Alexander Tanase: 347; Dušan Rozehnal: 351; Živojin Rakočević: 354; Branka Magaš: 358; Vincent Šabik: 360; Wolfgang Haug: 363, 381; Čazim Sadiković: 368; Adolf Bibić: 371; Vojislav Stanovčić: 373; Irena Dubska: 377; Božidar Debenjak: 379;	
NAJDAN PAŠIĆ: Concluding Words . . . . .	383
Information about the Review Teorija in Praksa . . . . .	387
Notes on Foreign Reviews . . . . .	391
Selected Bibliography of Articles and Books of Yugoslav Authors on the Theme Socialism and Democracy . . . . .	399

# Participants in the Colloquium

## 1. CZECHOSLOVAKIA

- Jozef Bob, *Kulturni život, Bratislava*  
Jozef Bzoch, *Kulturni život, Bratislava*  
Irena Dubska, *Sociologický časopis, Prague*  
Jan Hysek, *Nova Mysl, Prague*  
Miroslav Jodl, *Sociologický časopis, Prague*  
Jan Kamaryt, *Filosofický časopis, Prague*  
Jaroslava Krylova, *Nova Mysl, Prague*  
Miroslav Kusy, *Filosofický časopis, Prague*  
Jakub Netopilik, *Filosofický časopis, Prague*  
Dušan Rozehnal, *Nova Mysl, Prague*  
Vincent Sabik, *Kulturni život, Bratislava*  
Zdenek Št'astny, *Sociologia, Bratislava*  
František Vartik, *Filozofia, Bratislava*

## 2. FEDERAL REPUBLIC GERMANY

- Meino Büning, *Neue Kritik, Frankfurt*  
Detlev Claussen, *Neue Kritik, Frankfurt*  
Frigga Haug, *Das Argument, Berlin*  
Wolfgang Haug, *Das Argument, Berlin*  
Monika Steffen, *Neue Kritik, Frankfurt*  
Friederich Tomberg, *Das Argument, Berlin*

## 3. GREAT BRITAIN

- David Fernbach, *New Left Review, London*  
Quintin Hoare, *New Left Review, London*  
Branka Magaš, *New Left Review, London*

## 4 ITALY

- Mario Spinella, *Rinascita, Milan*

## 5. ROUMANIA

- Octavian Chetan, *Revista de Filozofie, Bucharest*  
Ion Mitran, *Lupta de Clasa, Bucharest*  
Alexander Tanase, *Revista de Filozofie, Bucharest*

## 6. YUGOSLAVIA

- Ivan Babić, *Kulturni radnik, Zagreb*  
Vlado Benko, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Adolf Bibić, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Aleksa Buha, *Pregled, Sarajevo*  
Božidar Debenjak, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
France Hočevar, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Peter Klinar, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Marko Kosin, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Stane Krajnc, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Ivan Kristan, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Boris Majer, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Boštjan Markič, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Vjekoslav Mikecin, *Kulturni radnik, Zagreb*  
Slavko Milosavljevski, *Pogledi, Skopje*  
Zdravko Mlinar, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Najdan Pašić, *Socijalizam, Belgrade*  
Ernest Petrić, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Jovan Raičević, *Socijalizam, Belgrade*  
Živojin Rakočević, *Socijalizam, Belgrade*  
Prvoslav Ralić, *Socijalizam, Belgrade*  
Zdenko Roter, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Čazim Sadiković, *Odjek, Sarajevo*  
Lojze Skok, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Ratomir Sokolović, *Praksa, Titograd*  
Vojislav Stanovčić, *Socijalizam, Belgrade*  
Majda Strobl, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Rudi Supek, *Praxis, Zagreb*  
Janez Škerjanec, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Stipe Šuvar, *Naše teme, Zagreb*  
Niko Toš, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Vinko Trček, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*  
Zoran Vidaković, *Socijalizam, Belgrade*  
France Vreg, *Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana*

# SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY

*International Colloquium of the editors and collaborators of reviews for social problems. Organized by: Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana and Socijalizam, Belgrade. Ljubljana: February 26th 1969 to February 28th 1969. Papers and discussion.*

# TEORIJA in PRAKSA

Stane Kranjc

## Introductory Words

*At the beginning of our meeting I would like to express a warm welcome to you on behalf of the boards of editors of the reviews TEORIJA IN PRAKSA and SOCIJALIZAM and also our thanks to you for accepting our invitation. At the same time I would also like to wish you a pleasant stay in Ljubljana.*

*Socialism is becoming a practice and a consciousness; its forms and the problems it encounters vary. Theoretic thought is a constituent element, an active factor of this process. Exchange of opinions and experiences is not good only for the development of theoretic thought of socialism but also represents an urgent need of all progressive movement. From this insight there sprang the idea of a meeting of the various boards of editors concerned with the theme: Socialism and Democracy. The events of the past year, the expansion of socialist thought and practice in Czechoslovakia and later intervention with the whole complex of causes and consequences, the proliferation of student and youth movements and protests, their resistance against the existents social, political, and also other human restrictions and against various forms of pressure, and the direct threats of the imperialist forces, all these encouraged us to realize this idea as soon as possible. The confrontation of opinions and exchange of experiences of socially engaged and socialistically directed publicists are useful and stimulating in many ways. Such discussion helps to overcome distrust and egocentrism, which also socialism could not avoid, and at the same time — we firmly believe in this — it spreads the general findings of the struggle for socialism and democracy thus contributing to enrich their contents.*

*In our invitation to this meeting we indicated three main subthemes to be discussed. This is, of course, only a very rough definition of a large complex of problems, causing many misunderstandings because of its width and social commitment. Direct democracy, selfgovernment, participation of the masses in social and political life are the essential elements of humane and democratic socialism. The political*

systems of socialism, its institutional frameworks, given to encourage the action of individuals, of social groups, and above all of the working class, also essentially determine the content of socialism. The reflections of contemporary socialist thought are centered upon the position, structure and the role, and also upon various deformations and simplifications of the role of the avant-garde political parties and of other progressive movements. Avant-gardism of political parties is not given per se, it must rather be confirmed anew in each historic moment. The party can have a really revolutionary function, the function of the progressive historic subject; it can be the carrier of the most progressive ideas, theories, strivings and actions of the widest socialist layers. History provides many examples of this. But it can also turn into its opposite: it can become a new power over society, over man, a means of his alienation, a new bureaucratic power and an element of dehumanization.

The theme which we are considering is in the very centre of social practice. There is no reason for the discussion to be limited to general terms only. It will of necessity concern our time and its problems. Our considerations will not be able to avoid the analysis of the processes, contradictions and tendencies of the practice of socialist development, and also of the deformations of this practice. At the same time an attempt should be made at a critical estimation of the weaknesses and onesidedness of several critiques of socialism, which are often not only un-scientific but also have explicitly political aims.

Contemporary socialism is encountering many problems and difficulties. The historic, social, political, cultural, and other conditions of its growth vary a great deal. That is why it is not surprising if also the answers to the questions raised are often divided. This is in the very nature of the thing. The actuality cannot be changed by subjective wishes only, and even less by a priori ideological constructions. The consideration of the specific national and other circumstances of the struggle for socialism and democracy and the full autonomy and independence of all the subjects of the revolutionary action are a necessary imperative and condition of the success of the struggle for socialism and democracy. We must lay special emphasis upon this fact today. The consciousness of the necessity for international solidarity and for unity in diversity can proceed and prosper from this principle and from such practice only.

Our Colloquium should affirm this principle. We expect an open discussion and with, no doubt, a great extent of scientific, critical qualities and much tolerance. We desire a



live and open discussion and exchange of opinions about the results of scientific investigations and also about social practice in general. That is why this Colloquium is not centred upon previously prepared papers but rather upon the live word, as we stated before.

For us socialism does not represent a geographic idea, it rather represents a live, world-wide, social process. We reject any thesis trying to frame socialism within the boundaries of socialist countries, or even to limit it to a concrete historic practice of one sole socialist country. Forcing models of socialism is not only non-scientific but also very harmful for the development of the idea and of the revolutionary practice of socialism. The differences in views and projects are a necessary consequence of various circumstances; at the same time they are also a part of the complicated and contradictory process of learning the laws of social development, of various experiences, and similar. We cannot accept those views which measure progressiveness only by the correspondence of a certain movement or project to the previously determined schemes.

Socialism and democracy are uniform processes. This is becoming an unquestionable fact. The one presupposes the other; the more socialism develops its essential characteristics, the main elements of its content, the more and in a similar proportion democracy develops also. That is why the title of our Colloquium lays emphasis upon the profound, inner interconnection of these two ideas. The insight about the unity and inseparability of socialism and democracy should represent the fundamental starting point for the revolutionary action and for the progressive theory.

Many of us are meeting here for the first time. But this does not mean that we are strangers to each other. We could at least in some extent get acquainted with the things occupying our minds from the reviews which we edit and to which we contribute. There is probably nobody among us who would not value the considerable efforts of our Czech and Slovak friends for the reestablishment of the humane vision of a socialist society. We follow with great interest the reflections of our Italian friends about socialism and democracy. The search for new ways in the Roumanian circumstances attracts our attention. We do not doubt that the criticism expressed by the progressive new left against the alienation of the existent world represents an important encouragement for socialism. Saying this we do not want to be closed to the experiences of several other countries and movements. Since we are united by a common wish and struggle for socialism and democracy our discussion can be profitable and fruitful.

# Papers Written for this Colloquium



Irena Dubska

sociologický  
časopis

## For a New Model of Socialism in Czechoslovakia

The rejection of the given socialist system is losing its natural basis in the developed capitalist countries. Socialism can no longer be reasoned as the struggle against poverty, and also the struggle for power and socialism has become an abstract term, no longer effective as mobilization. From the economic point of view socialism can be only a collective ownership of the means of production, and from the political point of view only the power of working people, still this is not everything: the concept of socialism loses its significance if it does not include also a new type of human relations, a new hierarchy of tasks, a new idea of culture and life. That is why the strategy of the struggle for socialism includes also a higher role of the consciousness in the new conditions: if the intolerableness of the given system becomes relative, additional intervention is needed to make people aware of the urgency of the needs, which are not met by the given system, and of the possibility of their realization in a different system. This thesis was developed a few years ago by André Gorz (in German translation: *Zur Strategie der Arbeiterbewegung im Neokapitalismus*, 1967, Europäische Verlaganstalt); from this point of view he was critical as regards all the partial requests taking in consideration the worker as a consumer only and not as a producer and citizen, as a »human being« who does not ask the question regarding the total capitalist system confronting it with a global and complex socialist alternative.

I would not like to discuss Gorz's study meritoriously here, I would just like to call attention to his considerations because, in my opinion, they include three important statements in a condensed form and they are very important for defining the efforts towards a new model of socialism in Czechoslovakia. This is first the establishment of social and historical limits of that model of socialism which emerged in the theory and practice of the first socialist country in

the world, of its inappropriateness and ineffectiveness as regards the contemporary circumstances of the developed European countries, and the needs of the revolutionary movements in these countries. Secondly, it lays emphasis on the human content of socialism, surpassing all the signs of collective ownership of the means of production and the political power of the working people by total social-human solution, by a change of human relations, and the model of life as the appropriate aim of socialism. And finally, thirdly, it represents an emphasis on the crucial meaning of the theory and consciousness for formulation, and for ways of the realization, of the global and complex socialist alternative.

*The Traditional Model of Socialism and the Crisis in Czechoslovakia.* Other representatives of our editorial boards will give the summary of our theoretic discussions and the analysis of the humanist concept of socialism in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. I would just like to state in short my opinion regarding two problems:

1. the problem of the traditional model of socialism in its relation to the Czechoslovak crisis,
2. the problem of the inner totality of the planned model of the future development.

At this I shall draw upon the results of the interdisciplinary research team for the problems of the social and human relations in the scientific-and-technical revolution, working at the Philosophical Institute of CSAV, led by R. Richta. I am a member of this team. I shall particularly often refer to an extensive explanation of the theoretic and political position, as published by the collaborators of this team in the central communist news-paper *Růde Pravo*, July 10 to 12, 1968. At this I would like to call attention to the fact that this treatise as a whole, and particularly some individual passages of it have caused reservations and statements of disagreement in the publications of some other socialist states, especially the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic Germany.

In the course of the last year the term »crisis« has been often used and connected with the name of Czechoslovakia, meaning either the topical internal political crisis connected with a certain inner political situation, or meaning the international connection, i. e., the events of the month of August. This inflation of »crisis-ness« divested the attention from the more basic actuality, namely from a lasting total social crisis in which our two nations found themselves even before January 1968; the problem of the nature and causes of *this* crisis is crucial for locating all the other phenomena, which we consider to be a part of this crisis, and also for the

alternatives of the future socialist development in Czechoslovakia. The view, recently appearing in our newspapers, namely the view that before January 1968 »mistakes were made in the practice of the development of socialism in Czechoslovakia«, has as a result a rather banal conclusion, that the significance of the policy following January lies in a »consequent overcoming« these mistakes and shortcomings.

Somebody, and especially if he was watching the process of regeneration in Czechoslovakia after January 1968 from outside, must have been amazed at the variety of the unsatisfied group interests and a great number of conflicts, which came to light: in an immense confusion there came to expression the contradictions and tensions between intelligentsia and the working class, between artists and technicians, between youth and the older generation, between Czechs and Slovaks, between functionaries and members, between communists and noncommunists, etc. In a hard public criticism individual groups of the inhabitants called attention to those aspects of the former system which made them feel most neglected, above all sounding their requests and tendencies for a social change. Still, the actuality to which both Czechs and Slovaks reacted was one sole actuality: a profound many-sided crisis of the traditional model of socialism, which had come into a system of inner contradictions and in conflicts with the requests of the majority.

The traditional concept of socialism emerged and was strengthened in the conditions of states, which had no material, social or cultural basis for a socialist development. Thus in given circumstances of a certain historical period there arose an attempt — in many ways functional — to join together the revolutionary negation of the basic forms of bourgeois society with an actuality whose level of the means of production, economic interests and political tradition made it impossible to fill this negation with a real positive socialist meaning, and to develop the existence of the socialist society on its own basis and according to its inherent logic. Thus a transitional stage was created in which the socialist orientation was promoted above all by means of temporary solutions by the political power centre, i. e., in a deformed way, and this limited reality was interpreted by Stalin as the only, universally valid model of socialism. However, for the creation of socialism as imagined by Marx and Engels, and other socialist theorists, a mere negation of the private ownership of the means of production and of the organs of the bourgeois power is not enough. According to its true picture socialism cannot exist as a society where bourgeoisie

is replaced by bureaucrats who execute supremacy and decide about the freedom of other people, where instead of the capitalists the state takes care of the industrialization, changing the entire country into one sole big centrally directed factory, where the social justice is finally attained so that everybody is divested of the possibility to advance his creativeness and to develop his role.

Czechoslovakia began its course of the socialist development with several characteristics, which cannot be doubted: as an industrially developed country with a numerous and highly qualified working class, with an influential socialist movement, with an unusually high level of education, with a deeply rooted tradition of a democratic view, with a lively awareness of the struggle for freedom, and of the national independence, which have been a part of our history for centuries. The Czechoslovak Communist Party was — Yugoslav Communist party apart — by far the strongest communist party in people's democracies of that time, and till February 1948 it made every effort to take into consideration the specifically Czechoslovak circumstances (its natural leading role in the state and the democratic forms of the second phase date back to this time). After February 1948 this orientation changed, since there soon arose the historical paradox when the state, whose conditions were most alien to this model, was unjustly believed to defend the traditional model of socialism. The speeded introduction of the Soviet model into our circumstances, beginning with the economy and ending with culture, and its successful confirmation, cannot be explained only by the fact that the Czechoslovak leadership was not able to do what Yugoslavia did, thus acquiring the historical merit for the further fate of socialism: it seems that in the tempo and extent of this process a certain dialectic became evident, influencing in this direction the specific Czechoslovak circumstances (the support of the masses to the leadership of the communist party, own experience of the masses with the acquisitions and also with the limits of the formal democracy, especially with its restrictions to the political system only, and with the tragic consequences of too great a number of political parties, etc.). When the revolutionary changes came to an end the features and methods of the system, as followed the month of February, began to come into conflicts with the national circumstances and tradition; still, in the age of the so-called cold war the mechanism of this system was so perfect that a complete change presupposed a change inside its leading organs, or rather, a change of the contents of its international

relations. The effectiveness of the industrial basis, which Czechoslovakia brought to the socialist revolution, had its role in a relatively late showing the marks of crisis at the application of the traditional model of socialism to the circumstances in Czechoslovakia; but when these marks became evident the crisis was more acute than in other countries, and it represented a crisis of the economic and political model. The extensive development of economy — still today functional in some other states — brought about a profound economic stagnation of the country, condemned to an intense economic development; the system of central direction which did not pay any attention to the variety of the interests of individual social elements, had to come — especially with its repressive methods — into a sharp conflict and tension with the democratic experience and requests of our people and their creative possibilities.

In this profound and many-sided crisis of the concept of socialism in Czechoslovakia, a crisis whose features are different from crisis in other European socialist countries, and different also from the conditions under which the communist parties are functioning in western countries, the ideas and efforts for a humane, marxist model in socialist development have their roots. This situation is giving room to the practical and theoretical forces at the same time also determining them as regards the possible new universalist interpretations. Today real socialism represents a sequence of development stages and forms, and its general features do not exist anywhere outside these forms and stages. It should be conceived of as an open system, within which each country, seriously interested in socialist orientations, should independently choose such concepts of socialist development as are suitable to its specific conditions. To determine such an orientation would mean a positive solution of the Czechoslovak crisis. This was the direction of the activities of the regeneration process following January and — in my opinion — it should not be understood as the correcting or overcoming of the partial mistakes and shortcomings, or as an expression or reaction to the narrow conception of the political crisis, or a mere formulation of the »future tasks« for the new stage; it should rather be understood as an attempt to solve, in a different way and in the given circumstances, the *creative content and significance of the socialist orientation*, for which our two nations definitively decided in February 1948.



## *The Model of the Future Socialist Development in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic Conceived as an Organic Whole*

Speaking theoretically about the model of the future socialist development in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, we must state that this project does not refer so much to the actual situation, it rather refers to some central directives as expressed in the programme for action, and particularly to the perspective orientation arrived at by our sociological theory even before January 1968, and as represented by the above mentioned interdisciplinary research team. From the above stated concept of the crisis of the traditional model of socialism in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic it is clear that also in a very short explanation of the project of the future development two elements must be conceived together: the specific characteristics of our country and situation and the concept of socialism as such.

Socialism and communism are neither the final goal of history nor an end in themselves, but rather means of liberation of man, means of humanization — of an optimum satisfaction and development of the needs of a highly civilized man. The new society can only emerge with the positive overpowering of capitalism, its economy, its political and cultural inheritance and the entire industrial basis of the civilization. This means an actual nationalization of the means of production, a creation of the relations of mutual co-operation and thus a more penetrating economic interest structure, which will give rise to a general initiative; this means a constitution of the real organs of democratic decisions, offering a higher level of freedom than the state level, and, finally this means a creation of an adequate material basis, i. e., the introduction of means of production into such a movement which will perpetually offer the conditions of permanent spread of the life process and of the permanent growth of the possibility of a creative selfassertion of man and development, of human forces or the development of the subject as a goal in itself. Only in this dimension there can open the perspectives of overcoming the present contradictions between the material efforts and spiritual wealth, between culture and civilization, between cultivation and consumption. In this sense the traditional model of socialism, making absolute those elements which were appropriate to the possibilities and needs of the states at the threshold of industrialization, was actually not suitable for many socialist countries.

The transfer of the means of production into state ownership does abolish the capitalist exploitation, but it does

not create a positive form of socialist economy: in a centrally directed system the state passes from the organ of the people into the employer of the people, the initiatives of economic development, familiar in capitalism, are lost and they are not replaced effectively by other initiative, the centre becomes bureaucratic and subjective, while outside it a general lack of interest and responsibility predominates, the national economy acquires the features of being a purpose in itself. In a certain extent we can again speak of the separation of the producer from the ownership of the means of production.

At a certain time the specific historical circumstances joined together the processes of socialization and industrialization so closely that industrialization began to be considered the sole task of socialism. But the humane nature of socialism cannot for ever be united with the traditional industrialization. In our country the artificial prolongation of the model of extensive industrialization, lasting at least for ten years, brought about a serious technical lagging behind, an unbelievable waste of human energy in a onesided mechanical work, an insufficient exploitation of science and the intellectual potential, a catastrophic state of services and life environment, and limited possibilities of increased consumption and shorter working time.

That is why the conception of the development of socialism in Czechoslovakia includes a project of a new economic system, based upon the development of the subjectivity of social work in all its elements, upon uniting work with enterprises; the planned exploitation of market economy represents the backbone of this orientation. This conception takes into consideration a structured social ownership (according to the level of the means of production, and the content and object of the activity of enterprises) with a scale of the forms of ownership from the big state enterprise to the national, co-operative and communal enterprises and to small, individual enterprises. Further, with selfmanagement socialist enterprises, separated from the subjects of market economy acting on their own account and with the creation of economic competition in the domestic and foreign markets; the selfmanagement organs represent the basis of interests of the general socialist initiative. In this model the state does not replace other factors in economic movement; by means of economic instruments and regulators the general conditions are created which make it possible for individual enterprises to decide independently, and which direct enterprises to the most progressive branches of economy and the most effective estimates of the sources in the country. The state prevents the abuse of the power of

monopoly and influences the creation of social wealth where the market criteria would not be sufficient, or, where an immediate preferences of socialist or human values should be created. The project of the new economic system is inseparably connected with a decisive shift from the extensive industrialization to the intense growth of the means of production, where the centre of the economic development is in the reorganization of the existent industrial basis by means of modern sciences and technics and at the same time also in the development of services, pre-productional areas and care for man. Special emphasis should be laid upon the fact that creation of the system of various material stimuli to further the scientific and technical development in Czechoslovakia is of specific existential importance: as a small state of limited sources and considerable scientific and cultural tradition and reserves we must be directed towards the products of a highly qualified labour with an increased role of technics and production.

From the above described outline of the project of an economic reorganization it can be seen that in all its elements and stages it creates the permanent presuppositions for the development of a socialist democracy (so for instance: the independence of socialist enterprises and the creation of selfmanaging organizations does not represent only one of the important elements of the new economic system, but represents also the most important pillar of the system of socialist democracy) and also that this reorganization cannot be realized without the change of the social and political system. (This has been proved also by the empirical fact that the preparation for the new system of economic management almost came to a point of stagnation before January 1968).

The socialist revolution did not put the power into the hands of workers in order to make their class domination eternal, but rather in order to gradually abolish the domination of one class altogether. This development was discontinued and even threatened by the overthrow of the revolutionary power. Soon after the revolution the authorities accumulated such means of power over all the spheres of life of the people, as had never been the case before, while at the same time the appropriate mechanisms of control of this power and the institutional guarantee against its abuse were not created at all. The bureaucratic-centralist system was not able to go to overcoming the class-struggle inside the country, to the gradual limiting of the pressure functions of its organs, to the demonopolization of the activities in the field of politics, to the discontinuation of interference into the spheres outside the political field, to increase of the rights of



citizens and of the decision of man: thus it narrowed the political basis of socialism, paralysed the activity of wide layers of population, and antagonized whole groups against the socialist development.

Class unity of socialist society does not mean the abolition of the differences among people, differences among individual groups and their interests. On the contrary, the composition of the socialist society consists of a network of various social roles, connected with a qualitative change of the division of work and division of social activities of people in general. In these conditions the union of social groups presupposes that various interests can show themselves fully and freely, confronting each other and influencing each other, thus being solved on this very basis. The evaluation of these sources of the development of the socialist society requires the creation of institutional instruments, which would make possible the assertion of the group and national interests. The democratic solution of the individual, group, and social interests permits a deeper and more general identification of people with socialist society, with its principles and values.

In Czechoslovakia the need has been felt that socialism should offer more real freedom than bourgeois democracy, freedom of speech, of scientific research, of artistic creation, of information, of forming groups and movements, of travel, etc., and more realistic rights to have a home, private property, employment and influence, legal security, right to education and possibility of development of ones abilities, rights to social and health security and insurance, to the democratic representation and protection of one's interests, and to a share in taking decisions. To ensure this freedom and rights is the goal of the socialist democracy. In our country the realizations of the change from the bureaucratic-centralist system to a system of socialist democracy means the exploitation of all the possibilities of representational democracy, especially of the parliament, as well as the union of direct and indirect democracy so that selfgovernment would be strengthened in all the spheres of social life where it is to surpass the boundaries of representational democracy. In this developing of the democratic formation of policy in perspective we can count upon a socialist plurality, based on the confrontation of concepts and people, on the opposition of partners and on mutual control. A profound change in the concept and assertion of the leading role of the Communist Party, its inner perfection and role in society, constitutes an element and a precondition of this entire process.

We have lived through the years when the entire content of socialism was devalued and shifted by ignoring, suppress-

ing, or replacing some elements of Marx's concept of socialism. Reflections on this actuality lead us to lay a special emphasis on its internal logic and wholeness when speaking about the main features of the socialist development: this project cannot work, and cannot be carried out, unless all of its basic elements are realized at the same time. (A series of partial reforms could again temporarily block the proper state). It is this very conscious organic wholeness, corresponding to the conditions in our country, that forces us to make a precise distinction between the actuality and the project, and to take great care in estimating the internal circumstances as well as the international space at the introduction of this model into life.

NOVÁ  
MYSL

Jan Hysek

**Selfmanagement in Production  
as the Immediate Task of the  
Development of Socialism  
in Czechoslovakia**

(Notes to the most recent development of this problem)

In 1967 selfmanagement in production was only a general idea in Czechoslovakia. The practice was based upon the so-called co-operation of the working people in management, established above all by the trade unions. The competences, as determined by the legal norm — the Resolution of the IVth Congress of the Trade Unions (later amended and specified by the VIth Congress) was *en bloc* made the law — were relatively wide and included also the »right to co-deciding« in several central problems. The actual practice is convincingly shown by the results of a sociological investigation made by Miloš Barta, CSc. from ČVUT, Prague.<sup>1</sup> On the basis of a content analysis of the entire activity of the factory council ROH in some machine factory from Prague (in the year 1966), he established only two instances of the tendency to surpass the frame-work of the part in management and a tendency which indicated the real management of the organs of selfmanagement (with deciding about the shortened period

<sup>1</sup> ČVUT = Ceske visoke učeni tehnice — High Technical school; CSc = candidate de sciencie — a scientific title ; CSAV = the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.

of work without an increase in intensity of work or in the number of workers, as originally proposed by the economic management; and with determining the new system for the distribution of the share in the results of the full year).

At the same time the information about the theoretical conceptions of selfmanagement in production and about the attempts of its practical application penetrates into consciousness. We have to do above all with the Yugoslav experiences, and also Polish and Hungarian experiences, and with the data about the experiment of an Illyrian selfmanagement enterprise in capitalist market economy, or about the establishment of the so-called autonomous collectives in English factories, according to the project of the Tavistock Institute. In spite of the necessary postscript, that we have to do with a different social actuality, we must try to avoid any mechanical transfer of structures which are alien to us. The assertion that selfmanagement is appropriate for underdeveloped, industrially backward countries, with predominance of small enterprises and of low level of management, has been a common political argument (contrary to the scientifically verifiable truth). The science of law and sociology has offered a more objective information.

Selfmanagement in production has been changing from an idea into a practical, immediate task only since the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party in January 1968. It is determined by the action programme of the party, as accepted in April 1968.

»The programme of democratization of economy connects the economic reform more closely with the processes which we face in the field of politics and the entire management of society, and encourages us to establish new elements to further develop the economic reform. The programme of democratization of economy comprises above all the realization of the independence of enterprises, and groups of enterprises, and their relative independence of the state organs, the full and real establishment of the rights of consumers to determine their own consumption and style of life, the right of free choice of working activity, the right and real possibility of various groups of working people and different social groups to express and to stand for their economic interests in the realization of economic policy.

We think it now the most important thing in the development of democratic relations in economy to settle the economic position of enterprises, their independence and responsibility.

The economic reform will more and more put the entire working collectives of socialist enterprises into a position, in

which they will directly feel the consequences of their good or bad management. That is why our party thinks that the entire collective, which will feel the consequences of the management, must influence this management. There arises the need to establish in enterprises democratic organs with clearly determined rights in the management of the enterprise. These organs would appoint directors and leading workers in enterprises, and the latter would be responsible to them for the results of their work. These organs should constitute a direct part of the managing mechanism of an enterprise, and not social organizations (that is why they should not be identified with trade unions). These organs would be constituted by elections of the representatives of the working collective and the representatives of people outside the enterprise, to secure the influence of general social interests and a highly qualified level of decision making; the representation of these people should be subject to democratic forms of supervision. Also the relations of responsibility of these organs, in connection with the results of their management of socialist property, must be settled. Several concrete questions must be settled in the light of these principles; at the same time the statutes of these organs should be proposed and the tradition of our factory councils in 1945—1948 used, together with the experiences of modern enterprises.« This programme was repeatedly confirmed by the plenary session of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party in December 1968; the resolution from that time obliged the communists in the federal government and in national governments to ensure in the first quarter of 1969 ... »the submission of the proposal for the establishment of a socialist enterprise and the law determining the fundamental dimensions of socialist enterprises. This would lay the foundation to make it possible for the enterprise councils of working people, and the conception of their activities, competences and responsibilities, to be settled with the necessary differentiation as a constituent part of a wider complex and as one of the major conditions of the entire settlement of the relations of enterprises in socialist economy.« The arguments concerning the concept and the contents of this law became the main »battlefield« of the institutional constitution of the councils of working people.

In the mean-time practice has spoken its word. The councils of working people began to exist and to work in some enterprises. This took place on the basis of a temporary directive of the government and by the help of the organization of trade unions, which, on its own initiative, became a guarantee for the activities of the new councils of working

people (it transferred some of its competences to them) and organizationally co-operated in their emergence. At the beginning of this year councils of working people of enterprises were established in 114 enterprises. This information is non-official — no central records are kept — it derives from a reciprocally checked survey of some interested institutions, so occasional inaccuracy could only result if any council escaped our attention. The above mentioned councils (114) were established mainly in relatively big enterprises; they represent one million working people. In several other enterprises committees of councils of working people are prepared.

In the contents of the activity of these councils there comes to clear expression the effectiveness of the functions of authority and of enterprise (appointments of top positions in enterprise, discussion about the long-term concept of the development and about advantages of integration of enterprises, principled decisions about the use of the accumulated means). The data about the composition of the councils of working people are of special interest. They were gathered by the method of a post-questionary. So far we have at our disposal only the data from two thirds of the established and functioning councils. The following is their composition: 71 % of technical and economic workers, 23 % of workers and 6 % of administration workers. In all these groups the best qualified workers predominate. The elections, mainly carried out only after August 21, 1968, were characterized by considerable democracy — with one exception they were secret and without any limitations as regards proposing and choice of candidates. The results of these elections prove that the best qualified workers, irrespective of their professional adherence, were elected by the majority of workers. Thus these elections did not prove the fear as often expressed, that the councils of working people would be essentially organs of laymen and non-specialists. On the contrary, the facts lead us to the conclusion that the »maturity« of Czechoslovak enterprises for selfmanagement in production has been proven in this very way.

Let us go back now to the arguments concerning the law about the socialist enterprise. By way of explanation we must add, that its mission is much greater than the legalization of the councils of working people of enterprises. We have, above all, to do with such a definition of a relative independence of enterprises which would make actual enterprising activity possible for them. This is an important step to the realization of the economic reform, which is based upon the realization of one of the necessary conditions of functioning of the



managed market economy. Also the central significance of establishment of the councils of working people in enterprises proceeds from this: they represent the only useful alternative to the former administrative management — they contain both, an element of destruction of those surpassed power relations and an element of dispersion and new creation of decentralized power.

That is why the preparations for the law about socialist enterprise were not limited to narrow circles of specialists, but were rather a matter of wide publicity. Today we are discussing the proposal of the federal government, which has already the form of a paragraphed declaration (we expect it to be discussed at People's Assembly on March 21, this year). The proposal of the federal government determines the mission of councils of enterprises essentially as an organ of the enterprise and as an organ of dispersion of power. The view of the consultative session of the councils of working people (which took place at the end of January, at Plzeň) and the preliminary view of the central council of trade unions (the final formulation will be furnished by the VIIth Congress of Trade Unions, prepared for the beginning of March, this year) both consider this proposal to be a compromise, which is acceptable at present. In this connection we often speak about »the acceptable minimum solution of the fundamental principles«.

The position of the government of the Czech Socialist Republic has brought a considerable liveliness into this daily, serious discussion. If we simplify a little, we can say that this position expresses above all the views of the leading economic workers; it shifts the contents of the activities of councils mainly to the controlling function.

The present hard economic position is an important, indirect but objectively effective, factor in these discussions. The central administrative management so far has exhausted its possibilities — the logic of the urgent requests of practice encourages the search for new ways, meeting in self-management.

A revival of theoretical work is also characteristic of the present time. It is centred above all in two scientific teams: The first of them was created at the Institute of State and Law ČSAV, and its management was entrusted to Professor Karl Bertellmann, CSc. The establishment of this team was approved in December 1967, and it continued the tradition of the scientific team of Dr. Radovan Richta for the investigation of social and human relations in scientific and technical revolution and of the scientific team of Professor Zdenko Mlynář from political and scientific life.

The first working meeting of Bertellmann's team was prepared for November 1968. But the so-called events of August caused a postponement and the team met for the first time at the beginning of February 1969, to discuss the first project of research. From the yet unfinished project for investigation we can see its widely conceived direction toward the analysis of the actual possibilities of the development of the socialist social selfgovernment in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, and in connection with the beginning of the scientific-technical revolution. Its time dimensions correspond to the wide concept of investigation. So far the following time periods have been considered:

1. stage — preliminary discussion and explanation of the project for research.
2. stage: 1970—1973 — intense activity in groups,
3. stage: 1974—1975 — synthetic work.,

The second scientific team is the group created at the Sociological Research Institute of ČSAV, lead by Dr. Dragoslav Slejška, CSc. Its manner of work is above all sociological — but it also contains some interdisciplinary elements. It was established in Spring 1968, at the Congress of ČSI sociological association. In the course of several meetings, they have come to an agreement that it will be the best, if in long-term research of the sociological aspects of all the forms of social selfgovernment, they concentrate, at the time being, above all upon the selfmanagement in production (i. e., above all upon the selfmanagement of industrial enterprises and factories).

In my view, this limitation is most correct for a transitory period. It will make possible to contrive a complex sociological expert opinion for the constitution of the councils of workers in enterprises and for its connection with a wider model of selfgovernmental management. It will also make it possible to call attention to certain dysfunctional aspects of the activity of the councils of working people. This decision has made it possible for the members of this scientific team to be rather engaged in discussions, which endeavour to explain the essence and the mission of the councils of working people and to create the necessary institutional prerequisites for their activity.

At the end of the month of March the legal position of the councils of working people in enterprises will be determined. Irrespective of the final form it is quite obvious, that the tendency towards social selfgovernment — which we consider to be the tendency of the whole world — will make its influence felt very explicitly in Czechoslovakia also.

Jan Kamaryt

## The Significance of the Discussion on Democratic Socialism in Czechoslovakia

We shall first deal with the problem of the concept of democratic socialism. Like other attempts to characterize socialism as the socialism with a human force, or, humanist socialism and similar, this concept was born from endeavours to separate a part, or a certain model of socialism from the variously discredited reality of the development of socialism in Czechoslovakia after the war. It happened that with us the so-called socialist democracy was being developed for twenty years, and this actually meant the adjustment of the general democratic principles of state society to the »needs of socialism«. Finally we came to the conclusion that only the adjective »socialist« was left over from socialist democracy, and from socialism only its negative presuppositions: the nationalized means of production and the political power of the working class. And thus also democracy was essentially reduced to its socialist content, from which only the function of power was left over.

It is not by mere chance that terms like democratic socialism and similar have tended to disappear from official speeches in the development after the month of August and numerous orators have begun to speak that there is no difference between democratic socialism and a socialist democracy. Also some advocates and representatives of the policy following January 1968 have begun to emphasize that the term democratic socialism may remind our opponents of the tradition of socialist democratism, and also, that it does not matter at all with what label the new democratic and socialist elements are to emerge in the policy which followed January 1968 in Czechoslovakia.

In spite of all the pessimistic considerations which, in the first days following August the 21st, announced an end of socialism, that it would be entirely discredited in Czechoslovakia, it seems that this ideal has not been discredited so far in spite of the »hard reality«. Now we are interested in



replacing the acute language of the revolution, which came to exist in the awareness of people long before the Czechoslovak January as a type of critical thinking directed against the bourgeois democratic reality of Czechoslovakia before the war and against the regime of Novotny, with a completely different language by means of imperceptible terminological changes (also I. Novotny once used the term the *improved* economic system instead of the *new* economic system). Particularly in the course of the recent months and within the framework of some practical compromises, various attempts have been made to imperceptibly replace this revolutionary language with a conservative and neo-Stalinist reformed language and so to offer anew to the people of Czechoslovakia — in an acceptable ideological compromise which is actually only a cover — what they refused without cover only a short time ago.

In the discussions, before and after January 1968, regarding the content of the Czechoslovak model of socialism, there appeared the fundamental democratizatiional elements in all the social spheres. In the sphere of *economy* they appeared as discussions about the new economic system, about the state property and enterprises, about preparations for the law on the socialist enterprise, and about the establishment of the councils of the working people in factories. In the *political* sphere there were discussions regarding the problems of the structure of the political system in Czechoslovakia, about the possibilities of the so-called pluralist democracy on the ground of the renovated People's Front and a new function of the so-called mass organizations, like the trade unions and youth organizations. Further, there were discussions about the centralist technocratic and manager model of socialism and its selfgoverning variant not only at the level of selfmanagement in enterprises, but also in the entire structure of people's committees and elections into these selfgovernmental organs at all the levels of management. In the *ideological and cultural sphere* these elements appeared in the organic connection with the profound democratic and progressive tradition of Czechoslovak culture in the past and recent times (avantgarde tradion) and in discussion of its position and political role in our national life, always emphasizing that in the deeply democratic environment of the first Czechoslovak republic there were laid the foundations of the Czechoslovak socialist culture, and that in this very environment the majority of those works was born which today are considered to be classic works of our socialist literature and art.

In the *sphere of philosophy* the basic discussion was centered upon the problems of socialism and critical thought, upon the criticism of the Stalinist deformations of socialism,

trying to emphasize above all the positive features of socialist society. From the main Czechoslovak philosophers *Karel Kosik*, *Robert Kalivoda* and *Radovan Richta* were most active in connection with these problems.

Now we shall attempt to give a short survey of the problems discussed by these three philosophers. In April 1968 the review of the Czechoslovak writers *Listy* (which succeeded former *Literární listy*, or rather, *Literární noviny*) opened the discussion about these problems.

*Karel Kosik* was the first to develop the criticism of our political system in a sequence of articles with the title: *Our Present Crisis*. Kosik used the term socialist democracy with an absolutely clear meaning. »The reason of our political crisis originates in the fact that the inhabitants of our state refuse to continue to live as masses without any rights while the carriers of the power cannot claim their leading role in the form of a police-bureaucratic dictatorship, i. e. of an exclusive monopoly of governing and deciding supported only by self-will and pressure. A radical solution is possible only when the system of policemanaged-bureaucratic dictatorship is replaced by the system of socialist democracy. The difference between the two systems is of the nature of principle. Absence of political rights, or lack of the same, on the part of the masses, belonging to the communist party or not, is the foundation of one system, while the other system is based upon the political equality and full rights of the socialist citizens.«

Kosik's thought about the necessity that the efforts of bureaucracy to create a *closed society* based upon the professional limitations of individual layers, similar to the middle ages, should be overcome provides an exit out of the present crisis, which has been — at least it seems so — proved by the recent development in Czechoslovakia. In practice this effort would mean that the workers must be closed in their factories, farmers in their cooperative farms, intelligentsia into libraries, so that their political activities and connections would be limited to a minimum. This closed society can be opened only by means of the new activities of the working class, which in the time of the events in January and August and later on constituted itself into an actual *political force*. The democratization of the trade-unions and of the communist party, introduction of workers' councils in factories, activation of youth- and student-movement, and the movement of the new socialist intelligentsia were constituent elements of process, which brought about a qualitatively new alliance of workers, farmers and intelligentsia in Czechoslovakia. »The fate of our present

crisis depends on the fact whether the working class envisages the gulf between ideology and illusions on the one side, and its actual political position on the other, and takes all the consequences from this. And taking all the consequences means to become again a political power, the avantgarde of the social alliance with farmers, intelligentsia, employees and youth, etc.«

The Stalinist policemanaged-bureaucratic regime and its variants in other European countries depoliticized the workers. Workers as a class no longer play a decisive role, this function has been taken over by the bureaucracy of the communist party which is only ideologically identified with the whole, pretending that its monopolistic governing position is the leading role of the class. While the ideology and the leading role have been made into a state religion the actual public political activity and the defence of the interests of the working class have been reduced to a minimum. The leading role of the working class, proclaimed in words, has been actually reduced to a mere right to repeat all the time the loyal criticism of the shortcomings, and even this usually only in production, of the mistakes in ones own working unit, which of course, were characteristic of the whole country and could not be abolished withing the framework of a discussion in one factory. As far as the political sphere was regarded it was only possible to approve in a manifest way certain information as put forward by the governing bureaucracy of the party from time to time, by the expressions of admiration, and agreement. At prearranged formal meetings one had to be indentified with the previously prepared proclamations and declarations.

The term socialist democracy is used with a completely new meaning also in the second main contribution to the problems of socialism, which was published also in the spring 1968 by *Literární listy*. We have in our mind the article of Robert Kalivoda: *The Democratization and Critical Thought* continuing the discussion centered upon the problem of the *political model of socialist democracy*, which has been topical ever since January 1968. Kalivoda considers it a positive result of the development after January that the problem of a fundamental change of the bureaucratic system of political into a democratic system has become the centre of attention. He considers problematic the way of how the immediate experience of the masses is formed into and immediate control reaction; this came to expression in the first theoretic reflection of these processes, namely in the conclusion that if the monopoly of power is bad then the plurality of power should be introduced, in other words, that a political

oppositions is to be created. Kalivoda reacts correctly to these first reactions trying to translate them into a state of the *actual critical thinking*, i. e., seeing the deeper connections, overcoming the primitive white-and-black estimates, and giving a concrete and deeper meaning to these reactions.

Kalivoda first expresses his view as regards the development of socialism after the immediate taking over the power. In this connection he makes an interesting comparison of Stalin and Trocky emphasizing that Trocky was the first to conduct the analysis of the Stalinist deformed socialism from the positions of socialism itself. Right with these first critics of Stalinism a certain ambivalence of Stalinism could be seen, that is why it is the more true today: if the critical thinking does not make an actual objective analysis and just accumulates the negative features of Stalinism, it will not be able to make a step forwards at indicating the positive tasks of the modern socialist society. Kalivoda thinks that the main failure of Stalinism is to be seen in its gradual, and now complete, failure in the international field, while it has had certain successes in its internal development. A certain analogy can be traced here with Germany, whose military-bureaucratic system did not derive its life capacity as an independent system of repression, but rather as a system which would gradually fulfil the objective social need of uniting Germany, a task which was beyond the German democratic forces.

Kalivoda characterizes the Stalinist model of socialism as non-marxist, because it basically liquidates the humanist essence of the original marxist socialism regressing in its understanding of the human sense of socialism into times before Marx. These elements from before Marx are combined in a special position: the governing elite, leading in the name of an aristocratic, platonic communism the inferior masses, including in itself a machiavellian element and Prussian sharpness linked with the Russian tsarist tradition. This stalinist model of socialism is no longer able to represent an alternative to the modern bourgeois democracy, especially of the European type. This of course does not mean that it has lost its attraction elsewhere in the world. Also there it is true that the critical thinking should not be exchanged for the critical moralizing. We should realistically see the fact that progress in human history is linked with barbarianism and pressure which cannot be explained by a white and black primitivism. The stalinist model of socialism has given a heavy blow to marxist theory and to the actual marxist socialism by pretending to be marxist itself.

After this theoretic analysis Kalivoda, in the second part of his treatise, discusses some development possibilities of socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia. It is true of Czechoslovakia that any socialism, pre-marxist, marxist or after-marxist, distinguishes itself from the liberal conception of man's emancipation by a request to ensure certain permanent human values for all the members of the society. From the non-marxist concept the marxist socialism is distinguished by the fact that it understands socialist changes to be the foundations of human emancipation and not to be a form of social leveling or making man a part of an ossified and generally valid scheme of social and human values.

Kalivoda's concluding thoughts are particularly important: they concern the way from indirect democracy, i. e. the democracy of representatives and parliamentarism. He says that also the traditional parliamentarism can become means of social repression. From the grounds of bourgeois democratic parliament of Germany there emerged Nazism and also Stalin replaced the old system of soviets by a system of parliamentarism in the time when Stalinism increased its unlawful repression.

The novelty of Marxism is the conception of the socialist democracy as a certain stage of the development towards the *socialist selfgovernment* as the highest goal of the socialist organization of the state. The gradual introduction of the elements of direct democracy creates preconditions for the gradual dying away of the internal repressive functions of the state. Kalivoda believes the following three factors to constitute the main elements of direct democracy:

1. The mutual exchange of information between the political leadership of the state and the large masses, by means of mass media, freedom of speech. The latter had the most important role in the development of events in Czechoslovakia since January 1968.

2. The processes taking place in the trade-union are a form of direct democracy; here the immediate organizations of workers and socialist trade-unions are emerging. The development following January 1968 has confirmed this central role of trade-unions in political emancipation of workers, and finally,

3. The problem of *worker's councils and councils in enterprises*, which represents the problem of the immediate management of socialist enterprises. Without these councils the new system could not develop, it could be even deformed into a political and economic supremacy of technocrat managers thus losing its socialist and democratic contents. The selfmanagement in enterprises is, and remains, the most



important element of democracy, because it means a break with the state-administrative management of the society; that is why critical thought should be directed towards this problem.

*Radovan Richta*, another Czechoslovak prominent philosopher and the leader of a very successful team for the investigation of the social and human relations in a scientific-technical revolution, in his treatise *Socialism and Critical Thought*, published in *Filozofsky časopis*, No. 3/1969, discusses above all the problems of the critical conceiving of the model of socialism.

The socialist criticism was at first orientated outwards, to the *object*. The critical reason — following the model of enlightenment — was concerned exclusively with this outer reality. It behaved towards it as a supreme judge, not taking into consideration its own *subjective principles*, starting points and models which it has imputed to the actuality. Goethe's thought that all the epochs moving forwards are objectively directed while the epochs of decay are subjective has been often emphasized. Such a onesided presupposition implies a human society which can sufficiently critically change itself, taking in consideration each of its development stages and existent forms, in short, a revolutionary society conceived by Marx as a »coincidence of changing the world and self-change«. The same thing happened to this objectively orientated socialist criticism as to Hegel's »critical reason«. Asking the objective world to the judgment it itself comes into the position of the accused.

*What is socialism*, is the crucial question of our society and of other societies. The official theoretical ideas were traditionally incapable to surpass the horizon of mere negative concepts of socialism; these theories were not able to make a distinction between the actual socialist content and its temporary shortcomings and deformations, which often had an anti-socialist non-democratic and even anti-human nature. That is why market forms, freedom of speech, selfmanagement institutions, several discoveries of modern science and technics, some humanitarian institutions, and sometimes even the development of education and modern art were considered to be the so-called »anti-socialist phenomena«. None of these elements were included into the Stalinist model of socialism, which is exclusively defined by two attributes: 1. the power of the working class, and 2. the nationalization of the means of production, i. e., a mere political and class negation overturning the basic attributes of the bourgeois management, an external negation of it. Marx of course conceived socialism and communism as a negation

of the bourgeois management on the basis of a positive, universal revolution at all levels, not only at the level of economy and the means of production but also at the level of policy, ideology and culture.

Richta states the following five features as the basic presuppositions and characteristics of socialism:

1. The existence of a marxist theory as a form of a freely developing system of thought surpassing the boundaries of the cartesian encyclopedic science.

2. The existence of a socio-political system from which — by means of the governing of the working class and its avantgarde, the communist party — the conditions of the class struggle and with them the necessity of the existence of any class power, i. e., political power in the real sense of the word, would be gradually eliminated; and this would open the way for a general emergence of selfgovernment and a higher degree of freedom (higher than the freedom in the state).

3. The liquidation of the exploitation and private ownership of the means of production and a »real nationalization« (Lenin) of all the production sources, i. e., the creation of positive relations of mutual cooperation or of interest structure, suitable only to the given contradictions and nature of the social work and offering possibilities for a general and successful socialist initiative.

4. The presence of an industrial civilizational basis and the cultural level appropriate to it, which makes it possible for the dynamic of the productive forces to develop to such a state which will enable a permanent spread of the life process of all the people, which would have as a final result the creation of circumstances of a general, mutual human cooperation.

5. By means of all these changes a gradual attainment of a higher level of the self-realization of every man thus gradually leading the society to a general development of the human creative forces.

— — —

In the second part of my paper I would like to mention some discussion of Czechoslovak philosophers, economists and sociologists regarding the problem of the *selfgovernmental model in socialism*. At this I am drawing upon the treatise of a Czeck sociologist D. Slejška: *The Possibilities of a Selfmanagement Model in our Enterprises in our Conditions*, as published in *Filozoficky časopis*, No. 2, on the basis of some results of the discussion at the seminar about the

theoretic problems of socialism in Czechoslovakia, which took place in Prague last June. This seminar was organized with cooperation of the organizations of the Communist Party, and Sociological, Economic and Philosophical Institute of ČSAV. Some hundred famous scientists and institutes and other scientific institutions from Prague took part in this seminar. A note about this seminar can be found in *Filozoficky časopis*, No. 2/1969.

In his discussion of self-government model Slejška proceeds from the following structure of socialist countries and from the following basic parameters:

1. The *parameter of centralization*, based upon the need for social cooperation of activities, especially economic activities and planning, and on the value ascribed to the social unity.

2. the *parameter of collectivity*, emerging in the sense of democracy and equality, and supported by the intense initiative and equality of the masses, and by the value of their real social liberation,

3. the *parameter of managerialism* supported by certain elements of management, by the need of effectiveness and the value as ascribed to the responsibility and specialist qualifications.

In general the author characterizes the development in Czechoslovakia as follows: In the year 1949 collectivism was relatively strong in Czechoslovakia, the centralization was medium strong but increasing while managerialism was withdrawing. Czechoslovakia in 1960: centralism was strong, managerialism and collectivism in general equal, between medium and weak. Czechoslovakia in 1968: centralism was withdrawing, collectivism in the democratic sense was increasing, managerialism was withdrawing slowly. This third period, which has been prominent recently, is characterized by a relative equality of all the three basic parameters with a domination of a democratically conceived collectivism. The author points out that a similar development is characteristic of Yugoslavia also.

The technocratic and the selfgovernmental model represent a real perspective of a future development with us. They both lay emphasis on the democratization of policy and de-etatization of economy, which should be evident above all in a considerable autonomy of the economic units, especially enterprises, and in the central organs of the state administration. They differ from each other as regards the solution of the question in which extent the democratic relations are to penetrate the economic sphere.



The technocratic or managerial model rises the former contradiction of the political and economic sphere. According to it the real domain of democracy is policy only. A special emphasis is laid upon the democratic deciding at the bottom, the choice of functionaries takes place by means of elections and there is a predominant responsibility beginning with the top. Contrary to this the economy within the framework of autonomous and competing organizational units is managed by the correspondent leading workers essentially in an autocratic way. These responsible specialists follow economic and not political criteria. Taking decisions begins at the top and responsibility at the bottom to extend toward the other side. The choice of the leading workers is executed by means of appointments based upon specialist qualifications. In socialist conditions it is not clear who is the subject of the initiative.

The second of the above mentioned alternative models is the *selfgovernmental model*. This model takes in consideration the experiences of some other socialist countries, according to which the divergance between economy and policy can last only for a short time in the development of the socialist social relations. The economic reform cannot be effectively executed without adequate political changes. In accordance with the self government model the relations of democratic socialism must penetrate the political and the economic sphere. This model minimizes the power structure and diminishes the value ascribed to power. The selfgovernmental model cannot deny the importance of the specialized and good deciding and managing, still it subordinates the same to the democratic decisions of the working collectives, which establish their representative organs of the type of the workers' councils or councils of the working people, or our former factory councils. It is essential for the selfgovernment model that in it the relations of supremacy and subordination are limited by the very essence of the arrangement of this system. It is further of importance that the working collective itself becomes the responsible subject of the initiative in which its relation of the ownership of the means of production is realized.

Some economists with us pointed out the possibility of the conflict between the principle of selfmanagement in enterprises and the principle of specialized qualification. One of the major reproaches to the selfmanagement conception of enterprises was the statement that this was less effective than the managerial. This reproach was based on the theoretical ideas and also on some practical experiences.

Numerous Czech economists and sociologists think that the director appointed by the Council of Working People on basis of a public advertisement will certainly be better than the directors appointed on the basis of discussions of various town organs of the Communist Party and ministries. The authority of the director, the working capacity and discipline of the employees will be greater in a factory where the director is elected by workers or appointed by their representatives, and where the total income is divided under the control of the Council, than in a factory ruled by the monopoly of a few functionaries.

The discussion has proved that the selfgovernment alternative represents the only complex proposal which actually exists for us. Of course, it would be a mistake to evaluate the selfgovernmental and not-selfgovernmental concept as the socialist and the antisocialist concept, as the democratic and the undemocratic one. Everybody who has participated in the discussion is aware of the fact that both variants involve socialist and democratic elements. But extreme notions of selfgovernment and extreme notions of the managerial model should, of course, be rejected.

The *problem of interests* can serve as a starting point. The analysis of the nature of these interests, and particularly the works of O. Šika, mean the beginning of the economic reform with us. The selfmanagement is a solution which presupposes the unity of all the interests at all the possible levels. The unity of the short-term and long-term, local and general social interests and also the unity of the interests of man as an employee and as a manager of the enterprise. Our economists have pointed it out that the problems of unity depend on the attained level of civilization, on the level of the means of production and on the nature of man's work. That is why, such a unity of interests cannot be created by wishes similarly as the interests cannot be directed by institutional solutions. This contradiction of selfmanagement can be seen from the economic point of view in the position of man as an employee and the manager of the enterprise. If an extreme selfmanagement was chosen then trade-union would be superfluous. If employees directly decide about their enterprise then it makes no sense to have an organization which would represent them.

Many of our economists have reservations as regards the starting points of some philosophers, according to which socialism should above all overcome the alienation of man and ensure his selfrealization in the immediate production. Nobody wants to deny that these ideas may be right in general, still at the given moment we have to do with forcing

feeling of selfrealization upon people who do not realize themselves. This selfrealization cannot be brought about by an election of a fifteen member workers' council by a thousand workers, which fact should abolish the alienation of workers bringing their selfrealization.

Models with extreme solutions should be severely criticised according to the opinion of several Czechoslovak theorists. The technocratic model in its extreme formulation, in which the independence of the leading workers, specialists in not mentioned, abolishes the principle of democratic socialism. On the other side, selfmanagement brought into its extreme can come into contradiction with the economic rationality and effectiveness. In the given situation the combination of the selfmanagement elements with those of manager model may prove good. The organs of selfgovernment should in the relation to the specialized management limit the latter's ruling position, at the same time giving it full freedom for its specialized activities. The following functions should be entrusted to the Councils of working people: 1. the appointment of the topmanagement, i. e. the leading specialists of the enterprise, 2. the problems regarding the distribution of the total income, 3. the problems regarding the long-term concept of the enterprise, its acceptance, creation and aproval. As regards the director it is quite clear that he can be recalled by the Council of the working people. In the sense of the ruling position of the managers the Council of workers must be superior.

The necessity of selfmanagement has been derived by some philosophers and sociologists from the need for a regeneration of democracy. The so-called direct democracy and complete selfmanagement were the goals of this need. Of course, on the other side, it has become clear that the logic of emergence of the new economic system of management is connected with a certain nature, limits and possibilities of selfmanagement, given in the concrete need to constitute collective enterprises, which would be materially responsible for their economic activities and independence, and this in concrete economic and political conditions. We cannot speak about democracy in general in this connection. In a similar way as the emergence of the capitalist society created a certain need in this sphere, i. e., the necessity of a formal democracy, we can see here a new basis with collective producers within the framework of the social ownership of the means of production which will struggle for a new concrete type of democracy in the economic and political field.

It is unrealistic to speculate about the selfmanagement as if though it dropped from the sky, completely isolated from the economic management. The workers' collectives in enterprises must — as market subject — have the possibility to decide about things which influence their income. That is why they should get a certain independence now with the Law on Socialist Enterprises. The necessity of selfmanagement was spontaneously proved last year by the establishment of the Councils of the working people in 150 big enterprises, which were elected democratically. The principle of selfmanagement does not exclude the principle of the specialist qualifications or of the management by qualified specialists, as some people say. Taking in consideration the fact that enterprises are initiative subjects who act rationally then they will choose and elect good leading workers and managers, or else they would be acting contrary to their own economic interests.

In the end I would just like to mention the essence of the critical approach to the problems of selfmanagement, which has been predominant in Czechoslovakia recently. Selfmanagement certainly does not mean salvation and it should not be made into a myth. With us there exist several external factors which frustrate the functioning of a socialist enterprise (regulatory systems as taxation, market, etc.). It is a fact that selfmanagement with us has already helped to constitute a socialist enterprise, and it should also outrule the enterprise of the managerial type. In a sense it is a paradox, that selfmanagement has a real influence upon the introduction of selfmanagement, as has been proved by practice, even though the creation of external economic factors should be necessary for its introduction.

Temporary laws about selfmanagement have been accepted while the Law on the Socialist Enterprise has not been issued yet. So far the economic system has been discussed at a rather abstract level but often empirically introduced. That is why we need laws which would legalize this new economic system. From our experiences so far we can conclude that everywhere where selfmanagement has emerged there exists a natural tendency to change the factory into an actual socialist enterprise. Selfmanagement is not the only factor of the democratization but it must represent one constituent element of the democratic political system. A special role is played by the function of trade-unions as regards the state and selfmanagement and in this field, in connection with selfgovernment outside the enterprises there arise most numerous controversies.

# NOVÁ MYSL

Jaroslava Krylova

## To the Relations among Socialist Countries

All the socialist countries, have, beyond doubt, set themselves as a task of primary importance the development of mutual relations and strengthening of unity. This corresponds with the needs of socialism also. Yet today we do not witness strengthening of unity, on the contrary, we see it grow weak. The practice of socialist building and of the relations inside the socialist world so far has denied the concept of the monolith, granitic unity, of the fact that the mere victory of the socialist revolution abolished the objective grounds whence various views, concepts, and also contradictions and conflicts among socialist countries, would spring. The reason lies in a series of facts, from which proceeds not only the possibility, but also the necessity of various view-points and of differences in the worldview. We must be only aware of the rich variety in society of socialist countries, the past differences among them, or the present differences, be it the various levels of the development of the means of production, or the irregular rate of the economic, political or ideological development, the extent of the national economy, the historical tradition and psychology of people, the number and cultural-technical maturity of the population, the peculiarities of the international position, etc. If individual socialist countries want to develop successfully, they must take in consideration all these objective circumstances, since this is the very condition of a successful building of socialism and of the growth of their political influence and authority. This fact does not lead only to the possibility of new concepts, but also to the requests for a new formulation of the unity of socialist countries. This means that we must give up the fiction of unity as the absolute identity of views, and contrarily proceed from the concrete conditions of the development of the world socialist system and of individual socialist countries. The unity of



socialist countries cannot be attained by the abolition of varieties and specific national interests of individual socialist countries, but rather by taking these in account. The duty to maximally understand the differences, coming to expression not only in theoretical conceptions but also in the practical policy of individual countries, is in the interest of the non-formal unity of all the states. From this point of view, each socialist country and each communist party has the right to independently formulate and realize its interior and foreign policy, to take such a way to socialism which is most appropriate to the national conditions and the needs of the state. The Belgrade Declaration from 1955 proceeds from these principles, emphasizing that the ways of socialist development in various countries, and under different conditions, vary, that the wealth of forms of the development of socialism strengthens socialism itself, that the tendencies of enforcement of views determining the ways and forms of the socialist development are alien to socialism, even though it emphasizes that the co-operation must be based upon free decisions and equality. There is no doubt that socialism can be helped only by the attempts to develop it further theoretically and practically in national circumstances, and not by mere advocating the state which has already been reached; its further development is the best defence of socialism. Comrade A. Dubček said: »By our emphasizing the national moment and by our enriching the socialist movement with it, with effort, socialism is not becoming less internationalistic.« (*Rudé právo*, February 12, 1969.)

That is why I feel that only the development of independent national policy, appropriate to the specific conditions of the given state, creates the grounds for the common view of socialist countries, for their common actions, that only the development of national policy shows and creates possibilities of the international unity. The national policy of some socialist countries, realized with all the problems, mistakes and peripeteia, is the starting point and the condition of the international unity. This is the beginning of the way to internationalism; it must not be attained by the subordination of the interests and ideas of most countries to one country, i. e., not by the abolition of the processes, expressing with increasing clarity the conditions and needs of some states, that is the variety which represents the fundamental actuality of socialism.

The idea of unity and contents of the proletarian internationalism can be realized now only through the mediation of the national and specific. When emphasizing the moment of the national approach, we do not think of the conservation



of nationality, contrarily, we think that such an approach is the condition that the common interests and common needs come more in the foreground in the socialist system and in policy of some socialist states. That is why — in my view — regarding the present level of development, it is not possible to say that subordination is necessary; what is necessary is rather the unanimity of the national and international interests. It would certainly be an ideal state if all the communist parties put first the common interest and were ready to subordinate their own views to these interests in the given case. If at the present level of development communist and labour parties emphasize the needs of their own interests, this must be understood as a phenomenon corresponding to the present conditions of development, as a way and stage in the development when we try to attain this aim. Of course, in this connection we can pose the question of those boundaries at which the efforts to ensure national interest change into a nationalist tendency or deviation. Such a complicated process as is the adjustment of the national and international elements cannot be imagined without occasional defects and errors, which cannot be designated in this way for this reason.

The correct conception of this problem which, of course, does not exclude occasional one-sidedness and errors in practical policy, is of immense significance from the point of view of the contemporary position and the needs of individual socialist states. It has been proved again that the relation between the national and the international cannot be conceived so that regarding a certain question one state subordinates itself to the predominant views of several socialist states, and also not so, that other states are made subordinate to the conception of one state. We have to do with practical respect for the specific conditions and needs of each country, since only in this way good grounds are created for common views, for common action, and new possibilities of international unity. But we also have to do with a clear political conception of the relations and co-operation among socialist countries, which is the basis and the means of strengthening this co-operation. Ideas like unity and co-operation must have their concrete contents. The relations among socialist countries develop and their unity (or dis-unity) always comes to exist in a concrete situation. Only on the basis of this point of view an answer can be sought to the questions: What is the content of these ideas, and which is the progressive tendency from the point of view of the development of the relations among socialist countries.

The need for the respect for national and international elements in the policy of communist and labour parties is established everywhere. Still, the realization of these requests in the field of practical policy represents a very complicated process, in which a tendency can be seen, in the policy of some states and parties, to judge narrowly conceived national views in the way in which they have been solved in other socialist countries, and then to estimate them merely from the point of view of nationalism and internationalism. If the principles of equality and independence are not established in the practice among socialist states, this approach can become the source of interference in internal development of one of the socialist countries and at the same time also the source of the theoretical speculations about sovereignty justifying this approach. And this is contrary to the creation and strengthening of the unity of the communist movement, whose inseparable prerequisite is the respect for the principles of equality, of national and state independence, and of non-interference in the internal matters of communist parties and of socialist countries.

**FILOSOFICKY  
CASOPIS**

**Jakub Netopilik**

**Formation  
of the Democratic  
and Humanistic  
Features of Socialism**

This treatise does not pretend to provide an exhaustive explanation of this complicated problem. It just wants to be a warning, which has originated in consideration of the relations between sciences, in particular, between social sciences and philosophy on the one side, and their influence upon the formation of the democratic and humanistic features of socialism, on the other.

To speak about humane socialism appears at the first sight to be a pleonasm or a paradox, if not even a revisionist or contrarevolutionary slogan, as some critics want to prove. Socialism, which has abolished the exploitation of man through man, class antagonism, etc., is supposed to be the

most humane social system in its very essence, so adding humanism to it is a paradox and it raises doubts whether socialism so far has been socialism. Or perhaps the system named socialism was actually socialism, only deformed by a small number of incapable politicians, who also wanted power? Perhaps we only had to deal with a certain political system which made it impossible for socialism as a social system to reveal its essence and to develop its humane features?

If we characterize our movement following January 1968 as an effort for the socialism with human features, then we must suppose that before this time we had to do with a socialism without human features.

Still countless workers and farmers decided for socialism out of their own free will, justly seeing in it the only possible way out of the non-human class society. How is it possible that this effort towards a higher type of humanity turned into its very contrast? Whose fault is it and who is responsible for this, since everybody cannot have the same part of responsibility? And finally, where to seek the guarantee that the coming generations will not have to face a similar problem? Or, is perhaps also socialism, like the previous social movements, doomed to find its actual picture different for its expected one?

These and similar questions must arise in considerations of our present problems. From the philosophical point of view they give rise to thoughts about the relationship between man and his work. If the meaning of Marx's scientific discovery can be summed up in short, then this is the discovery of dialectics which can in certain circumstances grow into dramatic conflicts between the activity of man and the results of his social activities.

By his analysis of the historical development Marx proved how man's efforts to humanize the world turned into the dehumanization of the very author of humanization. This dialectic of man and his work reaches its summit in the subordination of the subject to the object, of man to the thing. Still the dialectic of man and his work at the same time also represents a permanent mutual criticism. Work — man's products »criticise« their creator, and the other way round, man criticises his work. This mutual criticism of man and his work, products, forms the essence of the revolutionary practice. In his *German Ideology* Marx put down a famous sentence that »the circumstances create the people in a similar way as the same circumstances are created by the people« and in his *Feuerbach* he accused the old materialism of not being aware that »the circumstances change the people«,

and of not being able to understand that »agreement may exist between a change in circumstances and human activity or only to conceive and understand a change as a revolutionary practice«.

There arises the question in which extent these thoughts of Marx are acceptable. Are they to be understood as a mere methodological instruction for understanding of the historic development of society, or can they also contribute to a deeper understanding of such human work as is socialism? Did not Marx in these sentences express the eternal problem of the human existence in the world? Do these thoughts refer to the economic activities only, or do they refer to the total practical activities of the social man? In his *German Ideology* Marx said: »For us communism does not represent a *state*, to be promoted, or an *ideal* to govern the actuality. By the name of communism we call the *actual* movement, which is predominant in the present state. The conditions of this movement originate from presuppositions existent in the present time.«<sup>1</sup> This movement is characterized by »execution of a fundamental change of all the former relations in production and in all the presuppositions, which have existed for ages, by for the first time, conscious treatment of the same as the products of former people, delivering them from their primitivism and subordinating them to the, authority of united individuals«<sup>2</sup>.

A detailed analysis of Marx's work would show, that the above listed quotations perhaps prove, that the man as the central force of the historic development was in the very centre of his considerations. Marx stated this explicitly in his *Holy Family* when writing: »*History* does not do *anything*«, »It has *no* immense wealth,« »it has not fought out any struggle«! It is *man* who does all this, who must fight out struggles, the actual live man; »no, history does not exploit man as a means for attainment of *its* ends, as if though it was a person; not at all: history is nothing but the activity of the man, who pursues *his* ends.«<sup>3</sup>

Thus man creates history by consciously changing the world. In his activity he is not conditioned by anything but the results of previous generations, into which he comes passively, but which he cannot leave alone. Marx conceived the origin and development of man as a process in which nature changes into human nature and man into a social man. The fact that in production forces and production

<sup>1</sup> K. Marx-F. Engels, *Spisy*, Vol. 3, p. 49.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 83.

<sup>3</sup> K. Marx-F. Engels, *Spisy*, Vol. 2, p. 111.

relations he saw an essential element of the total society does not mean that he reduced history to the so-called dialectic of inhuman production forces and production relations, which dominated instead of man. The main productive force for him was man, who also made economics. Only in so far as we have to do with an alienated society we see the movement of society as a movement of things.

Also the liberation of man is man's work, his deed. If sometimes history up to the time of the socialist revolution was called prehistory, in the sense that people were under the supremacy of their own products, while the power over them moved with natural necessity, which should be obeyed, then the beginning of the socialist revolution means the beginning of the actual history of man, as a conscious and active creator of himself. Here we have to do with a creation of a new humanity, which is based on itself and which develops from itself and is freed from external limitations.

This seems to be the source of the conflict. As long as socialism existed as a theory it was possible to logically prove inhuman qualities of capitalism and the necessity for its abolition. Once socialism has become reality it must practically prove that it is a more free and more humane human society than capitalism. But the existence of socialism as a social reality has obviously proved that it is not an easy matter to create such a society. Young Marx was already aware of the troubles to be faced by the socialist movement. Several paragraphs about various stages of the development of communism in his *Economic-Philosophical Manuscript from 1844* are enough to prove this. »The thought of communism suffices to abolish the thought of private property. But an actual communist action is necessary to actually abolish the private property. History is calling for it and the movement, which we conceive in our thoughts abolishing itself already, will actually have to go through a cruel and long process. We must see the actual progress in the fact that even before this we have realized the limitations of the aims of this historic movement and that in our minds we have already surpassed this movement and this aim.«<sup>4</sup>

This paragraph gives us an idea of Marx's anticipation of the difficulties of the socialist movement. He defined communism as the negation of the negation, i. e., as »the liberation of man's essence, which mediates itself by the negation of the private property.« In this connection he described in a lively way the so-called coarse communism.

---

<sup>4</sup> K. Marx, *Economical-philosophical Manuscripts from 1844*, SNPL, Prague, 1961, p. 113.



At the same time he called attention to the fact, that in the mind, if not in actuality, we are already aware of the negation. That is why it is not the aim of man's development.«<sup>5</sup>

In the Czechoslovak translation the following note is added to this text of Marx: »As such communism Marx understands the coarse, egalitarian communism, whose representatives were for instance babeuvists.« This note, as each reader can see himself, does not follow from Marx's text. If at the beginning the socialist movement is »rediscovery of man« in the form of the negation of the negation, then in its further movement it grows into a higher stage, into communism as »the positive abolition of *private property* as human self-alienation and thus as an actual taking possession of the human essence by man and for man.«<sup>6</sup> Here we have to do with such a degree of taking possession of the human essence, which represents positivity originating from itself; this is »a conscious return of man to himself as a social i. e., human man, realized within the framework of the full richness of the development so far.«<sup>7</sup> These and other parts of his work are perhaps the most precious statements Marx wrote about communism. This is his concept from his young age, however, he never renounced it. If we compare these sentences about communism to a later passage from the third part of the *Capital* (in the Czechoslovak translation p. 368) then we come to a conclusion that the two are basically in accordance. In this passage Marx considered it to be the highest form of the socialist movement in such a stage, at which there begins »the development of human force, which is its own aim«.

Thus for Marx the socialist movement was a struggle for a higher form of humanity. It appears as if though Marx had felt that even the socialist efforts towards a higher type of humanity were not automatically safe from degeneration, that they were in danger of alienation, which could fully embrace them. That is why the addition of »humane« to socialism is not at all external or additional, but rather originates in Marx's authentic thought.

The slogan humane socialism has not originated in theoretical considerations but in practical experiences of the socialist movement. These very experiences show that humane socialism is not a necessary result of the development of the material forces of the society, but is rather a possibility which can be realized. Its realization depends upon the entire human

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 104.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 92.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 92.



race and demands a high degree of creative activity and moral responsibility from each individual. This presupposes as a condition the freedom of the state and personal freedom.

The building of socialism cannot be only the scientific solution of the contradictions of social development, towards which an indifferent attitude of no participation is taken; it must rather be an effort toward the creation of a new personality and a new human race in general. From this point of view the socialist movement represents a moral imperative.

So we are not concerned with socialism as a well-functioning social system, but with the new dimension of mankind, which it can create historically. This cannot be done by any other socialism but only by the humane socialism.

Of course, the concept of the new, higher mankind, the new humanity, is still very vague. In as far as it is discussed by Marxists, it is determined as »the total man«, »the rich« man, i. e., a man who needs the total human life expression as opposed to the material richness.<sup>8</sup> Is it not the task of socialist society to create this new, rich man, both in practice and theory? Such definitions of man, like abolition of the exploitation, work as the life necessity, etc., have no sense if the present richness of personality is not at the level of the past and present *richness* in the world. If in the past socialism had to be ascetic to some extent, because of the conditions in which it was developing, then the humane socialism is making a conscious effort towards abundant necessities and expressions of man. If in some countries socialism had to accomplish the task of the capitalist primary accumulation, i. e., a pre-socialist task, and it had created the new man with accelerated speed from outside and often by means of repressive decrees, then today the time has come, when the man in socialist society could become the autonomous subject of the social and his own development. That is why the humane socialism does not mean a step backwards, but rather means a higher stage of the development of socialism. In underdeveloped economic and social conditions and in capitalist enclosure, a certain power mobilization at the top, and the subordination of man to the »unavoidable laws« of the building of socialism were requested.<sup>9</sup> He had to be educated for the new working discipline and to be freed from the primitive prejudices and a socialist consciousness had to be educated in him. This is not only the case with the large

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 102.

<sup>9</sup> When the criticism and comment from people were silenced authoritatively the building of socialism was realized in a more and more authoritative and bureaucratic way. H. Marcuse calls attention to the fact that the development from Leninism to Stalinism should be considered in accordance with its main stages

masses but also with the members of intelligentsia. The more primitive prejudices were to be encountered the more fertile was the ground for refusal of the past and present Marxist thought and cultural wealth, which should be opposite to unrooting of prejudices or even to support them. Marxism as science, including the Marxist philosophy, has been gradually changed in to a »scientific view of the world« which should prepare men mentally for the tasks of the industrial age. So as to be able to become the property of the large masses Marxism had to be simplified and changed in accordance with the requests of some methods of the building of socialism. If Marxism originally came into being and developed as a sharp tool in the great class conflicts and in the struggle against the nonmarxist systems of thought, it finally ossified into a positivist-pragmatist theory, which executed the service of the ideological apologetics of the immediate practice and its changing needs.

The victory of the socialist revolution and the emergence of the first socialist society certainly represented a world-historic success. Its acquisitions were successfully defended from the attack of Fascism. The fact that the building of socialism was not threatened from the outside world, from the international bourgeoisie only, but also from the inside, strengthened the tendency to persist in what had already been attained and also the fear of innovations. This tendency was realized by emergence of a special power structure, which was not interested in further development. Thus the socialist movement finally changed into a socialist reality, a final *donnée*, dispossessed of all the possibilities. The positivism of the theory was the result of the practical positivism. The doctrine that social consciousness is lagging behind the social existence, being merely its reflection, finally brought about the fact that man had to adjust himself to the given reality, to give up his critical views as regards the given reality and to abandon the discovering of new possibilities, carried along by the socialist movement. If the German classical philosophy and Marxist criticism conceived the actuality as unsuitable for man, which should be negated as »unreasonable«, then the dogmatic Marxist theory was dominated subconsciously by a superficial thesis of Hegel

---

and features to be a »result of an anomalous constalation in which socialist society had to be built so it really more coexisted with the capitalist society rather than being its competitor or heir.«

H. Marcuse, *Die Gesellschaftslehre des sowjetischen Marxismus*, Neuwid and Berlin, 1964, p. 335.

Still the reference to Leninism was not unavoidable. Stalinism was brought about by the external objective and historic circumstances and also by internal, subjective circumstances.

from his Preface to *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*: »What is reasonable is actual and what is actual is reasonable«. If a certain type of the socialist society was proclaimed to be almost the incarnation of the realization of Marx's philosophy, then it made little sense to inquire about its essential features and so the theory of the socialist movement changed into a description of the immediate experience, of the actuality.

But this given actuality was in sharp opposition with the anticipated picture of the future. If on the one side the theory became a mere herald of the given actuality, then on the other side, it — in so far as it wanted to be a prognosis of the socialist movement — changed into a chiliastic and eschatological doctrine, thus being even in a more severe opposition with the given experience it discredited Marxism to utopia.

When the building of socialism became a business of several countries, and especially of those countries which, like Czechoslovakia, had passed the age of capitalist industrialization, reformation, and enlightened bourgeois parliamentary democracy, the methods of socialism as attained at that time could be successful in these countries, but only to a limited extent and with risk. Finally also traditional socialism tries to find new ways for its movements because of the considerable rise of the scientific and technical revolution, the development of science and social changes.

The time has come in the development of the socialist movement which requests a new subject: a subject who will not be formed from the outside only (this used to be the method of the educational function of the dictatorship of the proletariat) an independent, creative subject, not developed but developing, a subject who himself takes possession of the entire wealth of the civilization and culture. From this point of view we can understand the search for new ways for the building of socialism (today we can speak of several models of socialism) and the fresh movement in the socialist thought (at first sight several »Marxisms« are emerging).

It seems that this stage of the development of socialism was centered in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic since the circumstance for it were especially favourable here (historical, social and economic). We can assume that the full meaning of January 1968 cannot be understood if it is explained only by the crisis of the authoritative bureaucratic system. This was so, beyond doubt, but we feel that the movement of January was more an expression of the deep historic tendencies of the development of socialism in the world, and above all, of the need of the new subject for new approaches to the development of the socialist movement. It

should be stated to the honour of the Czechoslovak thought that the leading philosophers: Kalivoda, Kosik, Richta and others, as well as important writers often, created their works in the circumstances of an unfavourable official »criticism«, and of persecution for theoretic concepts of a higher type of the socialist movement.

Humane socialism should be a practical and theoretic criticism as well as the negation of the authoritative-bureaucratic socialism but also of the manager-techno-bureaucratic socialism.

The old authoritative bureaucratic system is justly criticised severely and refused today. Democratic socialism is justly put against it. Arguments against the old system are often motivated by the fact, that this system was inefficient and unable to provide for a rationally effective development of technics, economics, a standard of living, etc. Is it really impossible to imagine and to realize such a bureaucratic socialism which would be efficient in technics and economy and also »human«, i. e., which would give several rights and privileges to the individual and still prevent him to live and act as an authentic subject? The inhuman qualities of such a system are of a slightly different kind from the inhuman qualities of the system based solely on authoritative-political assumptions.

With certain reservations it is possible to say that this way of the development of socialism is more likely, since it will be requested by the needs of the contemporary development of technics and economy. Of course, this process is full of contradiction, because on the other side it requests the new, creative, independent man.

The contemporary development of technics and sciences requests with inexorable vehemence a rational and productive settlement of the society, rational and productive policy, rational and productive thought and evaluation, a rational and productive way of life. »We live and die rationally and productively«<sup>10</sup> writes H. Marcuse wanting to characterize in short the contemporary situation of man in the modern industrial society. «Not only the life of entire classes, nations and social systems, but also the life of each individual man develops today in these two dimensions — the rational and the productive.«

Also socialism cannot exist without rationality and productivity. But in order to remain socialism and not to degenerate into a society, which though being efficient and prospective is inhuman, it must try to find practical and theoretical ways to redirect the rationality and productivity

<sup>10</sup> H. Marcuse, *Onedimensional Man*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1964, p. 145.

into means of development of a higher humanity — a task which seems to be most hard. The works of western writers dealing with the results of the contemporary scientific-technical revolution, technicalization and cybernetics, etc., are very encouraging for us, but also provide us a warning.

We can assume that in January 1968 the effort for a rational and efficient social system and the effort for a higher type of humanity joined together. Thus a really human socialism cannot emerge unless it is full of maximum rationality and efficiency, since rationality and efficiency can lead to irrational and inefficient consequences if they get dehumanized and become an end in themselves. Onesided emphasis on rationality and efficiency on the one side, and on humanity on the other, is wrong. In the first case we have to do with the dehumanized bureaucratism and in the second with a utopia. The well known conflict between the socialism and humanism, is the theoretic exchange for the two tendencies, which do complete each other in a way, still between the two of them there exists also a dialectic tension, which can lead to a conflict.

Against this view the argument can be brought that the fear of the dehumanizing effects of the development of technics and science is out of place in socialism, in more concrete terms with us, since at the time being the dehumanization is more the resultat of the insufficient development of science and technics. This blame is justified, beyond doubt. Still, everything depends on the question to what ends socialism should serve; is it to be only a perfect and efficient system or, is it to be also a humane society? If the initiators of its character and aims are only the elite (no matter whether the political or the manager-technocrat one) while all the rest of the people and morely well-qualified officials of the perfectly and effectively functioning system — can we in this case still speak of a creative and conscious subject? Or, will we just have to do with the adjustment to the system, passive or can we still speak of a creative act?

It seems that these questions are not only our problems, the problems of a socialist society. Their urgency — the need to pose and to solve them — is felt all over the world. They finally emarge from civilizational basis reached by mankind in our time. The latter has been created by the so-called industrial system, which is supported by economy, technics and science; these presuppose each other, and also condition each other,<sup>11</sup> creating one whole, which determines the life of men today, the classes, the national and social systems. The

---

<sup>11</sup> A. Gehlen, *Die Seele in technischen Zeitalter*, Rowohlt, Hamburg 1957, p. 11.



industrial world emerged and began its development at the beginning of capitalism, still it has penetrated all the spheres of the social life in this century only. Its emergence and development are conditioned by the development of the distinguishing of various types of societies according to their social relations, it seems that deeper forces should be sought under the surface, which condition and determine the nature of the socio-economic relations. These are — as Marx showed us — the productive forces. Even though we can see the sharp contradiction between the modern capitalism and socialism, we must pose the following question: Are not both systems finally subject to the same laws, i. e., to the laws of the industrial production thus being in a sense only two types of one and the same society, the industrial society? Is not modern socialism a grand attempt to overcome the industrial society, which is developing as a natural historical process and independently of the people inside this society, an attempt characterized by rich possibilities, but limited in its realization as a certain, given reality? Theoretical arguments about some issues — like: is our society really socialist or not, do certain features, for instance the nationalization of the means of production or the abolition of the class antagonism, provide a guarantee for the socialist nature of the society — a priori take it for granted, that socialist society is something final, closed reality or an existent norm, which the given reality has to confront. Even though appearing as contrary — the first as a dogmatic apologetics of the given state and the second as its criticism — but suppositions forget that socialism is a real movement, continuing under the conditions of a certain level of the entire development of society and that thus its nature depends on this society. It seems that socialism today cannot compete with developed capitalism as a social actuality but with its possibilities of subordination of an immense development of social wealth for the creation of the higher humanity, for the new way of life. In this several problems are implied; they cannot be analysed here so we shall just call attention to them.

Socialism emerged as an effort to negate the West-European capitalism, yet with a tendency to preserve its positive values. It is as international as capitalism. Even though capitalism did level the traditional society it did not succeed in abolishing the varied character of different cultures, ways of perception and experience of the world, life force, concepts of man and mankind, and similar. Is socialism as an integrational movement, to represent the total realization of the West-European concept of humanity, style of life, etc., or is it to leave room for other types of humanity? It is said that the



international socialist society is, or rather, will be, a differentiated unit. But what does this mean? Will this be a mere specification of the general concept of socialism and a generic essence of man, or will this mean various socialisms, contradictory in their unity?

Let us return to our former theme.

Apart from socialism also capitalism tries to master the contemporary industrial society. Attempts have been made, on both sides, to adjust it to human aims and to use its mechanisms for autoregulation. Gehlen has pointed to the fact that Descart's *maitre et possesseur de la nature* is changing into *maitre et possesseur de la société*.

What is the significance of socialism, what makes it different from capitalism? Cannot both systems be reduced to the difference of ownership? In spite of a certain similarity there exists a principled difference, which could be defined as follows: While capitalism is trying to develop perfection and efficiency of the society as a dynamic system, which is the end in itself, and changing man into its qualified, well functioning constituent element, socialism should not be interested above all in mastering society (since this implies also mastering of man) but rather in a free development of man on the basis of the maximum rational and maximum productive creation of conditions for his being. If in capitalism society represents for man a metaphysical intranscendental reality, then socialism brings it back to its human basis as a movement. While in capitalism man is defined by the system, i. e. by his position and function in a reified process, then — in its final ends — socialism poses and solves the question of what man is and what he should be.

The development of the social man is an extraordinary special dialectic of himself and his work. Finally, man also makes himself, and he has developed by his own work contrary to his will. In this we find the deepest sense of the human alienation. The age of forced development of man through his work has ended, or rather, is coming to an end. In order not to die under the ruins of his own products, and in order not to degenerate in their cold shadow in his further development, man as the supreme value of being must develop himself and give a deep human sense to his own products. The historical necessity of the victory of socialism as a higher stage of the development of man lies in this fact.

Particularly in recent years social history gives the impression of a history of the development of a world of things, technic, economy, etc., whose by-product is also the development of man. There is a danger that this reified world will devour its creator, who should endow it with authentic

human significance. Marx was not the only one to understand the critical point of this historic turn; numerous Marxists today are aware of it. So, for instance, F. Pappenheim writes: »The immense development of science and technics helped man to understand the natural forces to such an extent that he became master over them, that he subordinated them to his purposes. With this development of realization of the promethean dream there emerged a new picture of man, a man who creates his own life and masters his own fate. With the thought of human sovereignty a new climate emerged. The awareness that the human tendency towards autorealization has been destroyed becomes a terrible actuality, absent from previous ages. In this situation human alienation is not accepted as an unavoidable fate, it is rather felt to be a threat and also a request, much more than ever before.«<sup>12</sup>

Heidegger's statement that the essence of technics includes a solution, when danger is proved to be dangerous, has the same meaning.<sup>13</sup>

If we examine Marx's ideas we come to conclusion that Marx did not consider the abolition of the private property of the means of production to be a means for the realization of socialism. In his *Manuscripts* he argued that the alienation of man did not originate from the act of production. »How could it be that the worker is alien as regards the products of his activity unless he estranges himself in the act of production? The product is a *résumé* of his activity, production. If the product of his work externalizes him, then the production itself must be an active externalization, externalized activity and activity of externalization. In the estrangement of the object of work self-estrangement joins the externalized activity.«<sup>14</sup> Thus humanization of the world presupposes humanization of the production. Marx showed how to come to this in his *Grundrissen*. He pointed it out that modern science shortened the necessary time for work so conditioning a progressive growth of free time. It increasingly »devalues« physical labour and requests growing mental capacity to use science and technics.

The worker in the classic sense of this word, i. e., a person selling his labour, is beginning to lose this meaning confronted with science and technics as the main productive forces. If the worker as the main agent of the production process has been reduced to a constituent element of a

---

<sup>12</sup> F. Pappenheim, *The Alienation of Modern Man*, Monthly Review Press New York 1959, p. 115.

<sup>13</sup> Cf., M. Heidegger, *Die Technik und die Lehre*, G. Neske, Tübingen 1962.

<sup>14</sup> K. Marx, *Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts from 1844*, SNPL, Prague, p. 65.

technical mechanism, then his position besides the production process makes possible the change of man into a social being with a new human meaning, into a new subject.

The revolutionary technical basis, which at the beginning could not take into account the man, his needs, his cultivation (at this level capitalism emerged as a system), finally attains such a level of development that man with his needs becomes its main regulator. If exchange value used to be the main motive for the development of productive forces at some time, then this offer begins to lose its importance in the time of the developed production and its role is taken over by the useful value, i. e., man himself.

This tendency is apparent in capitalism also and socialism should inherit it. Thus Marx wrote: »The value of the old industry has been preserved in that it furnishes the basis or the new one, in which the relation between capital and labour will be expressed in a new form. Hence the investigation of nature to reveal new useful aspects of things and universal exchange of products from all foreign climates and new preparation for natural objects to obtain new useful values. Hence the investigation of the state from various aspects to reveal new useful objects and new useful characteristics, and these new characteristics as new materials, etc. Hence the development of science towards its summit and hence the discovery, creation and satisfaction of new needs originating from society itself; cultivation of all the characteristics of the social man and his production as man is similarly a condition for production, based upon capital.«<sup>15</sup>

These sentences in many ways anticipate the present theory of industrial society. It is possible to argue that in Marx's times the conditions were not ripe for the position of the new man as subject of his own development, and that these conditions are only being developed in the industrial society of today. But it is certain that today these conditions appear so ripe that the problem of man must be posed, so the cultivation of his humanity can no longer be postponed and with it the problem of socialism.

This tendency, however, will not be realized automatically; it entirely depends on man, on the realization of those possibilities he is offered by the contemporary industrial society. Arnold Gehlen justly says that »mankind has come to the 'absolute cultural threshold' with the industrial culture«, adding, »Great events of irreversible character putting the history of the mankind on a level which has never

---

<sup>15</sup> K. Marx, *Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie*, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1953, pp. 312—213.

been attained before and thus probably introducing several historical laws are very rare in the history of mankind.<sup>16</sup>

Thus the present position should be judged as an »interference or mutual operating of the civilization of the old style and the completely new epoch.«<sup>17</sup> The industrial system actually means a decisive boundary stone for mankind. Will the history of human products turn into the history of man himself or not? It seems that when choosing these possibilities man has to conduct the hardest fight with himself while before he fought against things.

With this we are coming to the position and to the tasks of philosophy in our society. In younghegelian spirit young Marx said »to philosophize the world means to make the philosophy worldly«. Later on he put down his famous sentence that by then the philosophers had only *explained* the world in various ways while it should be really *changed*. Here we have not got space enough to discuss what Marx meant when he said that the proletariat could not abolish itself without creating philosophy and that philosophy could not realize itself without abolishing itself.

The dogmatic Marxism understood these sentences so that it degraded philosophy making it a servant of policy and of the apologetics accompanying the political practice.

Kostas Axelos represents Marx as the philosopher of the technical development and explains the above quoted sentences as indicating how philosophy should turn into a philosophy of production and technical development. In his book *Marx — the Thinker of Technics* he writes: »*Philosophy is dying under the blows of technics*. The tasks of philosophy become the task of the historical practice. Philosophy should make its last step: open the way to the total development of productivity thus abolishing itself by its realization.«<sup>18</sup> At the end of his work he speaks that after Marx the total thinking of the future will have a technical character and adds: »The full development of technics, the *technological* development will devour thinking and ideas, the *ideological* development. The ideologists will be given no word, they will become unimportant and ineffective.«<sup>19</sup>

Marx's thought is actually not the philosophy of technics, of productive forces as such; it is rather a radical humanist criticism of the inhumanity of the human world, a humanist

---

<sup>16</sup> A. Gehlen, *Die Seele im Technischen Zeitalter*, Rowohlt, Hamburg, 1967, p. 87.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 88.

<sup>18</sup> Kostas Axelos, *Marx — penseur de la technique*, Les Editions de Minuit, Paris 1961, p. 183.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 299—300.

selfconsciousness of the authentic revolt against the rule of the world over man, the rule of the object over the subject. Marx's philosophy refers the human world to its authors, to man, and this, of course, does not mean that this is a philosophy of anthropology. It does not only try to explain man, it also struggles for the new man, for a higher level of humanity. It is a radical destruction of the unhuman being and a perpetual struggle for the human authentic being in the world made human and created by man. This endeavour will continue till man lives.

Of course, in this process philosophy cannot provide exact instructions for immediate humanization of the world. Philosophy cannot be made into a theory of managing the society. This is obviously the task of several sciences, natural and social ones.

Is philosophy in our world justified in any way? Will it not be pushed aside by the further development of social sciences in a similar way as the so-called philosophy of nature was pushed aside by the development of the sciences of nature? Man began to philosophize in order to explain to himself his position in the world and to approach the significance of his existence. He always wanted not only to explain the world but also to realize himself as an authentic being. He did not find the necessary conditions for this in the world, that is why he transferred his authentic realization into the world of ideas. Marxist philosophy showed the possibility of the authentic being and realization of man in the world. Is this problem out of date now? The very opposite. The new position of the subject in the world of today because of the productive process and socio-economic revolution emphasizes even more the eternal problems of philosophy. Today everybody is asking — more or less clearly — such philosophical questions as for instance: development of economics, technics, science, etc.? What sense does all this make in relation to ego? These problems are not losing their relevance, on the contrary, they are getting more and more urgent and painful, both in the capitalist and socialist order. This is so. We can even say that we feel them even more because socialism finally has given rise to the consciousness of the possibility of an authentic existence of man in the world, even more, it promised, that this would happen in a relatively close future.

With its ideas and its defeats socialism has made philosophy even more unavoidable than it has ever been. This was ascertained in the past also, only then philosophy was needed for the ideological handling of man. Today it is again a radical criticism of the given state and a struggle for the



authentic man, not for some external reasons, but for the sake of man. If socialism is the movement against the alienating forces of man and for a higher humanity, then it cannot be satisfied with the scientific management of the society, but must rather be directed towards the liberation and development of man. That is why it does not need science only philosophy rises the question of man in his totality outside any given system.

Also the process of the scientific-technical revolution rises the questions regarding the problem of man, the significance of his life and being. We can even say that the essence of the contemporary scientific and technical revolution is philosophical *par excellence*. Philosophy will not be silenced by its blows, as Kostas Alexos believes, it will rather become the most important issue of each individual man. Only the technocratically and scientistically orientated theory can assume that the problems as rised by the scientific and technic revolution can be solved by means of specialized sciences. The scientific and technic revolution is changing the traditional, metaphysical problems into an actual actuality (pysical means here the presence of being). Being and not-being, sense and nonsense, good and evil, humanity and unhumanity, etc., are the issues to which man comes today when thinking about the scientific and technical revolution. If in his history so far, man was forced to struggle with nature and with things, then now the horizon for a struggle with himself is opening in front of him. If the scientific and technical revolution is to be a step towards a higher civilization, towards a higher type of humanity, or a step towards the realization of an »ant-state« of manager and technocratic forms of society, depends on how this struggle will be fought out.

As a theory about the emergence and development of the total man in his total practice the Marxist philosophy should be a theory of the liberation and creation of the authentic man in the world of today; in this defenition theory does not mean any closed and final system, in accordance with which we should act. Philosophy cannot furnish instructions for the immediate action, for instance for political action. Its theory cannot be applied to the immediate practice, as is the case with some physical theories or sociological theories, which can be directly applied to solutions of technical effects or for improvement of human relations. An attempt to directly apply the theory of philosophy means to abolish it by way of destruction, as has been proved by numerous instances in the age of Stalinist dogmatism. Philosophical theory is an eternal questioning about the meaning of this world from the



point of view of the authentic man, an eternal question about man, the significance of his being and actions. This is a perpetual struggle against forgetting oneself, against the dissolution of man in an immediately given empiric reality. This is the critical humanist function of philosophy.

The world and man can be humanized immediately and practically by sciences and by policy. The latter are autonomous in the field of their research and also their practical action, so philosophy cannot prescribe to them what to research, what solutions to bring; and we all know that the truths of science are abstract, as Hegel said, in the sense that they express only some aspects of man's practical activity. And both scientific and technical results can be used to the advantage of or to the disadvantage of man. Science itself, and also the lot of sciences taken together, is not interested in the problem of the humanization of the world and man, or at least, these problems are not in the centre of its interests, and in as far as it pursues them it philosophizes. The scientific practice does not encompass the entire practice and practice taken as a whole is not only scientific. Today philosophy wants to encompass the total practice of man, that is why its tasks are wider than the tasks of science. Philosophy should critically investigate the attitude of the scientific practice within the framework of the entire practice and show it the ways of humanization of the world and man. In this we can see the union of philosophy and science. The concept of philosophy according to which philosophy would be a general methodology of science (natural and also social sciences — the scientists touched upon important tasks by their own means and not paying much attention to philosophy, or a sum of general theorems derived from individual sciences such philosophy never had any value, at best it performed the task of general education; that is why philosophy is sometimes conceived of as a general education today) is simply untenable.

If it is true that philosophy cannot immediately influence the humanization of the world in the same sense as science can (as for instance a physician who can cure people, etc.) does it not follow from this statement that philosophy is a kind of decoration of our education while its total doctrine can be reduced to the emphasis on abstract humanism? If the above considerations are right, and if philosophy deals primarily with the problem of the total man in his total practice, i. e., with the relation of man to his world, with the problem of the significance of human existence and with the problem of the humanization of the world and of man, thus in a sense it is a reflexion about mankind in its widest

sense, then it is simultaneously also a struggle for the essential human, for the creation of humanity; therefore it requires an active attitude in the practical struggle for the liberation of man and for the creation of a higher type of humanity. In this point it comes close to policy. The latter must not be understood as a mere copy of philosophy. Policy has an autonomous field of activity and philosophy cannot prescribe action to it. And also the other way round; in order to remain philosophy, philosophy must not be absorbed into policy or degraded to its servant. Still, if policy is not understood in rather limited terms as a specialized problem of power, then policy has never been closer to philosophy than in socialism. Since in a sense, policy should realize practically the humanization of the world and of man, thus both activities, philosophy and policy, should go parallelly to some extent. Socialism as a practical humanism, or, as an effort towards socialism, should make policy the main means to this end. Policy should be an activity in which man, the subject, becomes a creator of the humanized world, world adjusted to man, in the real sense of this word.

In order to avoid the bureaucratic model of socialism, in socialism each man, irrespective of his rational and efficient activities, should be a philosopher and a politician. The problems of man concern each individual person today in a similar way as the problem of the actuality adjusted to man. It depends on each individual how our society will give significance to the actuality and how much significance it will have for each individual.

NOVÁ  
MYSL

Dušan Rozehnal

**Topical Problems  
of the International  
Communist Movement**

All of us agree that our movement is struggling with great difficulties, that it must overcome them as soon as possible in order to fulfil successfully its main task — the struggle against imperialism and exploitation and for the revolutionary transformation of the world. We agree to a lesser degree when we investigate the reasons of these troubles, and even to a

lesser degree, when we have to decide about the most effective methods and forms of the anti-imperialistic struggle.

It is certainly surprising that the trouble of the movement are connected with the developed Czechoslovakia, on the one side, and with the backward China on the other, that they arise in the highly industrialized West, as well as in the preindustrial countries of the Third World. Thus our movement is facing a wide range of problems of the contemporary civilization, with all the particularities of the sprehe of a national liberation of an anti-imperialistic front and at the same time it must solve more general requests for peace and democratic principles of freedom.

At the time being, the theoretic forces of our movement pursue the economic, social and philosophical problems of the scientific-technical revolution, but we must also investigate these events from the political point of view. It is quite obvious that this is very important, since the very first — material and technical aspect shows the identity of this moment of civilization with the social transition from capitalism to socialism. On the basis of generally accepted ideas we can state with all certainty that the scientific-technical revolution is the only way to such an important event in production, and that it will for this very reason break the logic of private appropriation, and thus exploitation.

For the first time, ever since class society came into being, we can now expect such an important quantitative change that we shall be able to witness a qualitative change. Here we have not got to do with any similarity to a fatal passivity, but the very contrary: with the preparations for the revolutionary activities of socialist and progressive forces everywhere, where capitalism is not able to carry out social conclusions. In a similar way as it is not possible to reach the creative source of the humanist thought only on the basis of a socialist victory in an industrial system, or through technocratic corrections of this system, it is — in my view — unfortunately also not possible to satisfy this model of socialism by mechanical investigation, since in all the cases known so far it is linked with a more or less developed industrialization.

We shall encounter a similar problem in the economy of the developing countries. The economic aspects of national-liberation struggles and also the economic side of the political results define in a new way the old connections between areas in the hands of a developed metropolis with their undeveloped colonies. While a prominent division inside a certain area — caused by the progress of the scientific-technical revolution — is characteristic of the developed

countries, the developing countries are endeavouring to join again in the world economy by means of an extensive division of labour among sectors, which is characteristic of the level of a developing industrialization. It proceeds from this that the methods of management in the economic policy of the world — as used for instance by UNCTAD — cannot be effective in the field of development, thus it is in the interest of the developed countries that, under the pressure of the further scientific-technical revolution, they do not offer this help.

The scientific-technical revolution requires also a formation of important new units in the economic field, namely of united regional markets, which actually influence also the sphere of political power. Still — taking in consideration the fact that these tendencies towards universalism and integration under the pressure of a concrete historical moment are active in the time when the world is divided in countless ways — our movement cannot avoid a profound scientific (and not only occasional) investigation of the problem of sovereignty.

One of the most important tasks of Marxism-Leninism is the evaluation of the actuality: in a considerable part of the world the scientific-technical revolution precedes the socialist revolution. We must state it clearly that the efforts trying to attain the level of international communism are efforts for a qualitatively new goal, which can be successfully realized only by creative parties. The movement as a whole can help them only if it accepts Leninism as the creator of this actuality, in a similar way, as Lenin once in a creative way responded to new circumstances, which the Vth International could not accept. Only with courageous ideas and principled politics — like Lenin — we shall be able to capture the best heads and hearts of youth. And if we do not do this, the young generation will continue to be attracted by red booklets and anarchist slogans.

The history of our international communist movement teaches us that the periods of self-critical considerations in the struggle against dogmatism and the policy of sects are connected with its rise and precede a period of people's fronts, National Fronts and — after the XX. congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union — also a qualitatively new action among the masses in capitalist countries and in the developing countries. Contrarily, if we cease to make the difference between non-communists and anti-communists, or if we characterize straight-forward and good communists as »anti-socialist forces«, how can then straight-forward but yet undecided democrats come to our side?

In order to explain how these problems are understood by our party I would like to quote two passages from the November Resolution of the Central Committee:

»That is why the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia thinks that it is incorrect and harmful for the policy of the Party if the possible mistakes in the marxist, scientific regeneration of actuality are replaced by anti-socialist aims and purposes without proofs, and on purpose. That is why it is most necessary that the mistakes of marxists and of communists be tactfully distinguished in practice from the political, antisocialist, rightist tendencies, if we want to escape the danger of reviving such negative phenomena as were the false condemnations about »activities (of communists) against the state« and about »the ideological diversions« in the fiftieth.«

In all the fields, the party will come to support the initiative of the specialists of various scientific institutes in the search for new ways to socialism on the basis of creative Marxism-Leninism and in their solutions of important problems connected above all with the social aspects of the scientifico-technical revolution and with the full establishment of personality in socialism.«

The basis of the anti-imperialist struggle can be limited also by a certain kind of »etatization« of this struggle; communists in various western countries have called attention to this fact. We are speaking about narrowing in a field where only socialist countries can resist, as in the economic and scientifico-technic competition, in military and diplomatic field, and because of this the movement as a whole is limited to the role of a mute person, watching sympathetically the endeavour of the authorities to the point where all the means should be used, including the ideological means, and also all the parts of the movement and its allies.

Even though this may sound paradoxical, such tendencies may originate from an overestimate of the imperialist forces, which are considered so powerful as to be able to overthrow at any time the socialist system also in such a country like Czechoslovakia, where socialism was accepted by the vast majority of the people and therefore also deeply rooted. On the basis of such opinions it is believed that the hypothesis that time works for classenemies and that within the past twentyfive years socialism did not gain sufficient adherents and did not succeed in converting its former enemies is rather pessimistic. That is why every conception of the regeneration movement of the people towards the development of socialist democracy (which is justly ascribed completely different criteria by the new society after global changes in



the class structure, than by the old capitalist society) as resulting from the influence of a few refined plotters or writers and journalists represents in the case of Czechoslovakia, an impudent offence against the twenty-year activity of the Party, even though such nihilism is often attributed to criticism from the bureaucratic era of Novotny.

We must say that in the course of the last year numerous legends about the Czechoslovak development have been contrived. I am going to mention a few of them since their explanation is connected with the problems of the international communist movement.

So, for instance, it is asserted that our party has not struggled against wrong tendencies. It is true that it, with all force, prevented all the provocative endeavours to renew the social-democrat party. It condemned inconsiderate sentences is the declaration of 2000 words. It made agreements with political clubs in connection with the free abolishment, or with rejection of the central management. Several journalists criticised most severely some objectivizing articles, etc.

Still, we would not be Marxist-Leninist if, at the same time, we did not criticize our own mistakes of underestimating the international factors; party documents speak about these, adding a note about our naivete and our illusions.

In spite of this it would be good to add here that in the framework of a concrete historical evolution nothing can emerge in its pure form, so it is impossible to expect positive aspects only and not also negative ones. Still, we must get acquainted with those elements which predominate, which make progress possible. As regards this the documents of our party are completely uniform, at this we encounter our January and our action programme. If after the period of bureaucratic deformations, after crimes committed by the law courts, and after suppression of innocent people, the party wants once and for always to settle with weakness and indecision, if it wants to renew the confidence and socialist initiative of the people, then it must not be afraid of the negative deviations, of necessity accompanying this process. If we have to choose between a formalist unity — seemingly without problems but connected with a real lethargy — and mass initiative — with the risk of coming to extremes — we shall have to choose this second possibility, even though it is harder to be realized. In my view only such a decision is leninist.

The same is true of the international level. To be assured that there are no problems does not mean that they have actually vanished, and the isolation or removal of their



carriers does not bring anything positive. These methods, characteristic of all lower social formations, owe a great deal to subjectivism and political idealism, which cannot understand the real reasons for the emergence and development of political opinions. This is true of the internal circumstances, but also in external relations the fact should be taken in account that the class-enemy will try to use the peaceful co-existence to his own advantage. But this does not prove the necessity to reject the very idea of Leninism. We only have to take this danger in account and to resist it.

The second legend which came into being in connection with the Czechoslovak development states that bourgeoisie, imperialism, and West are glad of, or even actively support, the process of regeneration. A full year has passed since west press published numerous opinions that the Czechoslovak example was harmful for the bourgeois system since it made Socialism attractive. Quite recently (in the end of January 1969) we could read in *Le Monde*: »Why this inactivity, why only a few gestures without any real effect? Because East is not interested in the Czechoslovak experience? What is it all about? An endeavour to give socialism a humane picture. But is it possible to imagine that bourgeois states would support such tendencies? These tendencies are contrary to their own interests«. (Jagues Mandanle)

Even though in the case of Czechoslovakia specific circumstances — as for instance the democratic tradition of the country — play an important role, the enemies of socialism were most alarmed when a general progressive tendency came to expression, making its way where capitalism could still offer many things.

This statement leads us to a conclusion, which proceeding from the standpoint of the classes and in the international relations and confrontation of the communist movement with imperialism, is of necessity two-sided and identical with the two-sided system of the military equilibrium of the two world powers because of the given historic circumstances. But this is only one starting point, which in practical policy must correspond to the acknowledgment of pluralist factors in the international development, or rather to the existent differences in the international progressive movements, differences corresponding to the objectively given stages of the revolutionary, anti-imperialist struggle in the world. So we have to do with the following duplicity: we should not try to hide the uniformity of the classes by exclusive heterogeneity; but let us not watch this uniformity only, since in this way its organic elements, which alone can constitute it, can escape our attention.

**Socialism  
and the  
Human Factor**

*»Theory is capable of fascinating the masses as soon as it is demonstrated ad hominem and it demonstrates ad hominem as soon as it becomes radical. To be radical means to seize a thing by its root. The root of man is man himself.«*

(Karl Marx in the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law)

Ideas and ideals of socialism are no novelty in the world of human values; they were built in the conceptual structure of mankind by other great spiritual currents of Western countries. Socialism as a political and historical actuality has a rich history, even its own unvanquished past. The socialist discussion has become profound, it tries to seize the thing by its root, and the ideological disintegration of the socialist movement of today is already a fact. Contradictions come to a specially clear expression in the view concerning the fundamental question of socialist democracy.

If we do not count the orthodox conception, there remain three currents, coming to expression in the new definition of socialism. The pragmatic group of tendencies had transferred its main interest from the »abstract« debates to the concrete ends, which it tries to attain within the framework of the existent economic order and political situation. It accepts the traditional organization of society and attributes the main significance the more to the desired modifications and development. Apart from this pragmatist tendency there is another tendency struggling for influence, the tendency standing for the establishment of a new specific socialist order; at this, the opinions about the range of the socialist contents of the new order vary a great deal. In this second phase of the explanation of the socialist order we can make out also the third model, whose starting point represents the

circumstances of industrial society, the scientific and technical civilization, the profound structural changes of the progressive society and of the fundamental concepts of the new actuality.

The truth is: the basis of the socialist vision of reconstruction of human society, the powerful motor driving the masses and brains, has been and remains the hope of the proletariat, of intelligentsia, and of all the people, the hope of liberation, the expectation of the real emancipation of people. This basis has endured the political trials of the recent decades. Still these principles have not touched the practical everyday requests and so they continue their obstinate life. The old economic political and social revolutionary requests put themselves through to a certain extent. The socialist development has brought to the people (relatively) big material and social results, and above all, more than any other system, it increased the ethic value of labour.

Still, the socialist revolution has not fulfilled the hopes and needs of unlimited horizons of the new humanism. Many things are not satisfactory.

In the recent decades the fate of socialism was the victim of a great wrong account — false philosophy of man, which in practice determined his concept of humane actuality. Well-known deformations of socialism and socialist democracy, and of humanism — the strait jacket of bureaucratic dogmatism, demagogic hypocrisy, terroristic despotism, thirst for power and its concentration, anti-intellectualism, idolatry of the apparatus, abolition of the individual and person, etc., provide proofs that socialism in general has not succeeded to finally solve the problems of power and its abuse, the contradictions of power and spirit. It seems that the institutional structure of socialist society offers particularly favourable possibilities of abuse of political power to groups and individuals, i. e., that its mechanisms of social control of power were absolutely insufficient. This fact brought about a break in the development of socialism, that break which caused that a humanist embryo became non-humane. This is great inconsistency, desertion of the original ideal, this is danger, latently threatening socialist democracy.

Can socialism preserve the humanist embryo? This question is necessary, since we have experienced the contrary. The experience that socialism is not identified with the dictatorship of the proletariat but rather with the dictatorship of the secretariate, and with the kingdom of the silence of reason, is alarming.

A question proceeds from the above said: Where do the reasons for this threatening lie? Human existence is the real

content of history. Now it has become a matter of wide knowledge that in building socialism we have to do with a complicated organism, within which various forces are active, and which cannot be put upside-down from one day to another, even by the best considered recipe.

I proceed from the thesis that among these forces those forces which can be characterized as the human factor are of the highest importance. It must be quite clear to us that also in socialist society we have to do with people, who rule other people and decide about them. That is why it is quite clear that the bad deformations of socialist humanism and democracy must be proclaimed the consequences of the wrong early-marxist anthropology. These deformations mean that the old outgrown Marxist concept of man has definitely given up.

The problem of man's picture is thus in the centre. In the sense of this old anthropology man was firstly considered to be the product of economic laws, the object of economic and social circumstances, and degraded to the transitory point of these processes, merely to the transitory greatness and in accordance with this to this extent »dead«. The social position actually has a formative influence upon man's consciousness and his decisions; but this fact cannot be primitively and non-dialectically generalized as an explanation principle of man's complicated existence. Man is not merely an exponent of the political, economic and social situation. The ownership of the means of production, which has been considered a conglomerate of social power ever since Marx, was only the first prerequisite for the abolition of social poverty and injustice. The mere socialization (nationalization) of the means of production has not settled the problem of the concrete (eigentlich) and the abstract (uneigentlich) man (K. Marx). On the contrary, this concept of man caused damage to the cause of socialism. It reduced man to a mere function of the historical fundament, it abolished the man as the subject, it bereft him of his human dignity and finally condemned him to be a toy of the political development. Instead of final abolition of his alienation, instead of arising his selfconfidence, it brought about a new and even worse alienation.

The consequences of this for the socialist practice are well-known. The fact that society appropriated the means of production did not free man and did not make him good. His life struggle did not end. Man does not exclude himself from the »animal kingdom« to pass from the animal to really human existence, circumstances. Socialization did not overcome the evil in man, its immense power, all inhumanity. Evil

is actual subjugation of man. Evil, whose traces we know well, originates from the instinctive structure of human nature (envy, need for esteem, aggressive instinct, fear, thirst for power, etc.). Man — unfortunately also the man in socialist social order — is no harmonious unit, he is rather a battlefield of most severe contradictions and historic elements.

In my view, this is the most important statement, not only for the explanation of human existence (unreduced) man's actuality, but also for any obligatory, scientifically founded concept of socialism.

The thought of evil in the human world — an ancient thought — must be comprised in the conditions of the socialist revolution as the anthropological specificness. The idea of the socialist liberation of man, of socialist democracy, must — if it wants to make sense — take into account all the dangers connected with the existence of evil in man, it must be able to protect and defend itself from its eruption.

Scientific socialism cannot overlook humanity, the profoundly human sides of the human being. Serious investigation of the latter must be one of the fundamental conditions of socialism, without the effective application of its results, socialism is a senseless utopia without history, a dream picture, and not a real phantom, a mere talk.

The anthropological basis of the problem has its important significance in the very connection with the problems of socialist democracy. Socialist theory must pose anew the problem of the human being. We cannot speak about socialism without measuring it by the norm of what man is, what he needs, how he feels, what his world looks like in reality, and what forces work within it.

Objective and subjective forces of human existence in policy must be controlled, anonymous forces in man must be named; we must not be blind to them, we must have a survey of the psychological factors of the masses in superindividual space, master the laws of human personality and man's initiative, functional connections in personal happening, etc. — all this opens new possibilities for socialism.

The process of such an evolution and adjustment in concepts of socialism has already begun. It is no longer possible to argue on the basis of categories which do not exist any longer. We must free ourselves from the old categories of theory and move on, accepting the challenge of the time. In this connection I would like to say that in our political thought prescientific views are still predominant. We can see that science as a method in policy and in strategy of the socialist revolution has not attained much. The question



arises: Why? The significant connection of scientific methods makes it possible for us — this is true both of Yugoslav and of Czechoslovak experiments — to conceive a really complex scientific concept of socialism at the stage of the second industrial revolution. I would like to briefly mention some aspects of the new model in Czechoslovakia, of course, from a purely personal view.

Credibility of the ideas of socialism will always depend on whether it succeeds in realizing, in a permanent way, the concrete ideas of a contemporary order and in linking them with ideals, representing psychological, material and institutional facts and needs of our time.

In the present period of the scientific and technical revolution, various processes are active; their consequences are profound changes in the traditional structure of society, in the material basis of life and in nature of labour. Man is beginning to understand gradually the essence of his human existence.

Structural and functional changes in the relations in production (the abolition of class antagonism, the realization of relations in the process of collective co-operation and human development) have become essential constituent elements of socialist changes as attendant phenomena of the technical revolution.

The level of development and the structure of the contemporary social means of production (science being one of the most important of them) are, in their social and general human consequences, more radical than the traditional theory of socialist industrialization admits. Relaxation and further development of economic, sociological and anthropological conditions of the production of the progressive means of production, conditions of revolutionizing the civilizational basis of human life, belong to the most elementary significance of the socialist stage. Intervention of science in social life has become one of the most important factors of this new development.

Socialism could not win, if it did not establish the preference for a social structure without class antagonism in public and the sensibility to the new dimensions of the civilizational process.

The study of social and human connection with the technical revolution shows that a rising line of needs for democratization of life comes to expression in the contemporary socialist basis of civilization. The process of absolute democratization has become the fatal question of the contemporary Leninist socialism. In the time of a rationally organized society the polarity of freedom and order



is no longer threatened and destroyed by too much freedom, but rather by too many state social ties (administrative centralism and management by directives belong to the latter).

The new dimensions, laws and forms of historical movement in the field of the scientific-technical revolution, which also includes socialism and has a profound influence upon it, represent a real and decisive test for socialism.

The entire sphere of human life appears gradually as the new dynamic factor in movement of socialism. Between man and his work — socialism there develops a complicated dialectic controversy, which can lead to absurd.

In its contemporary phase, civilization activates and accelerates the intense development of man's creative forces. Its subjective dynamics has an increasing role. The entire structure of the human world is given a new significance in the circumstances of the scientific and technical revolution. Man's development has become an active factor of socialist development. This development can accept a considerably larger degree of freedom and take the same in account, freedom as man's own goal. A certain disorder in its movement can be a consequence of this development. In principle this development makes it possible for each individual to actively co-operate in the rise of civilization, this has not been possible so far. But freedom also includes the cause of destruction, says existentialist Jaspers. This freedom must be justified (in the sense of a real life impulse by the emergence of »collective reason«, or else catastrophe threatens).

In this dimension of the problem, socialism gets new justification — as the basis for integration of civilizational and cultural forces, needs of individual and of society. These possibilities give it a great advantage over capitalism.

This new absolute democracy of socialism is not announced; it is a constituent element of the »automatic« processes of contemporary civilization, which cannot be permanently frustrated or abolished.

Everything depends upon the fact, whether socialism succeeds in establishing a new system of civilizational regulators, means and rules to objectivize economic, sociological, psychological, anthropological and biological conditions of accelerating man's creative forces, his freedom (collective reason). The development in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic has shown that also the worker is very much interested in preservation of the maximum sphere of the free development of the individual.

Social experience teaches us that it is possible to persuade the intellectual elite for a reasonable application of democratic

institutions in socialism. I would like to call attention to the words of Lenin, that the working class left to itself has no real revolutionary tendencies but merely bourgeois ambitions. Without the union of the proletariat with intellectuals, science, the way to socialism and democracy is not possible. In this sense also the idea of the intellectual opposition should not be understood too narrowly and exclusively in its political meaning. This opposition is not merely a question of thinking but also of critical and selfcritical consciousness. Thus it would be better to speak about a corrective. Also a critical education of the masses should become a part of general education. The political education should not be understood as it has been understood so far: as the means of comfort and effectiveness of implementation of power.

The new critical philosophy of man, which represents the main theme of socialist problems and to which young Marx furnished an important fundament when proclaiming man »the highest human being«, must take the place of the functional ideology. This is the main task of the contemporary socialism. Only in this way the moral prototype of man can be developed, which is so necessary in our time. The ethic establishment of socialism is directly connected with the new social order, in order to help man in industrial civilization to attain his rights, his human status, and to help to save man's humanity in the circumstance of industrialized society. This is certainly one of the fundamental problems of our time. We must be aware of the fact that socialism, inspite of all its shortcomings, is a real possibility of a free existence of man.

## Some Functions of the Political Relations and Institutions in the Social System of an Agricultural-Economic Enterprise

The social system of the agricultural-economic enterprise is a multi-dimensional, richly structured system of social formations, processes and relations, which participate because of the effect of a specific type of social tie in the realization of the institutional aims of the enterprise. The structure and dynamic of the social system of the agricultural-economic enterprise of the co-operative type (JRD) is distinguished from other productional systems by two specific characteristics.

These are specific features dictated to the enterprise by agricultural economy as a regional productional sector of the national economy, and secondly, specific features originating from the collective form of ownership in this type of enterprise.

Both these modifying influences come to expression in the following elements of the social system of JDR.<sup>1</sup>

### 1. *In the aims of the enterprise*

The JDR institution is characterized by a plurality of aims; in the complex of aims entrusted to the enterprise by higher system we can find besides the specialized productional activity, which represents the constitutional aim, also political and social, cultural and administrative-legal aims in a considerable extent. Apart from this the enterprise has also several orientations of its own, originating mainly from the autonomous ownership. With its role in the social field JDR includes into its system also some extra-institutional aims, originally fulfilled by the system and institutions of commune, or other institutions outside the co-operative.

<sup>1</sup> This classification of elements was made by A. Matejko in his work *Nástin sociologie práce*, Prague 1967.

## *2. In the personnel composition of the producers*

The demographic structure of workers of JDR is characterized — above all due to industrializational migration and processes of urbanization — by a predominance of older generations and a high number of employed women. Low qualification, small cultural and political activity, specific psychic abilities of population in villages, greater dependence upon tradition, religiousness and other are characteristics which distinguish the personnel composition of agricultural-economic workers in general, and worker of JDR in particular, from other groups of employees.

## *3. In the means and objects of the activity of the institution*

The biological and climatic factors are an essential part of the means and objects of the productional system. The natural forces act in the productional process to some extent as automatisms, which are still autonomous and beyond control regarding the level of the progress of science in this field. Manual labour, traditional technology and dispersed area of work are predominant in the working process. The traditional division of labour prevails. The institution of the enterprise, its authority and similar, is characterized by a smaller depersonalization and efficiency under the influence of the combination of communitarian and traditional elements. Institutions are poorly differentiated.

## *4. In social-professional status and roles*

The professional status and roles show a very small differentiation and mobility. The universal type of manual worker prevails. Institutional and professional relations and roles are strongly intermingled with home, family and traditional relations. Social and professional status of workers has little prestige.

## *5. In social cultural system*

In the enterprise there exist independent norms of institutionalized actions, sanctions and institutions (sub-culture). Many elements of social culture (and sub-culture) are not formalized and uniform in enterprises of the same type. There exists an ambivalent merging of values, namely of the values of the traditional and humanitarian types. The traditional and charismatic authorities and dependence upon competence, rational authority of the institution of the enterprise have an important position in this system.

## 6. *In the social organization of the system*

The principles of social organization and of technical-economic organization in JRD have the least formalized elements and are different from other enterprises of the same type. The organization of the production shows the least elements of scientific management; the traditional division of labour and management is predominant. Capacity of power is autonomously selfgovernmental. The amount of freedom of organizational structure is very high and often reaches the boundaries of anomy.

The functioning of the social system of an agricultural economic enterprise presupposes the existence of processes, which systematize the elements of this system inside (i. e. social formations, relations and processes in the enterprise) into the aims of a conformable, united system. The constructive principle of these processes must be the principle of the optimization of the interests, needs and aspirations of the workers in the enterprise as the subject of social relations, with the institutionalized norms, aims and interests of the enterprise as the subject and the framework of the social relations of this kind. The processes which fulfil this function create the social connection of the system.

Social connection is thus an organized process of social relations, institutions and elements of social control, systemizing social formations, processes and relations in the enterprise into a working unit, capable of existence and development.<sup>2</sup> This is the process which links the system of material and personal units, among which there exist multi-dimensional social, economic, legal, political, personal, actual and other relations, into an intergrated system, capable of action, development and of reproduction.

Numerous factors participate in the process of social interconnection: personal interests, motives, aims and aspirations of individuals, professional relations, linking individuals to their work and to enterprise, group- and social relations, communal and ecological connections, institutions of the enterprise, power and administrative relations and political institutions. Each of these factors joins the individual and the institution by a specific type of connections and relations, whose result is a multidimensional, complex social bond between man and enterprise.

One of the interesting partial problems of the social bond can be seen in the function of political relations and of institutions in this process.

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. Szczepanski, *Základní sociologické pojmy*. Prague 1966.

The political institutions of an enterprise (the organization of the communist party, its organizational units, institutional political functions, etc.) can, in principle, be analysed as units within which, or by means of which, the layers of higher political system realize their impulses of regulation and setting norms, held by these institutions to be positive and functional at attaining general-social political aims. The principle of reflexive bond represents the reactive results of these impulses, realized and modified by the political institutions of the enterprise, which in the final consequence become (through institutionalized channels and filters) the source of and the impulse for new impulses of political institutions of a higher rank. This process, a simplified model of the continuity of the circulation of political leading, presupposes for its continuous course a consensus of fundamental aims, values and interests of both parties, i. e., of the enterprise and of the society. This means that higher systems establish — through the political institutions of the enterprise — also social aims, which are in accordance (in principle, longterm and concept) with the aims and interests of the enterprise and its employees; but at this appropriate treatment, activity and interpretation of these impulses of the political institutions of the enterprise must be, at the given measure of freedom, in agreement not only with the interests of the enterprise and its employees but also with the principled interests of society.

Universalism of policy brings about that in essence all the elements of the inner structure of this system are an object effected by the political institutions of the enterprise. Constitutive principle of the activity of the political institutions of the enterprise is the inner activation of the entire system for the improvement of the general-social, normative, functional tasks (irrespective of the fact, whether these tasks are really functional socially). The performance of this function requires — apart from the existence of the above mentioned consensus of values, norms and means and also of the proper, rational organization of the system of the political institutions of the enterprise — above all the assurance of the interests and the active part of the workers of the enterprise in the realization of these tasks. It is quite clear that in the rational functionality of the political institutions of the enterprise there participate also several other factors apart from the two mentioned.

The process of the social bond can be affected by the political institutions of the enterprise, by political relations, by interests and similar, as elements with social integrational and cohesive effect. A worker in an enterprise can, through



appropriate functioning of these institutions and through his appropriate functioning in the same, affect and influence the processes in the enterprise, and also co-operates with a certain measure of influence in political life of global society. The functioning in the political institutions of the enterprise can link such man by a specific bond both with global society and with the system of the enterprise. The assumption that the political relations realized in the enterprise will become an element integrating its carriers with this system can be stated as follows: political relations and institutions will have an influence as an element of social bond with those workers who

a) accept the values, orientations and actions of higher political systems,

b) accept the interpretation and innovation of these values and actions on the part of the political institutions of the enterprise,

c) participate in their establishment, interpretation and realization.

If the suitable orientation of higher systems (a), or the interpretation and innovation of the political aims on the part of the political institutions of the enterprise (b), regarding the enterprise and the interests of its members is disfunctional or afunctional, then this leads to the isolation of the political institutions, to their alienation and to various degrees of the resistance of the subject of policy and the workers in the enterprise as a whole. On the other side, passivity and resistance of the subjects of policy (c) makes the functional acting of the political institutions of the enterprise (b) impossible and finally this breaks down also the effectiveness of higher political institutions (a). In this case political relations do not become a cohesive factor of the social bond in the system and lead also to various other far-reaching consequences.

If we accept this hypothesis and consider political activity, commitment, and institutionalized political activity of workers in the enterprise, and also the appropriate activity of the political institutions of the enterprise, an element which strengthens their social bond with the enterprise, and contrarily, if we consider political passivity and resistance to be a negative feature of this process, then we must — from the methodological point of view — investigate all these phenomena in an indirect, reflexive way, through the analysis of the external phenomena of political views of workers of the enterprise, i. e., through the reflexion of this state in their consciousness and view. First, their view of politics in general, then their view as regards functioning of the political

institutions of the enterprise, and finally their view of the participation in politics, i. e., of the institutionalized activity of the party. In the concrete empirical investigation, with which we will try to demonstrate the above indicated hypotheses, we examined the view of workers of a typical JRD in a maize producing area in Slovakia. The representative sample of responders was a fourth of the permanently employed workers of the enterprise (76 responders). Standard interview, completed by observation and analysis of materials, was the technical means of this investigation.

In this methodological process the external phenomena of *views regarding politics* can be classified in three types:

a) *politically active types* with general interest in politics, political activity and information,

b) *politically passive types* without interest in politics in general, but showing no inner reservations as regards politics; they give up, they do not understand politics,

c) *politically resistant types*, who on purpose distance politics, who refuse to be interested in political activity and do not trust politics, and have reservations as regards politics.

Also as regards the view of the institutionalized participation in politics, in party activities, politics and membership in party, three different types can be distinguished:

a) *party types* — members of the party and those interested in becoming its members,

b) *non-party types* — they are not members of the party and not interested in becoming members of the party, but they have no reservations and feel no resistance to the party institutions.

c) *outside-party types* — who are not members of the party and distance themselves from the institutions of the party, and have reservations and distrust of the policy of the institutions of the party.

By combining these types we can distinguish nine specific kinds of political and non-party engagement. From the point of view of these types of the process of social bond with the enterprise we can provide the following interpretation. With the representatives of the combination *politically active, party type* we can assume that through their political relations which they enter in the enterprise, and through their interests and acceptance of politics in general they become elements of social bond with the enterprise. These are types of active, politically thinking people, who are informed and seek political information, at the same time seeking and finding also possibilities of their own political engagement, through which they can establish their own concept of politics,

innovations and of influence. In the given framework they are active creators of policy.

With the representatives of the combination *politically active, non-party type*, the active interest in politics with simultaneous disinterest in the membership and work in the party and in the political institutions in the enterprise, can become, under certain circumstances, but informally, a potential cohesive element of their social bond with the enterprise. It is characteristic of this type that its representatives do not want to actively participate in politics, while being well-informed and attentive consumers of it.

With the representatives of the combination *politically passive-party type* their institutional engagement in the party at a complete lack of interest in politics can, in certain circumstances, become a potential constituent element of cohesive forces supporting the social bond with the enterprise. The representatives of this type try — through their engagement in the party (irrespective of whether this is a result of their inner motivation or some other reason) — to attain non-political aims. Here we have to do with an inadequate use of political institutions and activity of the individual, expecting from his activity success, advantages, power and similar.

With the representatives of other types of combinations we can establish various degrees of political and party passivity and resistance, which show that the political relations in the enterprise cannot become a cohesive element of their social bond with this system. So for instance, types of political non-party passivity, individuals indifferent to politics and party, without any engagement in this direction; politically active, outside-party types are people whose interest in politics leads them to an anti-party position (obviously due to their negative experience in known political institutions); politically resistant non-party types are people feeling crystallized resistance to politics without their own engagement in the institutions of the party; politically resistant, outside-party types are people in whom the crystallized resistance to politics is associated with distrust, resistance and reservations as regards the existent political institutions and similar.

In the investigation and interpretation of the view of the responders regarding the function of the *political institutions* in the enterprise we can proceed from the following postulates:

a) political institutions of the enterprise (party organization, its committees, composition and members) should be the representatives of the political influence in the

system and should — on this basis — create a certain «elite influence», establishing the policy of the party at all the structural levels of its functioning; the main principle of difference of these groups from other groups should be founded in this fact.

b) the influence, which the political institutions should have in the enterprise and which should distinguish the members of the party from the non-members, should be established in the appropriate field, i. e., it should be directed towards establishing of institutional norms, innovations and aims determined by the party.

Thus in our research the following questions requested an answer:

1. Do the members of the party and of the political institution in the enterprise differ from the non-party groups in the intensity of their influence,

2. Does the intensity of the influence of these groups differ from the intensity of the influence of other groups, namely of the formal power elite groups,

3. In what extent do the political groups and institutions establish their influence if they are the carriers of it?

The following table gives us a fundamental idea about the composition of the views of the responders to political and institutional party activity:

political activity party activity	politically active	politically passive	politically resistant	total
institutional party	1,3	1,3	—	2,6 %
institutional non-party	13,2	27,7	26,4	67,3 %
institutional outside-party	17,1	9,2	3,9	30,2 %
total	31,6 %	38,2 %	30,3 %	

From these material it is apparent that general political engagement is characterized by a proportional distribution of views, while engagement in the party shows a great predominance of both *non-party types*, who are not engaged politically in institutions and are not interested in this activity, and *outside-party types*, who on purpose distance themselves

from the party, its institutions and work, distrust the party and in principle do not want to have anything to do with such activities.

Politically active types come mostly from the old and middle generation of men and from the young and middle generation of women. Workers of low social-professional rank predominate in this group. Politically resistant types predominate above all in the young generation of women of low social-professional rank. Party types are represented exclusively by young men of high social-professional rank (qualified workers, leading workers), and non-party types by women from the middle and young generation with low social-professional rank. Men from the middle and old generation with middle or low social-professional rank prevail in outside-party types.

Types indifferent to politics and party, *passive, nonparty types* and *politically resistant types, unengaged in institutions and party*, prevail in combination types.

If we want to make a scale of the political and party engagement of workers of a typical JRD in Slovakia, we would come to the conclusion that the majority of the members of a co-operative (27,7 %) have no interest in political activity and are simply indifferent to the party. Politics as an element and direction of human engagement has no room in their world of values. Workers with reservations as regards political standpoints (politics is not for us, we do not want to have anything to do with it) and without interest in engagement in political activities of the party (26,4 %) have the second place. The third place of the scale is occupied by workers whose interest and activity in general political problems brought them to the outside-party positions (17,1 %). They are interested in politics and have their »viewpoint«, but they do not agree with the interpretation given by the political institutions, and refuse engagement in such policy. The fourth place of the scale is finally occupied by politically active, but non-party and unengaged »consumers«. Their interest in politics is »academic«, they simply have no wish to be engaged in it, they have neither reservations nor a positive active attitude to the activity of the political institutions (13,2 %).

It is obvious that with none of the above stated types, representing almost 85 % of responders, we can assume that their political relations, ties and interests are a cohesive factor in their social bond with this system.

Contrary to the recent past, when the thesis was advocated that the political engagement of people was a means to activation of people in their work, we see here its very

contrast. The system of political work, established by higher and lower political institutions, has not succeeded in activating, at least at the general political level, the decisive part of cooperative workers, a group which has been, is, and will continue to be, politically important in the demographic structure of our country. On the contrary, the system of political work so far has left more than two thirds of responders, adherents of this layer, unengaged in political activity, or two thirds of generally anti-politically minded people. The fact that also that part of the members of a cooperative, who are generally active and have interest in politics and political activity (approximately one third of those questioned), express an unambiguous distrust of engagement in political institutions, political functions and similar, and do not want to be engaged, or want to remain neutral in this direction, persuades us that this state is the result of the wrong system of political work and not of any given qualities of the peasants, »inherited distrust«, or of any other »objective circumstances«.

The political institutions of the enterprise — and also outside it — did not know, with its activities, to engage and to activate the decisive majority of people for political aims, they did not know how to join and integrate the general political and general social interests with the personal interests of the subjects of policy.

This state is characteristic also of the viewpoints expressed by responders regarding the political institutions of the enterprise.

Political groups in the enterprise	Orientation	In inter-individual sphere	In pover sphere
Representing the elite of influence	Adequate	29,0	31,6
	Inadequate	21,1	3,9
Not representing the elite of influence		50,1	64,6

According to the majority of the responders the political institutions of the enterprise (party institutions, functionaries, party members, etc.) do not at all represent an »influential elite« — a group establishing interests, norms and principles, on which our policy is based. Even more, if these



groups have influence, then they establish it in an inappropriate way, so as to cause damage to these interests, norms and principles. This comes to expression especially where these groups are engaged in interindividual relations, i. e., in the field which is most sensitive to a correct, suitable treatment. In the view of the responders, institutional activity is most deformed in this field, while the interests of individuals, cliques and groups establish themselves in an inappropriate way, instead of an actual policy suitable to the general-social principles and normatives. The political institutions of enterprises and their representatives either have no influence in this interindividual sphere, sphere of directing interhuman relations, or, if they have influence, they use it not for the realization of the appropriate aims, but rather for personal or group interests of individuals. At the level of power relations, concerning the management, responsibility, power and authority, the political institutions have — according to the responders — some more influence, and this influence is almost entirely appropriate.

*Conclusion:* The purpose of this investigation could not be an exhaustive representation of the function of the political relations and institutions in the social system of the agrarian-economic enterprise, still from the above stated hypotheses and their interpretation on the basis of a typically empirical material we can derive a few important conclusions. Above all we can state that the political relations in enterprises of this type have not yet become a factor in strengthening the connection between man and an institution, in the identification of workers with the enterprise, in their social link with this system. In this direction their effect is rather afunctional or dysfunctional. The inadequate, in most cases afunctional or dysfunctional functioning of the political institutions in the enterprise can be considered the main reason of this state. With the present system of work of our political institutions we can, even though without intentions to generalize, conclude that the roots of inappropriate inefficiency must be sought in the whole concept of the administrative, directive, undemocratic way of political work, which until recently predominated in our political system. The alienations of the subject of policy from policy as such, coming to expression here, the loss of positive relations, which should be established by policy as a uniting factor, calls attention to serious danger. Since peasants, members of JRD, are a *politikum*, and a very important *politikum*, which must not be underestimated.

Friedrich Tomberg

## Das Argument

## Experiences of APO

I would like to use some experience of the un-parliamentary opposition (APO) in West Germany, and particularly in West Berlin, for the discussion about democracy and socialism. I will first sketch three characteristic situations from the development of APO:

1. a mass student action at the university,
2. action of *ad hoc* groups without mass basis in individual specialized fields of the university,
3. action of APO among neutral or even hostile masses in town area.

The first example: a mass student action at the university. Universities in West Germany are birthplaces of un-parliamentary opposition. Here the appeal of the representatives of the students who had been struggling for a university reform for years had a surprising echo at a certain time. Almost daily meetings of thousand and more students, delegated by nobody, and filling the big lecture rooms to the utmost possible degree, became the carriers of student policy. From these meetings there emerged militant actions at the university, their success was subject to immediate, common criticism, advocates and opponents were given a free word. The elected representatives of students considered the agreed conclusions to be obligatory, and the meeting entrusted more and more certain individual functions to unofficial persons also. At elections and in voting students of the whole university had a chance to express their opinion about the policy of the student movement from time to time. This policy was always explicitly approved by the majority, on certain occasions it was supported by mass demonstrations, a part of students who have not determined their explicit viewpoint bore actions almost without condemnation, there was practically no principled opposition. The highest amount of direct democracy was shown at camping. The majority

F. R. Germany

had to decide in accordance with the form it took in free discussion, and also the outvoted students could agree with these decisions.

The second example: the action of *ad hoc* groups without a mass basis in individual specialized fields of the university. At higher schools there existed fields which were hardly touched by the student movement. In these fields individual students often formed *ad hoc* groups, which became active in the very field. The elected representatives either joined the *ad hoc* group or got lost in the mass of students, which remained passive and continued with its study in the usual way. It was easy for those professors, who in principle refused co-deciding of students, to point to the shortcomings of the democratic legitimation of the *ad hoc* group. But in a sudden democratic atmosphere they appealed to the majority, since they knew well: 1. that the students in their field were too rigid to bring together a sufficiently representative meeting, and 2. that at such a meeting, if it ever took place, the majority would hardly in an open way and explicitly stand for the provocative appearance of an appropriate *ad hoc* group. Still, the *ad hoc* groups persisted in their request to speak on the behalf of all the students in their field. At this they did not refer to the decisions of the majority, but rather to the interest, in which they agreed with all their fighting collaborators. They considered it their task to establish the student interest against the professors and to attain that the majority standing at the side became aware of their own interest and joined in the activity. To become subordinate to the majority, inactive in politics, would at present mean to prevent action, and this would be contrary to the interest of the majority. The interests and the decisions of the majority were contradictory to each other in this situation. The *ad hoc* groups decided to take in account the interests and thus ignored the rules of the game, considered to be an inevitable necessity of democracy. In spite of this they considered their activity as absolutely democratic.

The third example: the action of APO among neutral or even hostile masses in town area. Students soon came to know that the higher schools would not be democratically reformed unless the society became revolutionary democratic. That is why they made the city the field of their actions also and only at that time the real un-parliamentary opposition came into being, it was no longer borne by students only. Relying on larger social connections, APO managed to attract a considerable number of citizens to the demonstrations against the existent circumstances in the management. These demonstrations were suffered as long as they kept the

established rules of the game, but they did not arise any response in the masses, or, even a negative response. Still, APO did not doubt for a moment that it alone stood for the interests of all the working people of the city, even though the latter were not only passive at the side but denied unambiguously the identity of the interests between themselves and APO.

\* \* \*

What does the experience from these three sketched types of situation tell us? It tells us that democracy in the process of being only established or before being fully carried out can be a very contradictory phenomenon. From purely theoretical point of view it is not at all hard to acknowledge the perception of the interests of the people and the principle of the decision of the majority as the essential elements of democracy. The theorists of bourgeois and also of socialist democracy can agree in this respect. The contradictions arise only from the concrete situation. Bourgeois democracy has a very simple solution for such instances: to keep at any cost the rules of the game is its firm principle. The point of departure of the student movement and APO was the knowledge that the democratic rules of the game could be well used to suppress or to outroot democracy. The call »Break the rules of the game« was not in vain the sign for the beginning of the struggle for democracy and against the mere facade of democracy.

The experience of the *ad hoc* groups that the interests have priority over the rules, of course, does not make the rules superfluous, but rather requires their modification in accordance with the given situation. This is much harder in the complicated framework of the city circumstances of the activities of APO than in the field where the *ad hoc* groups, considered here, worked. These groups consisted namely of the students from a certain specialized field, and were no groups in the real sense of the word, but rather an assembly of those who wanted to become active in the tendency for common »*ad hoc*« interests, i. e., from a certain motive and with a certain aim, which could be attained in a relatively short time.

The position of the un-parliamentary opposition outside universities is completely different. APO is in a kind of ghetto, separated by a wide gap of bad temper and misunderstanding on the part of the masses which APO represents and it does not work *ad hoc* for this or some other change, but is rather engaged in a longterm activity to alter the whole society. The interest which it tries to establish is the interest of the

processes, rules of the game of struggling, should only be majority of population in a capitalist society, it concerns the self decision of the producers, i. e., socialist democracy. According to the experiences of the *ad hoc* groups appropriate processes, rules of the game of struggling, should only be developed from the given, concrete situation in order to establish this interest. With the exception of special cases, APO has not been able to do this so far. Long ago it broke — in a much more militant way than the mentioned *ad hoc* groups — the rules of the game of bourgeois democracy in the interest of the victims of the capitalist system. Apart from this it came to the conclusion that only self-decision could be their interest. In order to establish this interest it accepts anew the principle of bourgeois democracy, namely that the rules of the game have priority, may they be in the interest of the people or not. But now the rules of the game prescribe a political practice which is called socialist, imagined in accordance with the model of primeval communist democracy, namely the direct self-decision, used by all the participants in the same degree and without any mediation. This self-decision must be arrived at through nothing else but the self. It must be realized so that it be practiced here and now. Thus the problem of the revolution is reduced to the problem of the exchange of the rules of the game: if all the people depending on wages refuse to live according to the rules of the game of bourgeois democracy and decide to acknowledge the rules the game of direct socialist democracy, then democracy is thus realized. The whole matter comes to the masses, carrying out this action through self-decision. The revolutionary strategy, into which the masses do not enter themselves, must not interfere, since this would be an alien decision. Thus the activity of APO centred upon undertakings whose significance was mainly in demonstrations: by clearly proving in individual places, by occupation of offices or by a surprising victory over police, that the power of the establishment is not inviolable, the population should be shown the way to get rid of the alien decisions of capital and of the state. The actors were astonished to encounter at this again practice, which was authoritative and, because of defective organization, hardly within the reach of control.

The purpose that direct democracy would bring about direct democracy in bourgeois society is obviously an illusion. Irrespective of this, persisting in spontaneity in a situation, in which it is either not possible or not sufficient, would really hinder the organization of a society, in which alone possibilities for this spontaneity could develop, and thus frustrate the establishment of even modest socialist democracy.



In so far as APO follows this concept it again approaches bourgeois democracy in its practice: Like the persistence in the bourgeois rules of the game, the persistence in the anti-bourgeois rules of the game continues and with it the principled rejection of the bourgeois rules of the game, preserving the only goal of the revolutionary struggle: the liberation of proletariat from the chains of capital by any means.

\* \* \*

Why does APO succeed so poorly in subordinating itself to the interests of proletariat? The answer is very simple: both the student movement and APO have developed from an attempt of citizens to break away from the bourgeois order. Thus APO is first of all a potential socialist movement also where it already widely uses socialist words and concepts.

The carriers of APO are in a great extent bourgeois intellectuals. In a liberal commodity producing society this layer should have the role of producing a special commodity — ideology; for instance in the form of science and of art. In the free market everybody could sell whatever he had: the capitalist brought to the market material product, the worker his labour, and the intellectual came as the producer of knowledge and thought. Generally ensured freedom of thought became an existential condition for him. Bourgeois society could ensure this freedom, because it needed both bourgeois ideology, produced by the intellectuals, and labour of the masses of proletariat, for suppression of which this ideology was a necessary help. For a long time it was necessary and possible to put up with the fact, that several intellectuals offered bad »commodities«: namely the criticism of bourgeois society — and also found consumers for it.

The contemporary monopolit-capitalist society offers freedom in the market in a very limited extent. Its integrational tendency is increasing. Apart from this it is rather hard for the bourgeois intelligentsia with clear conscience to provide a justification for a system, which has obviously become anachronistic and behaves more and more unhumanly. That is why many clairvoyant writes in the German society after the second world war turned to exclusive criticism or to critically-minded works. In order that their criticism would not miss its aim, i. e., that people could read their works, the writers had to pay special attention that they did not touch upon the freedom of thought and of the press. In order to be able to pursue criticism, they had to distance themselves from society, in whose culture and worldview they had their roots. They considered themselves



to be nonconformists, and since they exercised criticism they were considered according to the official opinion to be »leftists«. Hence the opinion that the conservative cultural critics are considered to be »leftist intellectuals« sometimes now also.

The founders of APO are no longer the nonconformist left intellectuals, or at least, do not want to be this. In the mean time it has namely become clear that the freedom given to criticism was — in the view of voters — in direct relationship with the ineffectiveness of criticism. The freedom of thought and of the press made it possible for the press, which had firm capital, to keep a considerable proportion of the population in an unprecedented political indifference. One of the main rules of bourgeois democracy proved to be exceptionally suitable in the service of the governing capital to press down all the dangerous democratic initiative of the people dependent on wages. In its actions against the concern Springer, APO disregarded also this rule of the game of bourgeois democracy on purpose.

This was made possible for it by the experiences gained first by students at the beginning of their struggle against the university hierarchy. In the above described meetings and actions from the first example, the students, sons of bourgeois democracy, for the first time experienced what democracy could be. They have come to know that real democracy presupposes equality of fundamental interests, that under this precondition joining in a community does not mean pressure, that it is not necessary that publicity of discussion and common action are mere fictions. They have come to know that democracy must not be measured by the extent in which it makes it possible for a few privileged nonconformists to influence with their views the producers of social goods and thus also their own privileges, but rather by the extent in which the society with all its apparatuses accelerates self-decision of the working masses.

They experienced all this in full extent where they were. No wonder they refused to recognize time and space limitations of this phenomenon. Outside — there was, afterwards as before, the bourgeois society, to which they themselves belonged, and to whose manipulations they had been subject and still in danger of becoming subject to it again. In these circumstance APO had to become an anti-authoritarian movement, and as an anti-authoritarian movement APO is an attempt of self-liberation from outer, and even more, from inner, pressure. That is why APO is allergic to any decision which does not correspond to its own expressed will, no matter whether it has the form of the order

of study, of the hierarchy of the enterprise, or of the party discipline, or of anything else. That it why it could easily appropriate the socialist idea of self-decision, but not also the practice of the socialist revolution.

The un-parliamentary movement reached its culmination when there took place the student meetings from the first example and the mass demonstrations from the second. At that time numerous participants were under the almost intoxicating influence of the experience of an increasing spontaneity. It appeared as if though the state was proved to be powerless, and that only a spark of fire was needed to bring about the revolutionary act of self-decision on the part of the masses, arising from nothing. The longer this act had been awaited the more impatient became the anti-authoritarians, the more militant and violent got their quarrels with the organs of state power. The result: only one or two thousand people participate in occasional demonstrations, which would earlier count as much as 30,000 participants. Long ago students transferred their activities back to the universities trying to force the break down of capitalist society, or at least of its educational system, by strikes, occupations of institutes, barriers, etc. In the mean time the seeming and temporarily real weakness of the state proved to be its power long ago: while the state power keeps reserved as much as possible, students are compelled to more and more radical provocations and thus they are getting isolated; it is not at all excluded that the movement will literally die away.

\* \* \*

Was it possible to prevent this fiasco? This would be possible only if APO could develop its anti-authoritative programme in a strictly socialist programme. In general, it remained true to the law according to which it came to being. Its starting problem was not: How can workers reach a society free from exploitation? But rather: How can we, the privileged citizens, defend ourselves against pressure exercised by bourgeois society, to which we ourselves belong? This pressure was a consequence of the industrial development. Bourgeois society can no longer give the old privileges to the intelligentsia. Also the intellectuals have got to get used to the apparatus of a highly civilized society, they must become functionaries of this society and thus depend — under the conditions of the governing capital — upon income, as the working class has always depended. The liberation from this situation of pressure is possible only through socialist democracy. But also socialist society is an industrial society,

including all its members into its organization, also socialist society tends to take away the privileges of the intelligentsia — but socialist society also develops the possibility of the co-operation of all groups on behalf of the interests of all people — this is new freedom, which it can offer as a perspective. A common social arrangement is an existential condition of any future society, centralism thus cannot be avoided, we can only ask the question, whether it is to be an elite centralism or a democratic one.

The anti-authoritative citizens still hope that they will be able to escape this alternative. They are not interested in replacing the requests of bourgeois industrial society by the request of socialist society. They are rather interested — often more subconsciously than consciously — in keeping the old bourgeois freedom in spite of these requests. The freedom, as offered by the liberal bourgeois society of past centuries, the freedom of an employer, did not finally exist in the fact that bourgeois working- and private- life was in a large extent protected against the interference of social institutions, and above all, of the state. The bourgeois freedom was based upon the exploitation of workers in the process of production. If in the contemporary society also burghers are more and more among the exploited in production, instead of being among the exploiters as before, they can obviously attain bourgeois freedom only if both the exploited and the exploiters get the right to have disposal of their products. If the dependence of the one upon the other is to be abolished this can happen only through self-decision of the entire collective. Self-decision understood in this way is a socialist idea. The contact of the privileged intelligentsia deriving from the capitalist system with socialism makes it possible to put opposite to the monopolist level of social development a new liberalism, a social liberalism. With the introduction of the socialist self-decision into the idea of bourgeois freedom it was possible to be opposed to the class of bourgeoisie and yet to remain an adherent of this same class.

Similarly to the classic also the socialist modified liberalism is interested in the freedom of personal, private existence opposed to the state power, only the individual should be replaced by the production collectives, having the same immediate disposal of themselves as was attributed by the liberalistic ideology to freely producing employers and to intellectuals. This concept presupposes that the role of the state can be disregarded in the same extent as with the liberal society. In the classic capitalist society liberal bourgeoisie had the parliament as an instrument against the executive of the state; later, when the parliament became an instrument of

the state interference in the society of monopolistic capital, the socially liberal burghers acted correctly if they were opposed to both the state and the parliament. As an anti-authoritative movement the un-parliamentary opposition must needs be against the parliament, the experience of the general presence of the state, which like a night guard would not let itself be pushed to the periphery, can be avoided only through anti-bureaucratic and anti-constitutional passions. This also explains the split attitude to the socialist countries: the latter have abolished capitalism, and also APO wants to do this, in this respect its relation to socialism in East Europe is positive. But since this anti-authoritative ideology conceives the rule of capital above all as the possibility to have disposal of the producers in the working positions, which should be — if possible — abolished through the occupation of the factories, APO is against the establishment of socialism as an entire social system, together with its political, administrative, enterprise-technical interference, similarly as it is against the entire capitalist system. Contrary to the classical liberalism, which in the parliamentary system knew how to disentangle political problems of society in its own interest, the contemporary social liberalism cherishes the illusion of the possibility of a bourgeois freedom in monopolistic capitalism so that it either refuses to — apart from the problem of the abolition of the authoritative structures in the places of production — meet the inevitable requirements of a highly civilized society, or sweeps the problem out of its way so that it gives to Lenin's socialist theory of the state a liberalistic and thus completely utopian characteristic: when direct democracy has been introduced in individual enterprises and capital has been eliminated, also the state as an additional instrument of the power of capital must die away, or at least be reduced to the function of the night guard.

In the mean time APO had to meet the experience that the bourgeois state is no mere fragile superstructure over the contradictions of the economic basis. The power of a state is *not limited to the power of its police*, occasionally shown at demonstrations. The masses, from whose heads the need for self-decision has been completely driven out, are still always the most reliable guarantor for the system. If they were taken the authorities, which they use for orientation, they would — left to themselves — spontaneously find a new authoritative regime. The history of Fascism makes this assumption necessary for us.

If the anti-authoritative APO has come to know what power is opposite to it, it can either resign to its fate or undertake a policy conscious of its aims, which is not embar-

rassed if it has to make a compromise with its enemy, if this is in the interest of the circumstances, and which can make use of the existent institutions also, if only to finally abolish them and put better ones in their place.

APO can become a socialist movement only if it becomes aware of the tasks, which cannot be avoided in the way to socialist democracy and which so far — 50 years after the October Revolution — have not been fully carried out by the socialist countries either. If the revolution be preserved, not only fought out, then it does not need only a mass revolutionary movement, which is strong and technically clever enough to overthrow the power of capital. Apart from this the following is necessary: the will and ability of the freed masses to keep and defend the gained power, further the mastering of the organizational problems of the complicated structure constituting the contemporary society, further, the development of the art of the adjustment of the given social organism to own, reasonable aims of the socialist co-operation, and last but not least, the advancement of economic growth so that the working time spent in direct material production gets more and more short, while it is made possible for all the producers to generally develop their forces and to have disposal of their common affairs. Thus the realization of the self-dicision of the producers cannot be ended with a successful revolution; it must rather be imagined as a process with several stages, which should not, like the social processes so far, result from the antagonism of class interests, but should rather be suitably directed on behalf of the common interest; thus it requires higher and higher guiding abilities of the participants.

The first insights into the inevitable complexity and discrepancy of self-education for socialist democracy can already be gained in APO from the hard experience, which it had to undergo. The details cannot be determined yet. It seems that the great coalition of the anti-democrats together with a silent approval of Fascism, which somehow creeps into society, might force the anti-authoritarian rebels to take leave from their last bourgeois illusions.



Socialist Democracy —  
the Highest  
Socio-political Value  
of our Time

The axiological investigation of the contemporary social and political phenomena clearly reveals the exceptional importance of the political values in our social life as a whole. In our view we must — right at the beginning — distinguish between the main theoretical and methodological directions. The contemporary non-marxist axiology usually changes social and political values in a field, which is subordinated to moral values, and if it does not do this, then it is generally directed — wanting to attain positivity — to making distinctions between a political value and a political fact, an act in the real sense of the word, to estimating political acts as facts *per se*, as characteristic phenomena of a certain society, and at this it does not raise the problem of the social- and class-contents of political values, of their social role, and of their inter-connectedness with the existent socio-political *donnée*.

The Marxist axiological literature, on the other side, does emphasize the importance of political values, giving to them the first place in the hierarchy of values, still it has not treated this problem systematically. Thus it happens that the new political values born by our time, and above all the actuality of contemporary socialism are investigated almost exclusively by sociological means and through the prism of the theory of scientific socialism. This circumstance has an unavoidable consequence, namely that we treat these values as *social phenomena* (with institutions, political and public organizations) or as the *leading principles* of a political action (when we have to do with the internal or foreign political direction of the state), or as *political actions* of leaders, parties or organizations, masses or even individual persons.

If we disclose the *axiological dimension* of these social phenomena, of these political principles and actions, we lay a stronger emphasis upon the specific features of the contemporary political life, thus making it easier to understand; and this sheds new light upon the phenomenon,



which we have so often established, namely upon the surprising attraction of these values for the masses, which they often drive to exceptional actions, thus reminding everybody that *ideas become, as Marx said, a material force as soon as they reach the masses, as soon as they become political values and are accepted as such by the largest social layers.* In our time political consciousness, originating from the structure of the actual political values, becomes a dangerous weapon resisting dramatically the crude power everywhere where peace is not respected and independence and sovereignty of the peoples, and man's freedom and dignity are disregarded.

If we begin the investigation of political values from the sociological or from the axiological point of view, the analysis of these values presupposes both ways of investigation. The principle of a concrete, historical analysis of social and political phenomena which are attributed the status of values, i. e., the principle of a sociologically founded axiological analysis, is obviously decisive for the marxist perspective of the theory of value, but at the same time it is also insufficient, and this must be stated clearly. The social foundation of political values explained in this way must be complemented by observation of political values in their value relation. This is the only way to understand the *conceptual and actual* nature of values of various kinds, and especially of political values. This connection of *the conceptual and the actual* in the *structure of each value* gives the value its status of power, mobilizing consciousness and motive forces of social development; this directs our present political activities to the futurity. An exclusively ideological investigation obviously cannot reveal the conceptual course of political values, and at this positiveness of investigation it is threatened by narrow utilitarianism. The second alternative is one-sided at least in the same extent: the analysis of social and political values based exclusively on the axiological point of departure chages these values into empty abstractions, into unhistorical, moral principles. Any attempt excluding mutually and a priori the axiological and the sociological approach must needs narrow down the theoretical approach. The only solution can be found in their mutual complementation.

Political values are determined by specific historic conditions, by the given sphere of social existence; as such they are accepted and experienced by the masses as the *highest social* and political phenomena, decisive for the social progress, and at the same time also as ideals, established as the measure of social and political activities, of political and moral behaviour. Social patriotism and internationalism, the

permanent development of socialist democracy, the affirmation and continuous strengthening of the national independence and sovereignty of each socialist country, the development and strengthening of friendship among socialist countries — these are not only phenomena of our political life, not only the necessary leading principles, required by the social development itself, these are also *real political values*, echoing deeply in the spirit and hearts of the masses. And the very fact that these phenomena have become *basic* political values for millions of people, who build socialism, proves their close connection with the social and political practice and also the necessity of developing and strengthening them even further.

The continuous improvement of *socialist democracy*, for instance is of special importance at the present level of our development. With us, in Roumania, the exploiting classes, capitalists, and great land owners, were abolished a long time ago, thus the necessary conditions of the unlimited development of the productive forces were created, socialist ownership includes 99 % of national wealth. From the social, class- and material-point of view we have created circumstances which are necessary to make for ever impossible the return of capitalism in Roumania. The belief that socialism represents the only social and political system ensuring material and spiritual progress, good life for all the members of society, and a harmonious realization of man's personality, took deep roots in the consciousness of the people of Roumania.

In accordance with the improvement of socialist building there appear various forms of co-existence and co-operation of the members of society in all economic, political and state matters as an objective necessity. This is so because socialism must ensure a society in which all the people will live in material wealth, and also a society which will be able to realize the highest social and political values of mankind, the highest strivings for freedom and for happiness of men on the earth. One of the highest aspirations of man has always been to ensure the social and national freedom and equality, to create a society in which people can confirm themselves in all the fields of material and spiritual production, in which man's personality can develop freely in all the directions.

Socialist democracy is a certain higher stage than the stages of former forms of social and political life: it must ensure, and ensures, to the workers, freed from exploitation, equal possibilities and conditions to establish themselves in society; apart from this socialism enters history as the system which can ensure the implementation of the widest public rights and liberties.

On the basis of the concept that socialism and democracy cannot be separated, the Communist Party of Roumania has been developing far-reaching policy, tending to the deepening and improvement of socialist democracy.

This policy is based upon firm belief that the creation of the new socialist system is a *conscious work of the masses*, a fruit of the thought and creative activity of the whole people, lead by its marxist-leninist party. The creation of those necessary conditions which will make it possible for the workers and masses to actively participate in administration of all the public affairs, to express their opinion regarding all the problems of social development, is *the objective law of our development*, the main guidance in socialist and communist building. The communist party of Roumania believes that one of the first tasks is the settlement and direct leading of the process of a many-sided deepening and improvement of the new social system, the establishment of everything new and progressive in the social thought and practice, so that socialist democracy could be developed continually. The integral, perfect and direct nature of such democracy excludes any practice which could spoil the sovereignty of the national community and cancel the direct co-operation of the masses in managing the public affairs. Lenin wrote: »In our opinion a state is strong because of the consciousness of the masses. It is strong when the masses know everything, when they can decide about everything, and when they do everything consciously.« But this participation of the masses is actually realized when the highest elements of the entire state policy express, as we have shown, the main interests and aspirations of individual members of society at a higher level, when these are accepted and experienced as the predominant political values. This is the only real insurance against formalism and bureaucratism, which both make possible and support the negative practice of abuse of power, and also against malevolent pragmatism and social careerism, which can be found everywhere where the norms of social and political life are neglected.

The continuous deepening of democracy has many sides, harmoniously complementing each other, regarding the typical features of a certain historic level of building of socialism. Interconnectedness of political and economic democracy, continuous perfection of social relations, both the relations among various social classes and layers and the relations between the individual and the community, supporting and strengthening of the co-operation of the masses with the management of society, the establishment of an institutional system, which will make possible the realization of man's

basic rights, and also carrying out social obligations — these are the main characteristics of our socialist development. A systematic and penetrating analysis reveals their complexity in the course of a continuous process of development; individual constituent elements of this process are determined by the level of the development of social life and internal, economic and cultural policy, by the formation of a socialist consciousness of the people, but also by the international conditions, and especially by the presence of imperialist states, and also by other objective and subjective factors. The basic fact is that democracy tends to the very essence of socialism and that its perpetual development is one of the fundamental requests of the process of perfection of the new socialist society. To separate democracy from socialism, to create between the two of them an artificial contradiction, really means to bereave the content of socialism and to damage its concept. And this in turn means the denial of the essential factor, characterizing the superiority of socialism in relation to capitalism, and an arbitrary sanction of a certain type of »socialism«, which permits anti-democratic manifestations and practice, and malevolent activities; this would cause immense damage to the authority and attractiveness of socialism among the people all over the world.

Some authors raise the question, whether socialism is democratic or not, whether it must needs be democratic or not, and thus try to separate socialism and democracy. If we try to solve the question in this way, we — in our view — neglect the fundamental fact, namely that democracy is the central value, and an organic dimension of socialism, that every process of creating the new social system is also a gradual process of further development and of deepening of the democratic nature of socialist society.

At the same time the axiological perspective regarding socialist democracy reveals also, in a persuading way, the untenableness of those theoretical and practical opinions, which have recently appeared in some discussions about this theme and which state that the development and further spreading of democracy in socialist circumstances are contradictory to the principles of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the leading role of the working class, and to the fundamental interests of a socialist society. But the leading principles of social and political life, as contrived by the classics of Marxism, and the present practice of building socialism unquestionably reject such a fictitious fear. Socialist democracy does not in the least reduce the political power of the working class, it rather strengthens the alliance of the working class with peasants and the intelligentsia. The power

of the working class, as the class in power in socialist society, is the power of a class which has abolished exploitation and thus also opened the road to a classless society. This is one of the major aspects of the historic mission of the working class. In liberating itself, the working class liberated all the workers, mobilized the masses, set free their creative energies, and thus successfully performed its role of the leading social class.

The historic role of the marxist-leninist party as the leading social force is realized in concrete circumstances of a continuous development of socialist democracy. The relations among these phenomena are objective, necessary and dialectic; they are set by those laws which regulate the new system and tend to the strengthening of our socialist society. Even in the course of the most turbulent class struggle for power, and to break down the resistance of the exploiting classes, the new system made every effort for giving the widest democratic rights to the working class, to the peasants and to the intelligentsia — and this very fact characterized the fundamental difference in the relation to the old society, which was based on exploitation and suppression — and it encouraged revolutionary energy and the public consciousness of the masses. It would be even more incredible if in the time after taking over the power the victorious socialism limited the free expression of public rights and the participation of the masses in the execution of the state power. The fact that at the present level of the building of socialism in Roumania the process of strengthening the leading role of the party in the country is organically connected with the process encouraging co-operation in the management of the state and the establishment of new measures of a widened concept of the organization of society, is of special importance and highly characteristic.

As a political value socialist democracy involves a sense of responsibility with each individual citizen, and also a sense of the necessity of acting in accordance with the requests and highest postulates of the society and of socialist nations. The development of socialist democracy is closely connected with the development of this profound, public responsibility, which is contrary to anarchy and bourgeois liberalism. Socialist democracy presupposes a high level of social consciousness, a conscious discipline, and freely accepted respect for order and lawfulness. From this point of view socialist lawfulness appears to be the only possible framework of a profoundly democratic state life. Only the strict respect for laws ensures favourable circumstances for the establishment and development of democracy, similarly as the existence of a certain



democratic atmosphere in socialist conditions represents the main assurance of the laws to the benefit of the society and of all the citizens. The Communist Party of Roumania consequently implements the policy, founding our whole social life on the basis of socialist lawfulness, of strict respect for the laws, norms and rules of social life, requested from the state organs, public organs and from each individual citizen.

These essential phenomena of social and political life and its basic principles are accepted and experienced by the public opinion of the masses as the right political values. The political line of the party is advocated and defended by all the people. Marxism-Leninism has deeply and for ever penetrated the consciousness of the workers in our country and has become the leading ideology of our socialist society, contributing to the fact that all the workers united around the Communist Party. Socialist unity of our people has penetrated all the spheres of our social life and has come to a complex expression as a political, social and ideological unity. The attempts to create antagonism between the political and moral unity of the people and the interests of a socialist society are mistaken and bad. Such theses reduce the global social changes from the time of the revolution and of building the socialist society, and express the lack of confidence to the profound and final nature of these changes. On the contrary unity of the people represents an assurance of the solidity of the socialist order and one of those factors which support the increase of democracy in the life of the state. The growth of the social role of the unity of the people in the process of socialist development, and the emphasis on its role of the motive force in preparations and the realization of the tasks of individual periods, are directly connected with and closely dependent upon the dimensions of the development of socialist democracy. In recent years the leadership of our party and of our state have always stood for the spreading of socialist democracy in economy, in political and social life, in scientific activities, etc.; such forms of organization have been sought which would be most appropriate for the present level of development and which would encourage and strengthen the co-operation of the masses in the development of social life. The new decrees for the improvement of management and planning in economy, in the financial system, and in the organization of industry, are being tried and checked now. The practice of the party to have consultation with the workers and to discuss all the major problems of its internal and foreign policy in public has been established in a wide extent.



The accepted decrees to enlarge and perfect socialist democracy also strengthen our socialist society and the leading role of the working class. In the masses of people they develop the feeling that they are the masters of the country, at the same time promoting people's devotion to the cause of socialism and strengthening and developing the socialist unity of the people.

We think that these social données — if treated from the axiological point of view — reveal in a more clear way the process in which the masses of people appropriate the political direction of the party and of the socialist state — and this is the fundamental request for the development of socialist democracy.

**Ion Mitran**

**Lupta  
de clasă**

**The Communist Party  
in the System  
of Socialist Democracy**

The problems of democracy in socialist society, the direction taken by it and the ways used, as well as the problems of the relations between democracy and the role of the communist party have become a subject of a justified theoretical and practical concern; this fact can be felt at our present meeting also. The opinions about these problems vary a great deal because they have been borne from various circumstances and different historical past of the social structures, various development levels of economy and from the differences in the tradition of political life of various countries.

On the basis of these differences and from the point of view of the Marxist-Leninist principles, we feel that we must discuss certain generally valid requests which have definitely conditioned, and still condition, the victory of the new society, if we want to discuss these problems on proper grounds. Among these requests there are, for instance, the ensurance of the social continuity of political power, of economic and social relations, a complete establishment of the progressive

forces in society, acceptance of the new and abolitions of the old, and the active role of the social superstructure and of the subjective factor. Marxist-Leninist thought long ago founded the role of the party of the working class in revolution and in building of socialism, the role which has been proved by historic experiences. On the basis of the marxist theory and social practice we can speak about several objective factors which condition the necessity of a uniform management of a socialist society: the dialectical parallelism of the subjective and the objective, the predominance of the conscious over the spontaneous, the necessity of the appropriate reflexion of actuality in political theory and also practice, the extensive tasks of the economic and socio-cultural building, the independent development of each socialist country which must take place parallel to the dimensions of its international responsibility, and the complexity of the world connexion within the framework of which the development of socialist society is taking place today. It is obvious that the recognition of the generally valid principles of the role of the subjective factor is not followed automatically by application of the same.

The role of the leader of such a large project as is socialism — according to its very nature a deeply democratic system — cannot be a consequence of certain administrative decrees, written in statutes and pragmatist declarations as theses of fundamental significance, it can only result from the creative activity taking place so that practice persuades people of the rightness of the political line and direction. We live in circumstances of a socialism which is no longer in its beginning phase, in the phase of transition from one system to another, but rather in the time of its victory in several countries. It has developed and established itself on the basis of its own laws in certainly different circumstances, characteristic of various countries; that is why new problems have arisen regarding the development of society and the acceptance of certain decisions at the macro-social level. Hence the thesis that the implementation of social leading can be actually realized only by means of a penetrating and exact investigation of the concrete actuality and a policy contrived on the basis of the general laws of building of socialism and appropriate to the circumstances in which it works. The fact that socialism has won, that new relations have come to exist among the classes, that the problem of power has been irrevocably solved to the advantage of the working people, and that the socialist regime is at a qualitatively higher level, gives rise to new views of those

factors, which express power, and truly, there arise qualitatively new changes in the leading of social life.

The means for the implementation of social leading, in a way appropriate to the contemporary circumstances, have given rise and still give rise to a series of theoretical and practical questions, among which the problem of the relations between the party and socialist democracy is of central importance. The essence does not change if in this system there is one party only or several parties, i. e., the vanguard does not change: the Marxist-Leninist party is the hegemon in any case and this does not at all limit the vision of democracy.

In our view it is not the decisive question if the party has a leading role or not, and also not the question, if the leading of society is its exclusive mission or also the mission of other social forces; the fundamental question concerns the means by which the party implements its rôle and mission in society as a political factor of the superstructure.

Well, we feel that the problem of one party or a multi-party system has not got the value of a principle proceeding from the general laws of socialism, this is rather a political question, which can be answered by the concrete analysis of the social and political relations within each individual socialist country, and of the particularities of its process of the revolution and socialist building. Thus in Roumania, for instance, the abolition of bourgeoisie and big private land owners, together with the fact that the political power was taken over by the working class and its allies, resulted in vanishing of political parties from political life, since these parties represented the interests of the exploitation class forces. Obviously there was no room left for such parties in the social-political structure of the country. The formation of a unified party of the working class and its establishment as the leading force were a prerequisite of the creation of the new society itself.

Today all the nations consider it a historical *donnée* that the victory of the Roumanian people on its way to socialism, its material and spiritual progress, and the acceptance of important democratic rights and liberties, are to be attributed to the creative Marxist-Leninist policy of its party, to its creative spirit, to the flexibility in the implementation of strategy and tactics, to the organizational and political ability to engage the masses, and to the authority and reputation, acquired in the revolutionary struggle.

The party as the leading and uniform power in the system of political and social relations, based upon scientific analysis, and the programme and concept of the development of

society, proceed from the idea that both absolutization and negation of general laws or of special circumstances, and also the mechanic acceptance of certain forms and activities, peculiar to other countries and other levels of development, can only introduce prejudice into the process of building socialism.

At the present level of the development of socialism the following problems are posed with special sharpness: the problem of the nature of leading, the problem of the ways of bringing in accordance various social interests, further the problem of a fully responsible evaluation of material and spiritual enrichment of society, and the problem of the tasks of internationalism.

Irrespective of the forms and particularities of these ways, all of them are essentially democratic and the deepening of democracy and the strengthening of the role of the party are closely connected and mutually interdependent.

All the measures accepted at the IX. Congress and at the National Conference for improvement of management and planning of the national economy, the methods of leading in all the fields, and the measures for the abolition of the phenomena of extreme centralism are a part of the process of developing democracy, at the same time expressing a profound scientific nature of the social management and its consistency with the requests of social life. The activity of our party becomes concrete with effective and original solutions in the building of socialism and in economic development, thus proving the correctness of the assertion that each party must independently work out its political line on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and so contribute to the development of the same.

It is a matter of general knowledge that the founders of our view of life and society, in their time, advocated the creative attitude towards their own views. That is why we can say that they bequeathed to communist and labour movements an initiative for a live, creative thought, seeking to surpass spiritual rigidity and inflexibility, to abolish stiff schemes and to do away with all the outdated concepts and obsolete structures. The idea of Marxist spirit has for long been a synonym of creative spirit; Marxism-Leninism cannot be used as archives from which to take this or that formula in accordance with our needs, this or that quotation for a certain purpose, without respecting a certain logical order and period of the actuality.

Party as the initiator of socialist democracy realizes the organic, scientific connection — expressed in its policy — between the requests of the objective laws of social develop-

ment and the aspiration of the people for progress. In its role of the representative of the people, as a part of the people, and as a political power including the most progressive part of the people, the party establishes itself more and more as a political organism, actually offering the solution for the problems arising in building of socialism. Now we really have a new position as regards the relation between the party and the people and also new forms of persuading people to cooperate in social life. Hence the conscious need of the masses to act as a subjective factor in the process of social development. Our party has recognized and admitted the unpleasant fact that in some fields the parallel activities of the party and the state have been developed for a long time; that is why now it has begun to delimit and determine the main tasks constituting the management of social life, and to abolish the double functions. These were, for instance: the accumulation of certain leading functions in the organs of the party and the state, the acceptance of the principle of the responsibility of one person for a certain field, the inclusion of the representatives of the mass organizations into the composition of certain central state organs and local organs; all this has brought about a qualitative rise of the act of decision making, making possible a more direct co-operation of various categories of citizens in economic process and in socio-political life.

The administrative-territorial reorganization of the country, the improvement of the role of deciding and independence on the part of the local organs of state power, contributing to a more perfect establishment of the principle that the people lead the state, all come to the same group of phenomena. This same purpose is also served by the establishment of the councils of management in all the state economic units, the institutionalization of general assemblies of workers as the organ to make it possible for the masses to partake in a better management of social property.

The political system of socialist democracy is really possible only if the forms and methods of social leading are such as to lay open its activities to the people who evaluate them. And this means that the citizens in given circumstances have the possibility to speak freely and critically, to »administer« the state and not the other way round.

In order to create a concrete system of control over power in a society governed by one party only, it is necessary to take the way of the authentic democracy in the party and at the same time also in the whole system of institutions, organization, enterprises, etc. In this complex of ideas and in this perspective the leading role of the party is conceived as a



motive power of a firm democratic life in all the fields from the sphere of material production to the whole complex of institutions and organisms of the superstructure.

In the course of recent years the party has consequently encouraged wide debate with workers and specialist in various fields. The active co-operation of the masses in social life, together with the perfection of the relations of the socialist production, with merging of social classes, and with strengthening of the socialist unity of the people, is imperative, because of which the creative forces, the inexhaustible and perfect, without reservations expressed energy and initiative of workers, become an important factor in the evaluation of advantages of the new society. These have become forerunners of such democratic forms as are: the public discussion of the problems of national significance before final decisions are taken regarding these problems, consultations within economic branches, and a wide exchange of opinions in various other fields. The dynamic presence of the masses in political arena at all the levels of management and organization of social life proves the stability of the socialist system in which the masses are really the subject of history. This is the significance of the authentic socialist democracy through which, and because of which, immense social forces express their qualitatively new energies and consciously improve social relations and the environment which they desire.

Our party is of the opinion that the active co-operation of specialists from all the fields, as well as of the widest category of citizens, is of essential importance in working out the ways of society and in finding the solutions for numerous problems posed by life. It prefers that democratic principle which is at the same time also deeply realistic. Our party wants to create as favourable circumstances as possible for the expression and establishment of the initiative of the people, because it feels that it can be dynamic only in a society where there is no fear of limited horizons of thought, where courage and creative spirit conditioned by the Marxist-Leninist consciousness of the people are the governing forces, in a society where the experiences of the individual man are compared to the experiences of others in a permanent critical examination.

The strategy which conceives the establishment of the subjective factor in this way makes the party face social processes objectively and so it also determines correctly the relationship between the leading power and the masses, the relationship which does not merely give the masses the role of the registrar of party's opinions, but rather includes them into the direct and active co-operation in the emergence and



realization of these opinions. This is the way to realize the harmony of the interests of the people and of the party policy, which is the foundation for the laws of socialist power, seen by the masses as their own power.

The increasing role of citizens in discussions and in taking important decisions and decrees regarding the interior and international policy of the state contributes to the perpetual strengthening of the unity of the party and the people. In the process of completing the socialist system and of improving the socialist democracy, the leading role of the party is getting more and more prominent, with its nature of the main force of socialist democracy. The field of the socialist democracy is comprised in constitutional and legal laws, working in accordance with democratic principles. On the basis of this concept special attention is paid by the party to the strengthening of the socialist legislation and to the implementation of the ethical standards and the principles of socialist humanism, to the creation of certain circumstances, which are necessary for the general establishment of man's personality. With this purpose in mind, some essential improvements have been accepted in the administration of justice and in some legal institutions, to protect man's life and dignity, and to ensure such a legal institutional order, which will make it possible for each citizen to develop his inclinations and talents without limitation and misuse. The idea that the force of laws and legal obligations is valid for all state organs and public organizations, for all functionaries and citizens, has been made a constitutional principle, and accepted and protected as such.

The development of socialist democracy — a problem which has been finally solved by the establishment of a new social system — is closely connected with the strengthening of lawfulness, with the abolition of subjective elements and of wilful elements, and also misuses and deformations, from which also our society is, unfortunately, not free.

Recently the party as the motive power of socialist democracy has accepted several measures to strengthen anew the principle of equality and justice.

The establishment of the role of the party in the system of socialist democracy is closely connected with the assurance of a really democratic life within its own lines. The democratization of inner life — the goal which is ascribed the greatest significance by our party — proceeds from the concept that, in the last instance, the management of a socialist society must be conducted by the party as a totality of its organizations and members and in immediate co-

operation in the production and implementation of the accepted decisions, with everybody co-operating in his own field.

The improvement of the fundamental principles of the party and consistency of discussion about all problems within it (at congresses, in assemblies and sessions) provide assurance that we shall avoid certain deformations, abuses, which might damage the principles of socialist democracy.

Our party pays great attention to the establishment of progressive, dynamic ways of work at all the levels of development of its organizational structure, to the direct political contact of the people elected into various organs of the administration with the masses of the party members and with workers. Various measures have been adopted to ensure the rights of all the members to freely express their opinions.

Also respect shown for the views of party members, and persuasion in the form of a discussion about wrong views, are two phenomena which increase the confidence of communists and workers into effectiveness of debate and encourage creative thought.

The course of a normal democratic life inside the party is conditioned by a consistent implementation of, and respect for the highest principle of party activities, the principle of collective management. All the decisions must be the fruit of wide, principled and consistent discussions within the framework of the elected party organs. The latter are responsible for the decisions which they take and for their collective activity; and each individual member is responsible for his own activity and for the activity of the organs, whose member he is.

With the course of its inner life, the party must be a model of real democracy for socialist society thus always attracting the creative forces of the masses.

**Democracy**  
**Humanity**  
**Personality**

The experiences gained by Roumania in the field of social and state building have gradually revealed certain characteristics and peculiarities. If we analyse them, we discover original ideas and solutions, which do not represent merely adequate answers to the questions raised in the process of a profound reconstruction of certain social structures and of social, economic and political superstructures, differing from those in other countries, but also represent genuine contributions, making richer the experiences of the international communist movement. The recent years have been especially characterized by an outstanding exuberance of dynamics and proliferation of the systematic improvement in organization and leading of the social life. These improvements have been seriously prepared for a long time. No spectacular reform was concerned, but rather a gradual process of perfection and decrees for a building of a social life based on the ripening of all the social, political and cultural circumstances. Well, this is one of the most characteristic features of the method strictly used by our communist party and the state.

The process of democratization reached all the spheres of political life; the following elements became important: an independent position, a strict emphasis upon the principles of freedom, independence and sovereignty, a request for mutual respect and national integrity of each nation in the field of the international relations — all this is better known and echoed more in the progressive political consciousness of our time, still, it is true also that such foreign policy would not be possible without that correlative, which we call the interior policy.

This line derives from the Marxist-Leninist concept and its creative application, made by the Communist Party of Roumania, and also from a certain historical characteristic of the development of the Roumanian people. In spite of the

suppression and the foreign and interior slavery, suffered by the people of Roumania, the principle of democracy meant for them the principle of their national movement and historical consciousness: all the important events and social and national processes which constituted and strengthened the people of Roumania as a special actuality, *donnée*, the modern Roumania, which ensured her entering the family of free and independent nations, were not the consequence of agreements made by foreign powers, or of diplomatic compromises on the part of foreign powers; they were rather the result of important social movements with *democratic content* (due to an exceptionally wide cooperation of the masses and to the struggle of the whole nation) and with *national-progressive content* (due to the aims set and results attained).

\* \* \*

On the basis of the development and establishment of the new productional relations, characterized by the cooperation and decisions on the part of the workers, socialism has set free all the creative energy of the people. To give them a full and effective expression we need a political mechanism, there must exist such democratic institutions which will make permanent progress and improvement possible. Lenin proved that socialism was not possible without democracy in two senses:

a) in the sense of the struggle for the performance of the socialist revolution, which is a permanent struggle for democracy, and

b) in the sense of strengthening of the victory and of the final socialist building, which cannot be imagined without perfect democracy.

Two ideas appear to be of fundamental importance (they, of course, do not solve the entire problem) in connection with the way, in which our party and our state attack and try to solve the problems of the organization and leading of the social life and the development of socialist democracy.

1. With the *methodological* relation a dialectic is established in the economic and cultural policy, and this dialectic conceives of the socialist society as a *donnée*, originating dialectically and surpassing itself and, in accordance with its own interior laws, tending towards a perpetual self-improvement, thus it is a very complex *donnée*. Social structures, organizational forms and methods of leading therefore cannot be hardened and given once for always; the fact that there arises an increasing number of situations has, as a consequence, the impossibility to apply

uniform recipes for the settlement of social relations and cast methods for the leading of the society. The best evaluation of the live, non-speculative, dialectic thought, appropriate to the dialectic of the actual, is the separation of the present, live structure from the old, anachronistic ones, and the recognition of the changes, which have really taken place, and the finding of the forms most appropriate to the organization and leading of social life, and the establishing of those decrees — in accordance with the laws and the generally valid principles of the socialist building — which derive from the investigation of our own données and from the study and selective application of the experiences of other countries.

The dynamics of a given social organization can be measured also by the extent and the ways in which it has established the new and got rid of the old forms of human activities. It is not enough that socialism objectively conditions the unlimited possibilities of a general progress, that it gives us such economic initiative for action which is exceptionally effective and very wide. In order to realize all these new social circumstances and possibilities, in order to change them into a successful social actuality, an active and immediate co-operation of the subjective factors is necessary, and above all, a creative, critical attitude on the part of the leading Marxist-Leninist party in its relation to the concrete forms and methods of the organization and leading of the socio-economic life. Immobility and ossification are, in principle, incompatible with socialism; but to make them really incompatible we must continually use the methods of leading at the level of the production powers and relations, at the level of the professional readiness of the trained specialists and the masses for the progress of the entire society.

2. *In connection with the relation between the social and the human, the perfection of the social-political system — which represents the fundamental content and the form of the development of socialist democracy — is inseparably connected with the humanist principles. Democracy and humanism are fundamental principles which guide the activities of the Roumanian socialist state, for which man means not only the final but also the immediate end, for which man is not only the object of policy but, and above all, the active subject of the process of democratization. The humanist significance of democracy lies in the fact that, on the one side, the progress of civilization, helped by the entire system of political, state and public relations, becomes the progress of the entire society, while on the other, a completely new conception of man and his destiny emerges. The value*

of socialist democracy is based upon this very humanist final end, in the general perfection and realization of man. Man is conceived in the full many-sidedness of his relations and constituent qualities. Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu says: »The society which we are building has set itself as the highest goal to serve man and to realize the highest aspirations of the people. It has directed all its efforts towards ensuring a high material civilization and a rich cultural life of all the people of our country. The socialist society does not degrade man to the role of the means of production, it rather sees in him the man participating in all the scientific and cultural values, produced by the previous ages, and the highest factor of society that must perpetually widen his personal view, strengthen his consciousness, and perfect his character and personality, in order to realize the great mission entrusted to himself in the transformation of the world.«

The new man of our society is not satisfied with a passive reception of the benefit of democracy. He exists and confirms himself as a personality which is modern and socialist only, if his relations to the democratic system of political and cultural relations are expressed above all in the active participation in the moral responsibility of taking decisions.

Since democracy conceives of man as a personality, its role is twofold: (a) it must first integrate man into a complex unity of social relations; the levels and ways of this integration vary, but democracy which respects the moral values always acts to the advantage of an integration, characterized by the human essence, and is opposed to the alienation of the individual from the community, of his inner subjective life from the objective social life, it is also opposed to the disintegration of the individual in the social community or in a wider community; (b) its second role consists of differentiation, of delimitation; a personality is not an abstract unity of some community or its statistical mark, it is rather a unified and relatively autonomous expression of its possible creator.

At this attention should be called to the delimitation affirming that between the scientific comprehension of social phenomena and ideology (also political ideology) there is a gulf, this distinction is advocated by some marxist authors, who on this basis estimate humanism to be a pragmatic phenomenon, alien to the scientific theory and comprehension. Hence the conclusion about the theoretical anti-humanism of Marxism, according to which Marx should have built the scientific system of society so that man was not its starting point, in the sense of the philosophical anthropology speculating about man on the basis of the abstract and



nonexistent concept of man, but rather such objective and concrete facts as the productional relations, the means of production and the class struggle.

From the problem posed in this way, we can — at least in the field in which we are interested here — arrive at a scientific comprehension of political structures and processes, at which all ideology and humanism are denied, or at a system of pragmatic notions of the ideological type, which are of interest to science. We are not going here to go into a wider polemic about this problem, yet we have to explain the following:

1. Comprehension continually tends to an increasing objectivity, but its central concern and its dynamic principle is always man-subject, the man as a social being belonging to a historically determined time and space.

2. The object of the scientific cognition of social and political phenomena is not an actuality, which is not neutral from the axiological point of view, but rather penetrated with values requiring — even in the way in which we approach them — that we put them in relation to the human, with all its ideological meanings.

3. At the composition of its scientific concept Marxism does not start from man conceived as an abstract unit, it rather comes to man, its basic goal being always man as the concrete synthesis of certain social, national and other relations. The goal is not at all a non-scientific idea for comprehension; it derives from the very nature of the comprehension, which is the anticipation and perspective, the direction and finality.

\* \* \*

No honest man knowing the Roumanian actuality can doubt that, at various levels of the system of social relations, there comes to expression a many-sided search for new forms and structures of organization and leading the social life, appropriate to the general requests of the building of socialism, and, of course, taking in consideration the specific conditions of our society and our nation. Without denying the continuity with the party line accepted in previous years, the IXth Congress of the Communist Party of Roumania and later, plenary sessions of the Central Committee and the National Party Conference, marked the entry of our country to a higher level of its development. This is the period of the bigger and profounder creative zeal of our people, which must be attributed to the very fact that our party has consequently implemented the new concept of the organization and institutions of socialist democracy.

We have undertaken legal and organizational decrees touching upon the forms of perfection of the representational democracy and of the direct democracy. In creating and in establishing the new methods in organization and leading of social life we proceed from some basic principles, which are valid from the Central Committee and its collective organs to the fundamental party organizations, from the topmost organs of state power to the local people's councils. Here I am going to enumerate only some of them: — the principle of the leading role of the Communist Party in all the fields of social life;

— the necessity of the state as a fundamental constituent element of our socialist super-structure, as the main political factor in the building of the new system, having an increasingly important and active role in the settlement and leading of social processes;

— establishment and proliferation of democratic principles are taking a gradual course, in which mistakes and transitory inconsistency are not a priori excluded; still the consolidation of wide democracy for the entire social life remains the permanent and incontestable end. So, for instance, the qualitative changes which arose in the development of the means of production and their geographical disposition, in the economic, social-political and cultural development of our society, changes in the structure of the population, in the life in cities and villages, the fast urbanization on the way towards a socialist civilization, of necessity requested a better territorial administrative management and the systematization of rural areas. The new law about the organization and activities of the people's councils and also other recent decrees, reveal a critical attitude towards the tendencies to exaggerated centralism, to numerous useless mediating links between the central organs and the basic units, to parallelisms of the leading organs, and to everything what brings about subjectivism and voluntarism, escape from responsibility and lack of the creative initiative; this attitude is not only negative and destructive, it is also constructive since it is accompanied by the emergence of new organizational forms, in which centralism does not disappear but rather becomes really democratic, uniting the central management of economy and social life with wider rights and responsibilities of the local organs and economic and social units. In the Great National Assembly, a short time ago, stress was laid upon the fact that a complex society in the permanent process of modernization could not be led at the local, micro-social level, without increasing the role of the local organs in two directions:

(a) in the direction of the solution of the local problems, and

(b) in the direction of the participation in decision making of the central organs. From the very way in which the problem is posed, the inseparable unity of these two aspects can be seen: the strengthening of the central leading, which tends to deepening and progress and the development of democracy, which is possible only at an increasing independence and mobility of the local organs.

Everything constituting these local organs and their activities (permanent commissions, commune councils, the new status of deputies, the actual and not only formal responsibility of citizens) obviously expresses democratism of the socialist system, the permanent concern with the creation of such an atmosphere in which the constitutional rights and liberties can be realized and in which the entire mechanism will become more elastic, will work better and will be able to realize faster the new requests of life.

In connection with these ideas, socialist democracy faces a problem which requests a careful solution: the problem of the relations between democracy and planning, or rather, in a larger framework, between the requests of democracy and the requests of the scientific method in connection with the organization and leading of social life. At present we unanimously recognize the importance and the necessity of planning, which is an obligatory condition of social and economic progress. But planning presupposes preservation and effective exploitation of the main buoyancy of power. How can we ensure that this buoyancy will not be exploited and used to the damage of democracy? Can it be made certain that the scientific measures, which require a great deal of independence and professional responsibility, are connected with the principles of democracy, which require a wide cooperation of the masses not only in the realization of the best decisions regarding a harmonious and progressive development of economy and culture and the social life in general, but also in making these same decisions? These two ideas certainly cannot be opposed to each other since the scientific organization requires a high professional responsibility and no democratic participation. On the other side, the bureaucratic deformations of planning cannot be set up against the lack of planning in the name of democracy.

In the circumstances created by socialism, the moral values of democracy are not opposed to the scientific values of economic and technical progress. The planned and organized management of social life must be rational, scientific and based upon profound knowledge and considerable professional

responsibility, and, of course, also upon efficient activities of the large human community within the democratic framework. The system of democratic relations is that sphere of socialism where the unity of comprehension and act, of science and practice, is confirmed in a special way.

That stage at which the methods of organization and leading of social life must bring in accordance the romanticism of some democratic movements with the scientific consistency of created models means the higher stage of democracy. In Roumania this new phase is marked by a sudden zeal in recent years, coming to expression in scientific investigations, in emergence of specific methods of sociological research of the life, of the state and party. Numerous urgent problems of social development cannot be solved by administrative measures and by bureaucratic decisions from the top, they must rather be solved by the connection of the scientific method with the method of wide consultations of people. Only a harmonious application of these methods ensures an improvement of the ways and forms of performance of power. This connection, i. e., the co-ordination and the scientific management of all the human democratically organized and expressed efforts, a full estimation of the existent circumstances which is necessary in order to ensure the progress of the new system, is made possible by the fact that the social barriers and class antagonisms, which limit the possibilities of planning in systems based upon the exploitation and private property, have vanished.

The fact that scientifically founded forms and methods of the management of the state are not opposed to co-operation on the part of the masses, but are rather supported by the same through certain representational institutions or through direct democracy, represents another advantage of socialism. The immediate agreement of all categories of workers regarding the decisions about the way of our society, the scientific foundations of the policy of economic and cultural development of our country, or the establishment of the new and progressive elements of the social thought in practice, has become daily practice. So, the main documents of the National Party Conference in December 1967, the theses concerning the organization of districts and commune centres, the recent law on education and even the basic laws, like the criminal code and the law on the organization and functioning of commune and district councils, were made the subject of public discussion and perfected on the basis of the suggestions and proposals made at this discussion. In this connection I find characteristic the

way in which social experience is exploited with us, namely so that we depend on the profound studies, scientific fact, as well as on the organized co-operation of the wide masses. Let me mention as an example a problem, which is of essential importance for functioning and progress of the socialist system: the system of distribution which does not function automatically but rather in accordance with the principles of socialism only in relation to the actual socialist relations in production.

In the application of the socialist principle of distribution there can arise, and actually do occur, various anomalies, misuses and deformations. At the time being in Roumania the process of the gradual introduction of the new system of payment is taking place; this system is based upon experiences, and the results of these experiences, and its basic aim is to bring in accordance the general and the individual interests with the organic interconnection of income and the actual portion performed by individuals in the economic and socio-cultural activities. We are not going to speak about the details of this problem because this would lead us away from our topic; I would just like to emphasize that the solution of this problem reveals such a socialist democracy which makes it possible for people to co-operative with the management of the country, with the shaping and the development of its policy, at the same time revealing also a certain aspect of socialist humanism: the realization of the noble humanist ideas about social justice and equality, the continuous improvement of the new system of social relations, in which man's labour and creation represent the highest measure of man, his actual contribution to the progress of society.

In connection with these ideas we can mention also other decrees which tend to deepen economic *democracy*, for instance, the institutionalization of the general assemblies of workers in enterprises, the unified introduction of the *principle of collective management* in enterprises and institutions by establishment of the managing councils, which ensure democratic representation and co-operation with a double application, closely connected collective management in all the cells of the institutional mechanism of the organization and at the same time the personal responsibility of each individual, *civil democracy*: with the reorganization of the apparatus of administration of justice and of the state organs of jurisdiction, etc., so that public liberties, intangibility of personality, are given institutional affirmation and a more solid and effective legal guarantee; *social democracy*: greater possibilities of co-operation of workers in the management of social life immediately introduce mass organizations in work



of certain state organs: the president of the General Assembly of Trade-unions, the president of the National League of the Agrarian Production Co-operatives, and the first secretary of the Central Committee of the League of Communist Youth have electoral and consultational rights in the Council of Ministers, and this same principle is also followed at other levels of state power.

The wide democratic agreement about making and taking decisions of essential importance for the progress of our country, changing of these decisions and, in general, the whole economic and cultural policy in the field of civilization, material and spiritual actuality, presuppose a higher cultural level and consciousness of the people.

Socialist democracy must be conceived as a process which must pass several development stages in the development of social responsibility of citizens regarding the degree and effectiveness of social rights and liberties, regarding the possibility to deny and refuse everything old and out of time by self-criticism, and to establish the new, and regarding the development of the concrete, institutionalized system, confirming and expressing democratic activity. At present we have reached such a degree of democracy which requires new decrees, appropriate to the strengthening of moral and political unity of the people and of brotherhood of Roumanian workers with national minorities, and also new organizational methods of leading of social life. In this sense we must mention the establishment of the *Front of Socialist Unity*, which represents a wide democratic organism of a permanent nature, and unites all the social forces of our people, connecting all spiritual energy of a socialist people, and represents all the social classes and groups, constituting the *structure of the regime* in our country. In order to ensure a more full establishment of creative energies of our national minorities, taking in consideration their special characteristics, we have established the Worker's Assembly of the Hungarian, German and other nationalities, which also characterize a *higher stage* of development of the moral and political unity of our people.

In the end I would like to say that — irrespective of the startingpoint — the *active subject* of democracy is the man in his double function: as the receiver and beneficiary of conditions and influences which have created himself, and at the same time, as the *creative factor* of a really democratic system. If the main concern of humanism is liberation of man, development and confirmation of his human essence, then the socialist democracy represents the fundamental political means for realization of these requirements. Apart



from the working process, democracy is the fundamental factor in the development of active consciousness and creative spirit of the working masses.

Real democracy provides fertile grounds for the realization and establishment of the unity of man's personality. Democracy means a responsible and independent co-operation of the masses, of all the members of society, who directly, or through representational institutions, participate in organization and management of public affairs. An undifferentiated mass cannot be an effective and creative subject of democratic decisions. The centre of socialist democracy is not an »uncritical mass« but rather human communities created by fully developed personalities.

Socialist democracy means an improvement of the institutionalized system of organization, and even more, it means the creative realization of man as a personality. The new human typology, the confirmation of human essence in concrete social existence, presupposes the transformation of the possible and ideal conditions into real ones, the transformation of the human world into a free world.

**Vlado Benko**

# TEORIJA in PRAKSA

## **Internationalism Today**

Since 1848, when the Communist Manifesto and the slogan »Workers of the world, unite!« laid the foundations for the international solidarity of revolutionary socialist forces, the general historical frameworks in which they functioned have changed, as has their concrete situation. The October Revolution, the universal significance of which lay in its being the first case of a country pursuing the national road to socialism, meant the emergence of the first socialist country in the world. The position of the working class in Russia changed, as it became the standardbearer of a new, socialist order of society and as such took part in international

**Yugoslavia**

relations as the representative of its national community. After the Second World War, a number of socialist countries came into being; this was attended by a growth in the influence and power of socialist forces in the world generally. Socialism became a developmental form of contemporary society. It then reached a point where class-conscious socialist forces, impelled by the same common ideological goal, faced the problem of coordinating concrete national interests with the general interests of struggle for the victory of socialism on a world-wide scale.

As the world grew more integrated and interrelated, the basic contradictions of the capitalist social order appeared within broad world frameworks. Thus were laid the foundations for the international solidarity of the working class. But this solidarity neither neglected nor rejected the national element. If the working class in any country whatsoever was to struggle successfully against the bourgeoisie, if it was to destroy the system of capitalist exploitation, it had to win a firm foothold within its own country and become the mainstay of the fight for political and social freedom, although there was a clearly defined link between the struggle of the proletariat in each country and socialist internationalism. Engels himself had written that »the international movement of the proletariat was possible only among independent nations«!

The question of how to dovetail concrete national interests and the general interests of the struggle for socialism was raised, in terms of the principle of internationalism, during the initial years of Soviet Russia's existence. In practice, this was resolved by the support given by the working class in various capitalist countries to the first land of socialism in the world, which stood threatened by the capitalist forces, and parallel with this, by the support given by Soviet Russia to revolutionary and people's liberation movements. Practically speaking, it was resolved on the basis of Lenin's conception that there is no leading party. As Stalinism spread, bureaucratic tendencies strengthened, and the interests of individual Communist parties were subordinated to the »general line« of the Comintern, the essence of socialist internationalism was as time passed reduced to the following: the struggle for socialism is being decided in one country; the Soviet Union and the Soviet Party have the leading role; the yardstick of socialist internationalism is above all the attitude toward the Soviet Union as the center of revolution, and approval of all its foreign policy moves and requirements. Although formally speaking the Communist International remained the standard-bearer of the idea of

world revolution and international solidarity and as such was in a position to resolve all contradictions between the interests of communist parties the world over and the requirements of Soviet state policy in that particular situation, when the existence of the sole socialist country in the world stood threatened, actually its subordination to the needs of Stalin's internal and foreign policy was complete. True, there were certain positive signs, of the Seventh Comintern Congress, where the principle was raised and defended that communist parties, in the struggle against authoritarian and totalitarian regimes, had to merge with their national communities to achieve greater independence and recognition of the concrete conditions and specific features of each country in determining its policy. This would certainly have been the way to achieve Lenin's idea that »every country should contribute to the general movement with its own, original and essentially specific features«, which is at the same time the genuine Marxist conception of socialist internationalism.

The attack on the Soviet Union and the Second World War, the founding of the anti-fascist coalition, which were exacerbated as the end of the war drew nearer and social trends threatening the very foundations of the capitalist system strengthened — were links in the process which conditioned the bloc constellation. In that constellation, all the basic social contradictions were regarded from the aspect of the conflict between the two superpowers, or rather the two blocs, and their resolution was — as Stalin saw it — dependent upon the result of the conflict between the blocs. In this period, too, the basic yardstick of socialist internationalism was obedience to and support for the interests of Soviet foreign policy; this conception of socialist internationalism in practice contributed to a static approach to the bipolar structure of the contemporary international community.

The theory and practice of a leading party, a leading center, a leading socialist force, a single model for the road to socialism, and so on, certainly did not offer any real possibilities for coordinating national interests with the broader, international interest; quite the reverse, it was the source of grave misunderstandings and conflicts among socialist countries and communist parties. They reached a peak in 1948 with the Cominform attack on the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, and Yugoslavia itself, which was pursued under the banner of internationalism, just as is the case today with the intervention in Czechoslovakia. It was only in 1955 that a positive change took place. The Belgrade Declaration, signed by Yugoslav and Soviet leaders, established, among other things, such foreign policy principles in relations between

these countries as »mutual respect for and non-interference in internal affairs«, and the view that »questions of internal system, differences in social systems and various forms of development of socialism were the exclusive concern of the people in individual countries«. Although this declaration above all provided the foundations on which bilateral relations between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union were to develop, it would be difficult to refute their significance as principles to be applied also to relations among socialist countries generally. No reasons could be given for not applying these principles to other socialist countries as well, regardless of their geographic position and the way they had chosen to build socialism. As the Soviet Government Declaration of October 30, 1956, during the happenings in Hungary, had established relations among socialist countries on a basis of strict observance of full equality, respect for territorial integrity, national independence and sovereignty, and mutual non-interference in internal affairs, while recognizing at the same time that there were numerous things wrong with those relations, the expectation was that these principles would really become the general practice. The Moscow Declaration by 12 Parties in November 1957 on the one hand assumed the position that communist parties were equal and independent, but on the other hand revived the conception of camps and the leading role of a single country, that is, of a single party.

Yugoslavia's leaders explicitly pointed out that despite a certain degree of mutual interests and cohesion, serious and complex problems still existed in relations among socialist countries. They were also mentioned by Leonid Brezhnev in December 1964 while Mao Tse Tung in December 1956 expanded his theory of contradictions of a non-antagonistic character to include relations between socialist countries and communist parties. In any case, the problems were obvious. They derive from the various objective and specific conditions under which certain nations developed, from changes in the international community and within particular countries, and especially from uneven development. Also not to be neglected was the significance of growth in national sentiments linked with the economic prosperity of individual socialist countries, which Palmiro Togliatti particularly warned about in the Yalta Memorandum. The general differentiation which has been taking place in the socialist countries, and the striving for independent decision-making not only in internal but in foreign policy, are completely understandable and expected phenomena. With all this in mind, it was natural and indispensable for relations between socialist countries to be based on consistent respect for what we might call classic principles

of interstate relations, contained in various documents holding valid for relations among states regardless of their internal system. These principles are also to be found in all bilateral agreements on friendship and cooperation concluded between individual socialist countries. If there are any pretensions harboured about relations between socialist countries differing from customary practice, and if a desire exists for them to become an example of democracy in the international community, then the principles of socialist internationalism should be utilized as a lever to achieve this. In this respect in Yugoslavia we are aware of the fact that socialist internationalism cannot be confined solely to relations among socialist countries, as borders of socialism do not coincide with the borders of the socialist countries. Thus it is intelligible, that in the Yugoslav interpretation of the socialist internationalism, this one is understood as »a correct reference, support and solidarity with every socialist country and with every socialist movement, which is actually fighting for the socialism, peace and peaceful coexistence between the nations«.

In the bilateral and multilateral treaties between the socialist countries, in the majority case — with the exception of the Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty on friendship and mutual cooperation, and *the Warsaw Pact*<sup>1</sup> — the principle of socialist internationalism has been stressed as a factor that should operate to make possible a higher degree of cooperation between socialist countries. In the Soviet law's doctrine this principle is not only moral-political but also lawful obligation »of the strengthening of the friendship, cordial cooperation between socialist countries and mutual assistance«. That means, that in the many-sided relations, which are growing-up between the socialist countries and in the special forms of their regulation, the principle of the socialist internationalism should overcome the contradictions between particular national interests of each socialist country and the general and objective interests of the socialism as a world system.

It would not be difficult to cite this or that definition of socialist internationalism, but it would pose a much harder problem to transform into the kind of practice that would be acceptable to all socialist states (and to every socialist movement) the frequently quoted »general internationalist interest«, as a component part of socialist internationalism.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the preamble of the Warsaw Pact it is quoted that the principles on which this contract has its base, are the principles of the respect of the independence and sovereignty of the countries as well as non intervention in their internal affairs.



Although the soviet economist Bogomolov writes that for economic relations of a new type in the Comecon it would be imperative to »learn to coordinate the unequal positions of states, to dovetail national interests, which reflect the specific features of their socialist development, the level of industrial advancement and material prosperity, with the general international interests«, it still remains unclear, for instance, what M. Suslov means by »the solidarity and unity of communist parties on fundamental questions«. It is without question not a simple matter to achieve agreement on what is in the common economic interest of the socialist countries, in view of the different levels of their economic development and the endeavours by certain socialist countries to retain the economic advantages they possess, and by others to decrease or remove the existing differences. The same would apply to political relations. In the first place, would it be possible in each important case to secure coincidence of interests of the smaller socialist countries with the specific interests of the Soviet Union, which is a great power, regardless of whether these interests derive from the requirements of its German or European policy or, let us say, the consequences of its conflict with China?

So far, regrettably, we have too often been witness to the attempt to interpret the »general international interest« onesidedly, in a manner arbitrarily prescribing standards of behaviour for particular socialist countries and appropriating the right of having the final say. We have too often experienced self-willed interpretation of the state of affairs in another socialist country, despite the clearly expressed will on the part of its citizens to see socialist internationalism implemented in practice, as a principle on which relations among socialist countries should be based. And finally, we are asking too often ourselves which organ is estimating in which cases the general and common interests of the socialist system and the socialist social order in a socialist country are threatened, by which right and how are the rules of the proceedings. In the final consequences it is clear — and this is expressed in the standpoints of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia — that the legalization of the oppression in the name of socialism and socialist internationalism could be used only by those countries which can dispose of the means for the accomplishment of such oppression, while the consequence can affect only those countries which do not have preliminary conditions to oppose it.

As we see it, therefore, it is necessary perseveringly to demand consistent respect for sovereignty, independence, equality of right, non-interference in the internal affairs of



others, just as it should not be permitted for socialist countries to isolate themselves from each other, to allow themselves to get bogged down in momentary and short-term consideration of pragmatism or maintenance of equidistance in relation to various manifestations in the international community.

Just as there is a real and indispensable need for independent action by socialist countries, so is there the same kind of need for independent action by communist parties. »Each communist party is responsible for its policy to the working class of its own country«, states the resolution passed at the Tenth Session of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in connection with the situation in Czechoslovakia. It can struggle for socialism and socialist social relations, and develop the forms of that struggle successfully, if it has a concrete and complex knowledge of the realities, possibilities and circumstances in which it functions. No other communist party, or any communist center whatsoever, can know those conditions as well as the party in the country concerned. Socialist internationalism can be promoted only on the basis of such autonomy for communist parties. It offers sufficient scope for exchange and airing of ideas and experiences, for constructive discussions on new problems cropping up in the development of society and socialism, for an open-minded dialogue conducted without one party sticking labels on to other, for positive political impulses.

Both bureaucratic, centralist and etatist universalism and narrow, closed and self-complacent provincialism inspired by nationalism in ultimate consequence, are incompatible with such socialist internationalism. Communist parties and socialist forces prove their historic maturity and their internationalism by their struggle for the social transformation of their nations and by such forms of this struggle which correspond to the different levels of the historic development of these nations. Recognition of the autonomy of communist parties and of socialist forces finally means trust in socialism, in richness of its forms, in humanism and also the affirmation of its attractiveness. In this way communist parties and socialist forces must »internationalize«<sup>2</sup> their nations. This is the essence of unity in diversity and the condition of unity in action, the condition that the principle of socialist internationalism is given a concrete, social content.

---

<sup>2</sup> Umberto Cerroni.

# TEORIJA in PRAKSA

Adolf Bibič

## Dialectic between »Society and State« in a Socialist Political System

(Suggestions for discussion)

### I

1. The socialist movement has set itself the goal of organizing such a human community in which the state will not function as a separate power, alienated from society.

2. From class society, in which the state as a »political state« represents above all the dominant groups of owners, to communist society, in which the integration of political and social functions would be realized, political life is characterized by the existence of both the state and society, and by a topical question about the relation between the two of them.

3. Democracy in socialism essentially depends on the transformation of the mutual relation between the state and society toward ensuring not only the influence of the society on the state and a control of its functioning but also the possibility of the actual participation in political decision making.

4. The socialist revolutions themselves represent an important element in the transformation of the relations between the state and society in this very direction. On the one side they abolished the old state apparatus building a new structure of political power on a new democratic foundations (soviets, workers' councils, people's committees) while on the other side they influenced the transformation of the class relations in the society.

5. In their violent phase these revolutions represented only the beginning of the development of individual socialist countries and of the development of the revolution in the sense of the construction of qualitatively new, socialist social relations. In this phase radical changes as regards the relations between the state and society were brought about; this, however was only a first step towards the new society, and it faced — in abstract terms — two possibilities:

a) the development of the dialectic state-society towards the strengthening of the state, which thus becomes the main carrier of the socialist transformation;

b) in the preservation of the necessary functions of the state the whole formation of the political system would be conceived so that the increasingly autonomous forces of the socialist society would be its motive power.

6. Several reasons of objective and subjective nature have contributed to the fact that the construction of the socialist society has been characterized above all by strengthening of the state as the dominant political subject in the history of socialism so far. Insofar as this emphasis on the state, especially in the beginning phases and in certain circumstances, was justified it played a positive role but later on it turned into a serious barrier to the democratic development of socialism and also to general social progress.

7. Insofar as the state became not only an important but the only subject of the development of the socialist society it appeared that the dialectic of state and society had completely vanished.

8. Ideologically this was expressed in the statement that there were no contradictions in socialism, that it rather represented a harmony of special and general interests, that the various social groups cooperated on friendly terms within the framework of socialism, etc.

9. This conception of socialist society resulted, among other things in the fact that the theory completely disregarded the dialectic both inside in the state (among its structural elements), as well as the dialectic between the state and society: this harmonious, conflict-free conception of socialism as a whole must have resulted in the idea which denied or disregarded the problem of the *difference* and *contradiction* inside the socialist identity itself.

10. Practical consequences of such theory, itself a consequence of a certain practice, must have been fatal for the construction of the socialist political system and for the development of its democratic contents.

11. All the organizational links of the political system necessarily showed an inclination to become — if we can put it in this way — a »transmission tautology« of the central project and decision:

a) in the *field of economy* the direct producers did not develop in a direction which would ensure them the nature of the economic subject, but rather realized the activities determined in detail beforehand;

b) in the *political field* the actual contradictory and heterogeneous structure of the socialist social basis could not be constructed in an articulated expression of the political will, but was entirely subordinated to the higher directives;

c) in the field of culture and of science (particular social sciences) the creators and their institutions were more or less an object of administrative decision.

12. It was especially fatal in this connection that in the course of time the revolutionary avantgarde constituted itself into a monopolistic political power, which again lost its identity by identifying itself with the state instead of shaping itself into a hegemony with a dialectic relationship to the state and to the society, and promoted its ideological aims through the instruments of the state and not through the methods of an ideological, moral, and scientific nature.

13. The experience has shown that such all-around subordination of society to the state cannot last for long without essentially limiting the further progress of a socialist society. It has been proved that in such a political system the dialectic between interests, and thus also the dialectic between the state and the society, was not overcome but was rather only temporarily frustrated and essentially limited. The logic of the concrete structure of society and its contradictions necessarily broke through the narrow political cover:

a) in the *economic field* (in spite of the careful planning) disproportions appeared and led to signs of stagnation;

b) in the *political field* the autonomous dialectic inside the leading groups themselves was apparent behind the facade of the apparent harmony, and the deeper dialectic of political contradictions came to expression;

c) in the *field of culture*, and especially art and social sciences, stagnation was felt and even regression in comparison with the level as attained immediately after the revolution.

14. The crisis of the political system, which is usually called »Stalinist« thus did not result from certain subjective mistakes of its protagonists, but rather resulted from the conception of the political system which excluded from the political life of socialist society the autonomous, self-governing articulation of the interests and initiatives, the conception which attempted to »abolish« the contradictions of a socialist society by coercion, proclaiming these contradictions to be a consequence of outside forces, thus limiting or frustrating the initiative of individuals and social groups as independent and responsible subjects of socialism at the very crucial points of social and political life. In other words: the crisis of political system of which some characteristics have been

described, originates mainly — if, of course, the deeper roots are left aside — from the restriction of dialectics which could be established spontaneously and in an institutionalized manner without hindrances in the relation between the state and the society.

## II

15. The criticism of the »Stalinist« political system therefore could not and cannot be limited to criticism of personal characteristics of individual power holders of this system only, nor to a change of the people who are »in power«. The criticism of this system must reach the very institutional structure, the core of the relations between the state and the society in a socialist country.

16. This, however, means, that the whole political system, if it is to be democratically based, cannot be grounded in an assumption that the state is the main and the essential bearer of socialist construction. Not that the still important role of the state in this field could be left out in contemporary conditions, but this role can be realized only under one assumption if the dialectics between the state and the society are at the same time acknowledged and realized, that is to say, if besides the still necessary role of the state such political mechanisms are simultaneously constructed, which will represent not only a vertical channel for the flowing of »abstract« political will, but which will mainly represent the means for transfer of concrete expressions of needs and interests of socialist society in the very structure of the political system.

17. Such a concept of a political system then necessarily originates in a recognition that the socialist society, such as it is today, and such as it can be imagined today, is not a whole, but it contains the *immanent* structuralization of interests, the immanent differentiation and also immanent contradictions this has been proved by historical experience as well as by the social sciences. The causes of antagonisms, sharpness and crises which occur in a socialist country, should be primarily sought inside the country itself, among other cases also in the contradiction between the state and the society which is one of the essential contradictions of the socialist society.

18. The contradiction between the state and the society in the socialist political system originates — among other reasons — out of the circumstances that the state, in a narrow sense, still represents a strong institutionalized organi-

zation, which has at its disposal the means of physical compulsion and still behaves as something »particular« in relation to society.

19. The contradiction between the state and the society is sharpened — among other reasons — on the one side because of the tendency of the state power holders to preserve this power not only as persons, but also as an institution, and on the other, because of the tendencies of the society, i. e. of its individual structural elements to control the political power and to use it for the realization of certain aims.

20. This contradiction cannot be abolished in the present phase of socialist society, but it is to be acknowledged as a necessity, and solving by proceeding from the dialectics of real interests *inside* the socialist society; and from the need to eliminate the political alienation in the process of socialist construction by such a structure of the political system in which the contradictions between the state and the society are solving by the inclusion of essential interests of socialist social basis in the very structure of the political system.

21. The structure of the political system of socialist society based on this premise has in principle the following effects:

a) it limits the sphere of activity of those elements of the state, which, according to their form still signify the existence of »the political state« as »the abstract« sphere of politics;

b) it launches the transformation of the state organisms, mainly representative, in which pure »political reason« was traditionally concentrated;

c) it increases control over the existing elements of classical political representation, which are nevertheless still necessary;

d) it creates the possibility that the essential interests of the socialist social structure, especially the interests of the working class, are expressed in an obvious and legal form inside the very political system, and it restricts with this the need for the activity of an »anonymous empire« of »pressure groups«;

e) it gives weight to the representative-assembly organs in opposition to the executive and administrative organs;

f) what is most significant from the point of view of democratic contents of the socialist system, it creates the possibility that the participation of main social groups, which are formed upon the division of labour is increased in the political system;



g) it increases the possibility of individual participation in political life because the individual does not appear only as an abstract political citizen, but as the subject of social work;

h) the political system created in such a way offers increased possibilities of overcoming the political alienation which accompanies state and the society.

22. The realization of such relations between the state and the society upon the level of the global political system urgently demands that its grass root elements be constituted in a specific way: the *working organization* as such grass root element of the political system is not only the place where means of existence are obtained, but as the basic selfgoverning constituted subject, and also as a practical school of democracy, and a basis out of which the global structure of political system is also essentially formed.

23. The recognition of the immanent dialectics of contradictions in socialist society must necessarily have one more consequence for the socialist political system: the possibility and need to link the interests vertically and horizontally and in various forms of associations, which by themselves do not only satisfy the direct interests of their members, but which also form their sense and ability to participate creatively in broader political communities, must be acknowledged. At the same time these associations take part in the political process in those cases when there are decisions taken in it concerning the field of interests for which an individual association was created. The democratically structuralized political system of socialism, and the immanent dialectics between the state and the society, presuppose the richness of associations as its basic element.

23. The recognition of the immanent character of contradictions in the socialist society, especially of the contradictions between the state and the society, has essential consequences also for the understanding of the position and function of generally political organizations (of the Communist avant-garde, etc.) in the socialist society. For, a) the society which is heterogenously structuralized, needs political organizations, in which the political synthesis of different partial interests and the formation of the programme of social development is arrived at; b) the position of such general political organizations must be dialectical in a political system, i. e. these organizations are not identical and must not be identical with the activity of the state, but on the other hand they must not be just a picture of empirical interests of the structure of society; at the same time they must be in a creative relationship towards the state policy and in the receptive-

creative attitude towards the basic interests of the socialist society, towards the personal initiative of their members, and towards the initiative of the socialist associations.

24. The basic aspects of social life which seemed to be completely absorbed by the state, in this way appear consciously, and not only spontaneously and in a round-about way, as fields with the characteristics of relatively autonomous social subjects:

1. economic activity is no longer just an attribute of the central initiative and order of the state: self-governing enterprise becomes the basic subject of the economic system;

2. the contents and form of the *cultural activity* are no longer the object of monopolistic decision of the party bodies; cultural and similar organizations and individual workers in the field of culture become independent subjects of cultural creativity;

3. *political organizations* are not in the relationship of the »transmissional tautology«, but are relatively independent centres of political initiative and political decision making; individual political organizations are beginning to get the characteristics of independent political subjects.

25. The political system must be conceived of in such a way that it acknowledges and manifests in its structure the dialectics between the state and the society and the dialectics inside the state and inside the society and that it recognizes *difference*, *contradiction* and also *conflict* as an immanent law of socialism; this can appear from the point of view of political unitarism and monolithism as a threat to the very substance of socialism, because such a substance is made identical with a certain historically created form of a socialist society, characterized by the absolute »politization« of socialism and the forceful suppression of the immanent dialectics between the state and the society.

26. »The withering away of the state« is not an utopian error constructed by this or that man of fantastic ideas in the 19th or 20th century. This is a metaphorically expressed idea which is in its essence identical with the »destruction« of the political state, with the creation of such a political system in which greater possibilities were created in order to lessen the distance between the governors and the governed, in order to limit the oligarchic character of political decision-making so that it is replaced by forms based on the political participation. »The withering away of the state« is the activation of the dialectical process between the state and the society in such a direction in which the social subjects would more and more decide for themselves about the essential problems of their life and work and also about the forms

and contents of interaction among people and social groups, without a meditation of general political representatives who represent the danger and also the reality of political alienation. The process of »the withering away of the state« is therefore only a negative expression for such action, which is according to its positive aspect, called the »self-government«.

27. Socialist self-government therefore necessarily means the destruction of the myth which understands socialism as strictly hierarchal, monolithic condition dictated down to the last detail by means of »political state«, in which there is no room for differences, contradictions and conflicts, as an immanent law of the socialist society. On the other hand, socialist selfgovernment by releasing the dialectics between the state and society in the direction of greater potentiality for the society and its subjects, necessarily causes variety in forms and contents of the socialist thought and practice, which cannot be reduced to any model of the existing political system of socialism. Such variety, which is essentially conditioned by the degree of social development, by the political and cultural tradition of different nations, does not mean that socialism is made poor this way, but that it is strengthening and growing richer. At the same time such variety demands free and equal communication among the subjects of contemporary socialist societies — and subjects of the contemporary world generally so that all the links of the contemporary socialist and social progress could be enriched with the experiences of others, which are getting an authentic value just because of their originality. Such international exchange of experiences is also essentially dependent upon the relationship between the state and the society in a political systems of socialism.

### III.

28. The political system in which the immanent dialectics or contradictions of interests is recognized, does not represent an ideal in which social harmony would be created. The essential problems of such political system could possibly be reduced to the following questions:

a) How to ensure that the immanent dialectics of the state and society would not be charged in a domination of one particular interest above common, social interest?

b) How to ensure that, with the democratic participation, efficacy of social and political institutions would also be growing?

c) How to ensure that in addition to short-range interests the long-range interests would also be affirmed?

d) How to ensure that the social integration which is urgent, will be achieved by democratic political and social process?

e) How to prevent the released social interests and conflicts from growing to such a degree that these would cause the intervention of the state, which would necessarily reaffirm its absolutist tendencies?

f) How to ensure that, parallel with the affirmation of the immanent dialectics of the socialist society which stresses »the difference« and »contradiction«, social *solidarity* will be also strengthened, as an immanent need of the self-governing socialist society?

29. The relationship between the state and society, which essentially defines the democratic or undemocratic nature of a political system, *also* of a socialist society, is not something which has once and for all been established by the socialist revolution and which needs only to be preserved as an unchangeable substance in all conditions. A socialist political system is not only the consequence of objective conditions, but also the result of abilities of conscious socialist forces, to guide it in this or that direction. Therefore the open questions which are encountered by the concept acknowledging in the political system of socialism an immanent dialectics between the state and the society — can be solved only with the intervention of conscious policy. This is becoming and should become more and more a policy originating from society itself and through the participation of the society.

# TEORIJA in PRAKSA

Janez Jerovšek

## Efficiency of Participational Social System in Working Organizations

Two systems can be distinguished in working organizations: the technical and the social. The productivity of work and the efficiency of the entire working organization depend on the technical system (i.e. machinery, the degree of mechanization, the development of technology, etc.), and on an adequate social system. It is difficult to say which of these two systems is superior; it is a fact that they are two closely connected and complementary systems.

The experiences show us that a certain technical system can function on the basis of different social systems. The efficiency of the functioning of a technical system depends in great extent on the adequacy of the social system. In Yugoslavia we have enterprises with obsolete and amortized machinery, but they are more efficient than the enterprises with new machinery, and modern technology. If this happens in the same industrial branch, it is an obvious proof that the optimal functioning of the technical system is determined by an adequate social system.

The social system represents a total complex of interpersonal and inter-group relations which imply the system of decision-making, of participation, of the way of motivation, of control, of carrying out the changes, of the style of leadership, and similar. Since in Yugoslavia the most radical participational social system so far has been introduced and institutionalized in our working organizations, we are interested in the following questions:

1. regarding the fact that the participational, or rather self-management system was introduced from the top and not as the autonomous action from the bottom, there arises a question in what extent this system can be realized at all in this way, and in what extent it has been realized.

2. In what extent has the participational, self-management system influenced higher productivity of work and the higher efficiency of a working organization?

3. In what extent have the satisfaction with work and the working moral increased, and in what extent has the attitude toward work, toward the working organization and toward the entire society changed?

It is not possible to answer the above questions with a reliable answer as we have not got enough empirical data. Therefore my answers are not going to be sufficiently empirically tested.

Before answering the above questions I have to explain what we understand by a participational, or rather, self-management social system.

In self-management system all organizational and socio-economic groups influence all those decisions which they perceived as important. Investigations show that workers wish to participate above all in the every day working process where the amount of their knowledge and working experiences is the highest, and not so much in those important decisions regarding the whole enterprise and where the amount of their knowledge is the lowest. If workers through their representatives decide on the most important decisions (e. g., investments) and do not participate in the working process — i. e., in issues daily concerning them and tormenting them — then we cannot speak about the participational and self-management social system.

In the participational system all workers are relatively highly motivated for work and trust in their superiors. Working aims are not set only from the top but also with the participation of those who will carry out these aims and tasks. The function of control is not located only at the top of hierarchy but at all levels. This means that the communications flow from the top downwards, from the bottom upwards and horizontally. The organizational groups mutually control each other and influence each other. A system of positive and negative sanctions is brought about so that everybody is rewarded for the better work, for a higher amount of work and correspondingly punished for bad work or laziness. The responsibility is located at all the levels and brought about functionally with the system of sanctions.

The participational, self-management social system — as it was defined, or rather described above — cannot be institutionalized from the top. Institutionalization enables, it is true, the establishment of such a social system which gives the maximal output, but a social system which would optimally exploit human resources cannot be realized by mere laws and regulations. This means that within the framework of a formal bureaucratic or autocratic structure the participational social system could be realized, but it is also possible



that a formally »self-management« organization remains essentially bureaucratic or autocratic. Within the framework of a bureaucratic organization the style of leadership can be democratic, it can motivate workers, raise their working moral, increase their productivity, but within the framework of a formally »self-management« organization the style of leadership can also be explicitly autocratic, i. e., it has a negative influence upon the satisfaction, working moral, attitude toward work and productivity. This means that the creation of a participational social system depends to a great extent on leaders. Here we have to note the critical fact that the leaders educated at our universities and higher schools up to this time have not acquired enough knowledge on functioning of different social systems and on how to attain the optimalization in exploitation of human resources. Manipulation of different organizational variables was left to the invention of leaders and not to the systematic education.

If the empirical data show us that there exist enterprises functioning on the basis of the above defined participational social system, and enterprises functioning on the basis of an autocratic social system, then this fact or rather, the difference, can be ascribed to the managers and professionals who are the creators of social systems.

With us self-management has often been defined only by the decision-making. Formally the workers take all important decisions through their elected representatives. But we have established, empirically that in Workers' council — which takes all the most important decisions — the leaders and professionals have the strongest influence and that workers often pass decisions which they do not understand and whose possible consequences they cannot foresee. Since the members of a Workers' council usually do not consult the workers this kind of representative decision-making has no special effect upon the workers. We suppose that this representative participation does not have any particular influence upon the satisfaction of the workers, upon their attitude toward work and upon productivity. The following conclusion can be drawn from this fact: if selfmanagement is defined only by those decisions regarding the entire enterprise and the aims of the whole enterprise, then we have not realized the self-management model.

Here another illusion should be mentioned which has not been overcome definitely yet. At the institutionalization of self-management we proceeded from the principle of majority and minority. We considered the workers to be the majority and the managers the minority. From this a conclusion was drawn that the workers should exert a higher influence upon

all the events in an enterprise than the managers and professionals. However, all the empirical researches have shown us the very opposite for several years, i. e., that the managers and professionals exert considerable influence, and the workers a small one. The expectations that at a given technology and at a given education the workers would exert higher influence are unrealistic. It is possible that the workers have a certain influence upon the entire activity of an enterprise but not as much as managers or professionals. In connection with some decisions (e. g. the decision on personal income) it is possible that the workers have a stronger influence than the managers, but the power of the managers will remain greater than the power of workers.

On the basis of the above described and defined participational social system we started the empirical study of sixteen selected enterprises.<sup>1</sup> The results of this study are very important. We found out that the working organizations operating on the basis of a more-participational model are highly efficient, while the working organizations operating on the basis of an autocratic social system are characterized by low efficiency and operate on the limit of profitability. In highly efficient working organization the average personal income rate per capita is relatively high, in working organizations with low efficiency it is low; the net product per one employee in highly efficient enterprises is high and in enterprises with low efficiency it is low. Investments per one employee and funds per one employee in highly efficient organizations are high and they still increase, while in organizations with low efficiency they are low and they stagnate. In highly efficient organizations the number of employees grows, in organizations with low efficiency it decreases or remains at the same level. In more efficient enterprises the turnover is small and in the less efficient ones it is high. In more efficient enterprises the conflicts are solved quickly and successfully, and in less efficient ones they are solved slowly and less successfully.

The above data prove two things: 1. *that the participational social systems are more efficient*, and 2. *that the existing formal institutionalization of self-management cannot automatically create participational social systems in all working organizations.*

The social system is created by the people, and above all by the highest managers. Still, when creating and manipulating social systems people are limited. The kind of work, the degree of the attained technology, the education of the em-

---

<sup>1</sup> Stane Možina, Janez Jerovšek, Determinants Influencing the Efficiency of Managers in Working Organizations, Institute of Sociology and Philosophy, 1969.

ployees, and similar, represent the limiting factors. The degree of independence at work, and the possibilities of actualization of human abilities, are defined and limited by the degree of mechanization. Also the psychological needs, stated by Emery, cannot be always and fully satisfied, as for example:

1. the need, that the work is demanding in its contents and varied at least to some extent;
2. the need that you learn something when working,
3. the need that you participate in decision-making at least within the framework of a limited field,
4. the need for minimal recognition and help,
5. the need that you see in your work the sense of life,
6. the need that you feel that the work leads to some desired future.

The social system which optimally exploits human resources has to take into account the mentioned human needs. This means that an adequate social system is not a matter of feelings, of intuitions and of momentary inventions, it is rather a matter of knowledge on the functioning of organizational variables, and of knowledge on the structure of those needs and motives which lead to the optimal functioning of the social system.

## TEORIJA in PRAKSA

**Peter Klinar**

### **The Leading Role of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in Self-government Pluralism**

The processes of the transformation of political power into a selfgovernmental political power, and of the League of Communists into a socio-political organization are complicated and long. The selfgoverning political power is theoretically distinguished from the classic political power by the following characteristics:

— it cannot be concentrated in the hands of the governing political party,

— the category of subjects — the carriers of state power must be essentially extended,

— it loses the sanctions of pressure,

— the hierarchic relations of the superiority of the political power alienated from the citizens are abolished.

Empirical investigations with us show that there exist great differences as regards the influence upon the political decisions among individual categories of working people, who are defined as the carriers of the selfgovernmental political power. Some social categories have a prominent, or even monopolistic influence, while the influence of other categories is very small, or even nonexistent. From this it is possible to conclude that in political power there still exist elements of the hierarchic relations of superiority and subordination and insufficient social control over the realization of the common aims.

The League of Communists is trying to evolve inside itself from direct political power to a leading ideological-political power by means of promoting selfgovernment elements (activation of its members, publicity of work, strengthening the responsibility of the leadership of members, criticism is made important, arguments from public discussion are accepted, regeneration of the leadership, abolition of the personal union among the carriers of state and party functions, etc.). This means the promotion of the deconcentration of the political power and a change in the relation of the League of Communists to the selfgovernmental-political power, and to other selfgovernment centres and socio-political organizations and associations. The changed relation to other political subjects is understood above all as an increase in their autonomy. The development of selfgovernment in Yugoslavia has been brought about by the development of various political subjects, and this means that the political decisions are not in the monopolistic competence of the political party and its organs. The different political subjects represent different political interests, which often find themselves in a mutual relation of contradiction and conflicts. These different interests cause oppositions among individual social layers, among economic branches, between economy and social services, between regional and national spheres, and ethnic groups, etc. As carriers of various interests there appear: the interest and specialized associations, working organizations, socio-political organizations and trade-unions, socio-political communities, beginning with communes, through republic to the federation. There exists a rather large institutionalized system (selfgovernmental and also of the state) for solving these conflicts; still this does not mean that all the interests

succeed in being satisfied within the framework of the system. Apart from the selfgovernmental bodies there appear also informal groups, groups of pressure, etc., which try to realize their special interests. This phenomenon indicates that the self-management and selfgovernment power institutions are not sufficiently adjusted to the actual relations, that they are not sufficiently interested in the existent actual interests, or rather, that they do not pay their attention equally to all the interests. A more developed selfgovernment thus leads to various relatively autonomous centres of deciding.

Having established the existence of several carriers of political power and several centres of political decisions, or speaking about the phenomenon of the specific selfgovernmental pluralism, we must immediately ask the question regarding the functioning of the different political subjects. In their framework we find insufficient political activity in the general meaning of this word and functioning of the so-called nonformal groups within the framework of the institutionalized political subjects and outside them.

The reasons for the slow development of the political activity within the framework of various political subjects, which should be founded on the actual selfgovernmental relations, can be sought in a too small social state of development, in the insufficient level of education, in the lack of a democratic tradition, and in maladjustment of the programmes to the essential interests of the members, etc.

Apart from these inner phenomena also the phenomena of the monopoly of individual institutionalized and non-institutionalized political subjects frustrate the development of the specific selfgovernmental pluralism.

The problem of the relative autonomy of different political subjects, or rather the selfgovernmental pluralism, is — in our opinion — identical with a more developed democratic selfgovernment. This means ensured possibilities for the realization of individual interests. With a more intense appearance of special interests there necessarily appear new conflicts also. Because the latter are not hidden by the general interests, but rather public and obvious, there exist possibilities for their open manifestation, relaxation and solution. The autonomy of political subjects, the development of pluralism and processes of relaxation and solution of contradictions and conflicts represent factors which are in a close relation, factors, which request the socio-political organizations to strengthen their integrational and uniting functions.

The relative autonomy of political subjects opens several problems, and from these problems we would like to mention the problem of the leading role of the League of Communists



and of the relation of the League of Communists to self-governmental organs of power.

The leading ideological-political role of the League of Communists must not be conceived statically, as a given historic category, to which the League has come as the initiator and realizator of the revolutionary achievements, which have transformed the Yugoslav society. The leading role of the League of Communists must be conceived as a dynamic category. The League of Communist must fight it out with other political subjects regarding concrete problems and concrete political decisions. If in these struggles of relatively autonomous political subjects the League of Communists act as the most progressive political subject in the creation of a concrete policy as regards forwarding aims and also their realization, then it creates a starting point for the creation of the leading role at a more general level. In abolishing its integrational role the League of Communists can attain common and wider interests only by means of the generalization and realization of the progressive views, which it has successfully defended in a mutual conflict of concrete interests. Otherwise the leading role of the League of Communists comes into contradiction with the development of the specific selfgovernmental pluralism of relatively autonomous political subjects. The leading role of the League of Communists demands an effective influence of the members of the League of Communists in all political processes — i. e., within the framework of different political subjects — and on the basis of this influence the actual esteem of the League of Communists as a leading ideological-political power in the society can be evaluated. We have laid special emphasis on the influence of the members of the League of Communists because a mere influence of its leading organs leads to the monopolization of political power and its growing into organs of power — and this means limiting the autonomy of the political subjects, of the democratic selfgovernment and also limiting of the personal interests, in which fact we can see also a danger as regards the solution of social conflicts.

The empirical investigation of the influence of communists in various selfmanagement and selfgovernmental political organs, in other socio-political organizations and associations, etc., furnishes us very satisfactory data. Investigating the internal activity of the members of the League of Communists within the framework of their organization, we come to similar conclusions: without the League the active and influential activities of its members outside their organization really cannot be imagined. Thus the conditions for the leading role of the League of Communists, characterized as a dynamic



category, are slowly being realized in the changed social circumstances.

The second problem to be mentioned in connection with the functioning of the League of Communists in the selfgovernmental system is the problem of the relation of the League of Communists to the selfgovernmental power organs. We cannot agree with the simplified views, according to which the prominent separation of the League of Communists from the power should have been established. The League of Communists represents an ideological and political force so it does not renounce political means in its acting. The political function of the League of Communists is realized also through the state power, and this means that the League of Communists has a specific relation to it. Stated in a concentrated way, the League of Communist has influence upon the emergence of the selfgovernmental organs of power, and also influence upon their functioning. This means that the League of Communists does not act only in the ideological field and at a general level. Without the concrete views regarding individual problems we simply cannot imagine the initiative of the League of Communist in the formation of policy, its role of bringing into accord and of directing struggle against concrete view and of the solving of contradictions. We imagine the trend of the development of the specific relations between the League of Communist and the selfgovernmental political power as a more and more prominent change of the classic party functions into selfgovernmental functions. Freeing itself from its relation to power, and above all, from the struggle for power, the League of Communists has wide possibilities for the promotion of the processes of the politization of citizens and their connection with the selfgovernmental political power and other centres of selfgovernmental decisions (this function was considerably neglected by the classic Communist parties). Thus the League of Communists develops its greater autonomy in its relation to the selfgovernmental political power and also greater possibilities for a more efficient control of its work, at the same time promoting the processes of the transformation of the political power into a selfgovernmental political power. And this has a similar effect on the development of other political subjects within the framework of the selfgovernmental pluralism. Thus the liberation of the League of Communists from power brings about such a transformation of the function of the classic communist parties which exists in the act of mediating between the power and the citizens, in a more active influence of citizens upon the political decisions: in the field of their work and life, which concern the interests of citizens most of all. Thus the citizens

are also given possibilities to influence global political decisions, where their influence so far has not been felt sufficiently.

Summing up the directions for the further development of the relations between the League of Communists and the selfgovernmental political power, we would like to mention the development of mutual active relations and the increased relative autonomy of these mutual relations.

We believe that the social conditions are not sufficiently developed to speak about an effective transmutation of political power into selfgovernmental deciding and about an efficient development of the League of Communists as a selfgovernmental ideological power. That is why we must be realistic in planning the further development of the League of Communists, taking into account the actual level of the development of the social relations. The future development is complicated. That is why we have touched upon these two related problems: the leading role of the League of Communists and its relations with the selfgovernmental political power in the conditions of the developing selfgovernmental pluralism of the relatively autonomous subjects.

Ivan Kristan

# TEORIJA in PRAKSA

## Socialism and Direct Democracy

1. Before we begin the discussion, the concept of what is understood under »direct democracy« should be defined:

— Do we understand it in its original, etymological meaning (the ancient Greek state)?

— Do we make it equal to the people's sovereignty, to the principle that people represent the origin of all power, claiming it in the elections of their representatives?

— Do we use it as a name for the processes of the modern socialist society whose aim it is to bring power closer to the working people (citizens), or rather, to de-etatize it?

The use of the term direct democracy is general in the first of the above defined meanings. This term is appropriate for this use. But it is not quite appropriate to name the trend in the development of socialist society tending towards greater immediacy. The term »socialist democracy« would be more appropriate in this use, since it does not emphasize literally the immediacy of the democracy only, but rather encompasses the full scale of democratic processes in its concept.

The term direct democracy is used in Yugoslav political theory to mean the processes of selfgovernment. An argument for the use of this term can be found in the fact that the social selfgovernment (as it is emerging in Yugoslavia) means the direction of the social development towards the aim which would mean the end of the split between the state and society, with society regaining the power alienated by the state and thus again executing itself the power immediately. This, however, is not enough. It only characterizes the global social relation regarding the relation between the society and the state. The social selfgovernment does, by no means, represent a process which would be realized on the immediate level only. Contrarily, in practice we encounter numerous instances of the bureaucratization of the organs of selfgovernment (selfmanagement in workers council) and their alienation from the working people. This is also the case with assemblies in their role of organs of social selfgovernment.

If the term »direct democracy« is used inspite of the above stated considerations in the third denoted meaning, then certain limitations should be taken in account.

2. We are familiar with the thesis that in the contemporary industrial society, which is characterized by intense integration at various levels, there is no room for direct democracy, since the latter can be only applied in small circumstances and in a socially undeveloped community.

We could accuse this thesis of an oversimplification of the democratic solving of social processes.

At the contemporary level of the social development democracy manely cannot be equalled to political democracy in the traditional sence. Especially two aspects of the contemporary social processes are characteristic. On the one side democracy of today and tomorrow does not limit itself to the field of the political power, it is rather becoming more and more an element of the sphere disconnected with the state, of the social sphere, where it is in the very centre of sociology, as a more or less indisputable concept of selfgovernment. Thus we have not got to deal with democracy in its traditional political sphere, but also with democracy pene-

trating all the sphere of social life, with the so-called economic democracy — democracy in the field of man's work, in his position and also in various institutions, created on the basis of working principle.

On the other side democracy, if it is considered to be a process of deciding, is not a static category, limited only to one, i. e., the final phase of deciding, to the act of decision itself. Its significance lies above all in the preliminary, preparatory phases, when the arguments are only gathered together and confronted, when the alternatives are prepared or refused.

An element of direct democracy can be more easily claimed in preparatory phases. Here it should be strengthened, especially because in this phase it can be much more creative, while the final decision often represents only a formal act.

3. Direct democracy is of essential importance for socialism above all because of its starting point and its long term direction: the democratization of social relations, bringing the power closer to the working masses with the final aim to abolish the professional policy.

Thus we are not concerned with the movement from heteronomy to autonomy of the rights only, from the point of view of the subjective relation of an individual to a legal norm, but rather with the establishment of democratic forms of deciding, which will bring each individual into the position of an active factor in the process of taking decisions about issues of essential importance.

4. The possibilities of direct democracy are various, regarding to the fact whether we have to do with decisions at the local level and at the level of the global society: its application at the local level is usually more common, and the more general and global the level of decisions is the lesser is the application of the methods of direct democracy in its literal meaning.

At the local level the following forms of direct democracy have emerged in Yugoslav practice: meetings of voters, assemblies of workers in working organizations, referendum, local community, mass meetings of organizations like the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia etc.

Still, it is characteristic of these forms that they cannot be always used with the attribute of deciding; in a great extent they only serve as the preparatory, consultative, or rather, informative phase.

For decisions at the level of wider communities, or rather, the global society, the only appropriate forms are: the refer-

endum (if elections are not taken in account) and people's initiative, know in some West European countries.

5. Some people refuse referendum, saying that this is an unqualified form of deciding (the decision depends on all the people, including those who are not familiar with the problem as specialists) and that it is an expensive form of democracy taking much time, it is also ambiguous and can be »dangerous«, etc.

This view cannot be fully accepted. Its basic weakness is its tendency towards technocratism, to the opinion, that only an elite is authorized to govern, an elite of rational and qualified specialists who can judge best what is good for the large masses. A latent danger of bureaucratism is implied in this opinion: on the basis of the formula of lack of qualification (insufficient qualification), inability and lack of ripeness on the part of large masses to decide about the global policy and crucial decisions, bureaucratism strengthens its own positions of paternalism and tutorship over the masses.

It is typical of the Yugoslav practice of the last 25 years that it avoids a referendum at a global level.

The most recent constitutional amendments from December 1968 (Amendment XII to Articles 212 and 214 of the Yugoslav Constitution) canceled referendum from the Constitution, as it used to be foreseen in the procedure for the change of the Constitution in case community assemblies would not come to an agreement. The dissolution of the assembly is anticipated instead of a referendum now.

6. The question of the responsibility (political, material, criminal, etc.) is essential in connection with direct democracy.

Who is to be responsible for the decisions as taken by the working collective in a factory, by the assembly of voters, or by citizens in a referendum, etc., since these represent more or less anonymous bodies?

The answer to this question can be initiated by a new question: can the responsibility in the case of immediate deciding be represented in a different way than in cases when decisions are taken by a smaller body, especially, because they concern milliard value. What is the responsibility of smaller collective bodies and of leading workers (functionaries) in the light of the contemporary theory of the law of labour, which in principle, refuses the material responsibility, because it cannot be claimed in the contemporary technology, based on electronics and atomic energy?

The control of power, control of political and social function, is of essential importance for democracy, and especially for direct democracy. The principle of lawful activity of all the political subjects, and especially those of the state, party and other organs and their functionaries is of the greatest importance, and also the possibility of citizens to call their representatives to responsibility (political and legal) and to recall them before their mandate has expired is essential.

# TEORIJA in PRAKSA

Boštjan Markič

## Elections and Socialist Democracy

(Suggestions for discussion)

Even though the origins of the electoral system go back to the ancient democracy of the Greek polis, the electoral system in its better developed form is connected with modern states. Elections were only given their real meaning by the middle class in its struggle against absolutism and feudalism.

The development of the bourgeois democracy establishes the electiveness of a certain number of carriers of public functions, above all of the representative body which is formally the highest organ of the state power. The bourgeois political system is established as a form of the representational democracy and this fact adds to the political importance of the elections. Social and political strengthening of the working class in the framework of the bourgeois democracy and the establishment of a general electoral right bring new elements to the electoral process, still the citizen in the electoral process is not its actual carrier in spite of the democratic proclamations.

The socialist social system cannot take over the electoral system of bourgeois society, even though it can keep some of its principles the other must be changed in accordance with the profit of the basic factors of the revolutionary development.



From the beginning plebiscitary nature of elections in the time of the strengthening of the new revolutionary power, from the elections which represented above all a political manifestation, we have come to the elections, which represent a part of selfgovernmental deciding in the system of the socialist democracy in Yugoslavia. This conception of elections and of the entire electoral process also means giving up the classic forms of representational democracy, since a system which presupposes the existence of several parties cannot correspond to the socialist democracy in Yugoslavia. If we say that the system of socialist democracy in Yugoslavia cannot be based upon several parties this, however, does not mean that in the Yugoslav society there exists no struggle of various opinions and views as regards the assertion of important problems of the future socialist development. Our electoral system is abandoning the bourgeois electoral system, and the liberation from various etatist elements represents another condition of its democratization and adjustment to the system of socialist democracy. Only in such an electoral system, elections can become the deciding about the »public matters«, i. e., about a field which has often been outside the competence of man and citizen.

Elections in the system of social selfgovernment become an important indicator of the social position of man, they show to which extent he has been really freed and if he is approaching the position of the possible creator of his own history.

In the system of socialist democracy in the Yugoslav society, the role and the position of socio-political organizations in the electoral process differs from the role of the political parties in the system of bourgeois representational democracy, since with us the electoral process has not got the nature of the struggle between various political parties, attempting to acquire, or to keep the power. Taking in consideration the *heterogeny* of the society and conflicts of interest, the electoral process cannot be left to chance even in a relatively well developed system of social selfgovernment. Even though political organizations cannot renounce the responsibility in the electoral process, the selection of the delegates — citizens cannot be the monopoly of the closer informal groups inside the political structure.

Nobody can expect — in the system of socialist democracy — »his party« to get for him a candidature and an electoral success, or else the elections would turn into a more or less cleverly covered form of the bureaucratic investiture with a position.

The position of man in the electoral process is one of the central problems concerning the electoral process in the system of socialist democracy. He cannot be only a *participant* in the *final* stage of the electoral process, i. e., in the act of voting. In this case he would not be a creative carrier of the political activities. He must actually partake of all the stages of the electoral process, and in this his participation in decisions about *candidatures* is of special importance, since deciding about the candidatures represents one of the fundamental elements of democracy in the electoral process.

Pluralism of candidates corresponds to the electoral process in the system of socialist democracy — as the possibility of an alternative decisions to citizens in electoral process. In spite of the uniform, *global* electoral programme of the Yugoslav socialist society there is room left over within this framework for the »personal project« of the candidate. This opens the possibilities of electoral non-party competition and of the promotion of the electoral process as a process of choosing between socialist alternatives.

All these processes of democratization in the electoral process are in a close mutual interdependence with the democratization inside the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, as the leading political power, and in accordance with the increase of the social basis of activities of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People, whose pluralistic basis is an indispensable factor of the democratic political life, while its (former) activities in the form of a forum represent an unacceptable social anachronism.

Further democratization of the electoral process in the system of socialist democracy in Yugoslavia is possible only by means of the development (so far often neglected) of the *democratic political culture* and the respect for the fundamental socialist values, by means of cultivation of the *political tolerance* which can be permitted by the (relatively well developed) system of social selfgovernment.

In a *real democratization* of the electoral process, if the elections are a function of direct socialist democracy and a constituent element of the social selfgovernment, individual *negative accompanying phenomena*, for instance »nominalism« in recruiting, group loyalty as a criterion of candidating, paternalist relation to the candidates, electoral »nepotism«, and electoral demagogy, cannot threaten the elections as a process of surpassing the alienation of power from man.

In ancient democracy lot was sometimes used in choice of high functionaries, since it was considered to be a very democratic medium, giving everybody the same opportunity to become a functionary. Montesquie said that elections by lot

were a part of the nature of democracy, since this should be such a way of elections which did not harm anybody, giving the same possibility to serve to his country to each citizen. In our Yugoslav electoral system we do not want to have the lot or such electoral right which would be an entirely abstract reflection of the sovereignty of the people. Elections in socialist democracy cannot be a mere »ritual« of choice or even »ritual« without choice. The selfgovernmental electoral right, rid of the etatist ties, should make it possible for the citizen as the carrier of power to decide freely.

Slavko Milosavljević

**The League  
of the Communists  
of Yugoslavia  
in the System  
of Self-government**

ΠΟΓΛΕΔΗ

It is probably not even necessary to insist on the significance of a theoretical treatment of the problem of the socio-political role of the so-called vanguard of the working class in the socialist countries. Particularly not when we are dealing with the socialist countries in which the communist parties, through the working of various historical conditions of the revolutionary struggle, became the dominant political force in a special way, as this is case in all historical instances so far. From such characteristic of the problem in question stems the entire complex of problems in the international labour movement which reached its culmination in 1958, on the occasion of the Programme of the League of Yugoslavia, and in 1968, on the occasion of the action programme of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. In the meantime, frankly spoken, it has to be admitted that international labour movement — particularly if we refer to that part to which the problem is most directly related — has not found sufficient internal resources to launch a real democratic discussion of the problem but has reduced the polemics to one-sided evaluations, with little understanding for arguments and counter-arguments. In the meantime, two entirely opposed tendencies have become differentiated in the

practice: the tendency — »the party — the rule«, and the tendency — »the party as the leading force of the society without a direct reliance on the structure of the rule (state)«. In all of the fateful moments of the development of the political relations in socialist countries (1956, 1964, 1968) it was evident that the two tendencies were mutually largely exclusive. Particularly if it is the question of the relation of the former to the latter, its protagonists went in this respect sometimes so far as to qualify the political action developing on the basis of the latter tendency as counter-revolution and abandoning the positions of Marxism and Socialism. The development of the structures of the political system within the framework of the second conception is in view of the obstacles on the way understandably in its initial phasis and so it is not yet possible to face all the consequences. But some of the theoretical premises are almost beyond dispute and so it is possible on the basis of them and of course on the basis of the initial experience as well as on the analysis of the logical structure of the retrospective conception to talk about an appropriate model of the political system.

1. It seems that the following question requires at this point an answer: why does the Yugoslav political theory wholly or, to be more precise, almost wholly reject the rehabilitation of the idea of the further development of the Yugoslav society on the basis of the so-called classic party pluralism? I call attention to the fact that the one single, more serious, theoretical article left in our journalism in this sense no deeper impact. The conceptions outlined in this article have not been adopted even by the most liberal of the political thinkers and philosophers. Can this be explained by such a high degree of indoctrination that our political thought and philosophy could not see the real problems of the Yugoslav political society — today? Or is perhaps the freedom of expression in this society at such a rudimentary level that one cannot hope for a deeper and wider response? We should presently like to point out some arguments, which lead to a negative answer to both of these, naturally, imaginary questions. How much the Yugoslav political thought is in fact disindoctrinated, although not yet sufficiently radically, is evident from the numerous investigations and criticism of the present political system and its institutions, individual as well as done in teams, from those whose results are brought out in numerous theoretical periodicals, symposiums, professional consultations, and summer schools, to institutional publications. It is not too much to conclude that all of these investigations and their results have exercised a significant influence on the practical

development of the political system and of the political relations. Naturally, the really sharp criticism levelled at individual institutions (which went to the most direct protests) speaks about the superseded state of such a political society whose essence lies in the strictly directed criticism and freedom of expression. Evidently, the question is one of more deeply rooted causes.

A serious analysis certainly cannot simply by-pass a few noteworthy facts which have become deeply ingrained in the total process of the development of the Yugoslav political society since the rule was taken over by the working class. *First*, we are concerned with the fact that the Communist Party of Yugoslavia became the leading political force in the Yugoslav society during the time of the struggle for the national liberation of the Yugoslav nations. The social revolution, during which the working class of the Yugoslav nations became the leading social force, went on in the form of a national liberation struggle. Political differentiation and determination, the essence of which was either for or against radical changes, was expressed as the determination for the national liberation struggle (national liberation) or against it. The Communist Party of Yugoslavia did not, according to a pre-conceived plan or something, or for doctrinary reasons, abolish a multi-party system. What is more, in the beginning and in the continuation of the National Liberation Struggle, it strived for the inclusion of all forces. The logic, stemming from the above mentioned specific circumstances, led to an incessant and inexorable self-exclusion of practically all bourgeois political formations from the course of the revolution, and at the same time to the rejection of the fundamental prerequisites of the classical political organization on the principles of the party-pluralism. Since almost all the bourgeois political formations unmasked themselves as forces against the nation, since they determined against the most vital national interest in a very significant historical moment, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia continued to group practically all the patriotic strata of the people through the National Liberation Front, which was to play in the following period a very significant role. The complete legal elimination of the bourgeois opposition, which was carried out in a democratic confrontation immediately after the liberation, was no farce. It is just the most logical result of the obstruction performed by its organized and leading forces during the National Liberation Struggle. By directing the political struggle in the course of 1945 in this sense, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia was merely expressing the inclinations of the working classes in the strictest



sense of the term. Further, one should not forget, not even for a moment, that the Yugoslav society has no tradition of a bourgeois democracy. The bourgeois political parties in the period between the two wars worked in the shadow of the monarchist-Fascist regime and the personal rule of the monarch who relied on a small group of reactionary generals. For that reason, the system of several parties remained in the consciousness of wide circles of the population an irrational system in which the possibilities for omnipotent usurpations, corruptions, and manipulations were enormous. Hence, any attempt at its revival would in fact be an artificial construction, which might have unforeseen consequences for the already created influence of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia over the working classes. *And finally*, from the specific features of the National Liberation Struggle (National Liberation Front, National Liberation Committees) on the one hand, and from a direct encounter with Stalin conceived on retrospective specific feature, on the other — there was rehabilitated the old idea of the Communist movement of self-government and direct democracy. Although it is attended by numerous difficulties, like all other social and political systems in the first stage of their creation, the system of self-government has affected the working classes and strata so profoundly that any way out of the present difficulties in the sense of reverting to the old forms came across energetic opposition and rejection on the part of the people.

2. We believe that here it is not necessary to investigate the arguments concerning the relation between the idea and practice of self-government and direct democracy as well as the idea of the political organization of the working class as the leading ideological and political force of the society without its being identified with the structure of the power. Among other things, it is also the fact of their almost simultaneous origin (formally in 1950, or in 1952 respectively) which tells us something about it. What we should here deal with is the question whether such a political organization renounces its direct influence on the decisions of state organs and on the decisions of the self-governing bodies. We are further faced with the following question: is, within the frame of such a model of the political system, the role of the political organization of the working class reduced to mere most wide ideological and political guidance with the view to ensure the general socialist character of the movement and at the same time to facilitate a maximal self-initiative, naturally through an increasing number of organizations and organs in the so-called self-governing structure. These, and



some other similar questions, which were topical throughout the period of the development of the Yugoslav model of the political system and which have not yet been ticked off the agenda, have permitted a broad variety of answers: — from those insisting that such a political organization of the working class as the League of Communists of Yugoslavia is in the Yugoslav self-governing society superfluous to those who believe that in the position of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia nothing has essentially changed, irrespectively of the formal development of the self-governing structure. In the meantime, a more realistic analysis of the social relations and of the political movements has shown, and shows, that we are not really concerned with the impossibility of the mechanical adoption of either extreme, but with the building of one actually unusually complex political system which has to bring about fundamental changes in our conceptions of the so-called classical bourgeois democracy as well as of the democracy of one-party type, such as is established in some socialist countries. »The exit« of the League of Communists from the socio-political scene, its withdrawing into other spheres of the superstructure, or the complete »abolition« or »withering away«, would represent a self-impoverishment of the working class and other strata for a force which, in a definite way, performs the function of broad political integration of the efforts in the struggle for the realization of certain aims implied also in the sphere of building the self-governing and democratic relations.

It is in the historical interest of the working class itself that it should organize its most active, mobile, and class-conscious forces for the efficiency of its political struggle and action in this historical period as well. Through self-governing forms (let alone through state forms) the organization itself might sink in the day-to-day pragmatism and thus lose its historical perspective. The conception of the political organization of the working class as the leading ideological and political force of the society does not mean, however, its simple switch to the track of the so-called »historical perspective« just as here it also cannot have an absolute monopoly. The League, understandably, remains interested in, and to a degree in a certain way also morally responsible for, the course and direction of the practical steps and measures taken by the self-governing organs, by the organs of the state power, etc. The essential difference which separates the old model of the political system from the present one on this point is hence not the degree of interest taken by the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in the practical decisions and the practical course of the political development. The

difference has to be sought in the manner of the realization of the interest taken. But this is the moral and political influence based on arguments and all-round analysis of the social reality. It is understandable that a smaller participation of the direct action of the League of Communists in the practical decisions of self-governing organs will be always an indication that the process of the realization of the new role is adequately developing. In other words: the more is the role of the League of Communists realized as a new way of the vanguard organization, the less it will be necessary for the League of Communists to take direct action in the political relations — the domain of other appropriate organs.

3. In the meantime, the type of the political organization of the working class as the leading (ideological and political) force of the Yugoslav nation at the present stage of its socialist development leads towards a broader model of the political organization of this society. This model has not as yet received sufficient theoretical treatment, it has not yet been developed in practice but it is increasingly realistic as its starting principle is being realized. It is no accident that the discussions about such a model came into full swing at the moment when the struggle for the reforming of the relevant type of the political organization of the working class was renewed. We are concerned with the political model of the so-called convergent political pluralism, in which several political organizations, including the self-governing and the state one, play a certain part, basing their actions on the same social basis. Each of the relevant political organisms owns the same degree of autonomy, which is »limited« first by the objective working of the social basis, and second by the relative counterweight stemming from the autonomy of the movement of the remaining organism. Viewing it in its outline, we are concerned with such a political model in which each of its autonomous parts is »forced« to struggle for the realization of its role. It will be understood that the classical division of power in the spirit of Montesquie is here out of the questions; rather we are concerned with an organic differentiation of roles of several organisms which are in their essence the instruments of the working class, precluding an oligarchization and boureaucratization of the system in its entirety. Practically: the League of Communists of Yugoslavia is the leading ideological and political force of the society, its role is fundamental ideological and political orientation, political action, and struggle — which in no way excludes its interest in day-to-day problems. The Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia represents a forum of broad expression of the

interests and inclinations of citizens regarding daily political problems as well as regarding long-term tendencies. Through its democratic organism, one way of the positive synthesis of these inclinations and interests is getting realized. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same goes for the trade-unions, or for the organizations of the youth movement respectively. The sovereign right of making decisions, by means of which certain relations are regulated, is vested in the self-governing, state and representative organs. In this right they are limited only formally by the laws which they themselves have passed and actually by the real state of forces and interests in the society expressed in the conclusions adopted by the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia, the Trade-Unions, etc. Each of these relatively autonomous organisms makes its own decisions independently, bearing also independent responsibility for their contents and trends. The efficiency of the model is conceived on the dialectic relations between these conclusions which will sometimes (probably more often than not) be of the same direction and sometimes different. Naturally the model would imply a certain logical contradiction if based on the principle of formal supremacy of the conclusion of the League of Communists or any other socio-political organization. Each organism is unlimited in the frame of its »competencies« — formally, but limited by the strength and influence of the arguments on which the conclusions of other partners in the political system are based.

Accordingly, we are concerned with a model which in no way ensures an a-priori leading role and a certain necessary influence of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. Each of its conclusions represents another new step in the struggle for this influence. It becomes again and again faced with the conclusion of other autonomous political organisms. Hence this influence will grow parallel to its connections with the movements in the basis of the society, its state of being integrated into the consciousness of the working class and of the remaining working strata of the population. A factual »supremacy« of its conclusions can be based only on its mobility, on the active attitudes of its members, on its constantly critical attitude towards reality, on its permanent research efforts. All these elements, however, result from the fact that it represents, as said by Marx, »the organization of the most active, most revolutionary section of the working class«. Even within such an organization of the working class, these elements will be subject to constant less favourable influences unless they are put into the conditions of constant struggle, confrontation, and mutual moulding.

Naturally, the autonomy of the fundamental political organisms within the frame of such a model of the political system, and its positive and preliminary as well as possible negative confrontation, cannot be the only source of its force and efficiency. This autonomy and the corresponding mechanisms of the confrontation are in the last line only means, way, and manner of realization of the influence of the working class and of the remaining working strata over the tendencies in the social development. We believe that from the present experience of socialism it is not possible to draw the conclusion about the dangers of an anti-socialist degeneration (bureaucratization) of the political relations when they fundamentally follow and get materialized on one track. The respective pluralism forces every one of the relevant, relatively autonomous organisms to find the arguments for its behaviour and its conclusions from the connections with the working class and the remaining working strata. In this way, it is an objective frame which facilitates, to the greatest possible degree, the working class to preserve its active role in the political life and movement. Such a permanent activity of the working class within the frame of such a model of political system comes to the force particularly in the case of negative confrontation of the conclusions of the autonomous organisms of the political system (e.g. of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, of the representative bodies, of the Trade-Unions, and of the Government, and so forth). It is quite certain that in the case of a conflict between the various conclusions it is only the conclusion which is supported by the working class that can break through. Even irrespective of whether such a conclusion is in the historical sense justified or not. In this way, the primordial element of the force and efficiency of such a model of the political system resides in the dialectic of relations between the working class and the remaining working strata on the one hand, and the League of Communists, or rather, of the remaining sections of the political structure, on the other, as well as in the dialectic of the relations within the sections of the social political system. Such a dialectic of the given relation reduces to the minimum the possibilities and the natural tendencies of the negative institutionalization of the political movement through institutions and organizations of the system.

4. Such a conception of the political organization of the working class (the League of Communists of Yugoslavia) certainly represents one of the fundamentals of a radical »reorganization« of its internal relations. Let us leave aside the numerous problems of the democratization of these rela-

tions in the classical framework. One dimension of this democratization has so far remained insufficiently developed both in theory and in practice. Within the framework of this conception of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia there loses its sense in the largest possible degree the one-sided political course from »the centre of the organization to the basis«, or rather, the parcelled action of the basic structures organized by the so-called cell-principle. Naturally, these basic structures can assert themselves in independent »regional« action, exercising their influence on the practical movements in the enterprise, commune, settlement, etc., but this actions have to observe the chief track of the movement of the basic structures. It has become evident that on the basis of a general political platform the self-managing organs in an enterprise or in the commune can arrive at adequate solutions of more or less all the problems. The communists chosen to these organs have a very wide area for exercising their influence. The decisive role in this is played by the movement and influence from »the basis of the organization of the centre«. The organization as such justifies its existence only if in the course of permanent political struggle it manages to organize the efforts of millions of its members »who represent the most class-conscious section of the working class«. The centre ceases to be a simple collection of more or less brilliant politicians and speakers, in that it has become the means of the dialectical integration of the efforts of all the members. Naturally, this leaves its role a highly complex one, if not more complex than it becomes in the opposite conditions. The conclusions of the centre come through the result of a dialectical and democratic meeting of its own initiatives and evaluations and of the initiatives, proposals and criticisms from the members of the organization which in the meantime directly or indirectly reflect the inclinations, possibilities, interests, and the consciousness of the remaining working people. Within the frame work of such a dialectic of relations, the conclusions of the centre are, so to speak, at the same time the conclusions of the entire organization. One need not doubt that it is only in this way that they can in a democratic society effect, or so to speak permeate through, the whole social organism and to enter into a direct, democratic relation with movements, realized through other channels in trends of the social structure. What's more, within the framework of a socio-political system based on the autonomy of the movement of its sections, which functions in an optimal way, the League of Communists of Yugoslavia can adequately realize its role and influence only if the conclusions of its centre are in actual fact more or less the



conclusions of the entire organization — but not because the organization is formally organized on the principle of the democratic centralism, but just because the conclusions are the direct product of the democratic action of the entire organization. Such conclusions may survive the existing integral part of the general movement and development only if they are historically and socio-politically adequate, if they are a specific expression of the historical need of the movement and development. No other revolutionary experience has so far shown a better way of achieving this adequacy. Beside all the mistakes made in the course of carrying out any revolution, the political decisions came closest to the revolution's real needs if they stemmed from the movement of the revolutionary masses. In relatively peaceful, but essentially not less revolutionary conditions, the primary role of the movement from the basis of the organization to its centre represents the means of a permanent guarantee of that indispensable link between the centre and the basis of the organization and of the working classes and strata, which is one of the primordial factors in the prevention of a degeneration of revolution and of the oligarchization of the political organization. This is probably one of the logical conditions for the political organization to become the vanguard in doing which it radically changes the manner of the realization of its vanguard role, allowing the widest area for the working class to exert its influence for itself.

**Zdravko Mlinar**

**TEORIJA  
in  
PRAKSA**

**Conflicting  
Interests  
and Participation**

1. A general tendency of concentration of power seems to be apparent in every political system, in capitalist as well as in socialist countries. In this regard the following contradiction seems to be apparent:

— on the one hand: the increasing level of the education of the masses, the increasing role of women and young peo-



ple in public life, the shorter working time and more leisure, the increasing socio-economic position of workers in society, etc.; on the other hand, the permanent tendency towards the alienation of the political power from the masses, the concentration of influence and decision making at the top of large-scale political, economic and social organizations, the subordination of smaller nations in relationship to the big political powers, the process of institutionalization, professionalization and bureaucratization, etc.

2. The elimination of the class-structure is often interpreted as an establishment of social harmony, as a society based on solidarity and cooperation without important conflicts of interests.

Such an understanding in turn, has fatal implications for the conception and functioning of a political system. Instead of establishing a political mechanism which would enable and stimulate the expression of the special and individual interests, the tendency was to assure that these interests would not come to the surface (opposing one another in public, political life). The misconception of the social structure of socialist society led to important limitations of mass-participation and to the malfunctioning of institutions which were supposed to be a mechanism of democratic control.

If it is understood that there are no important differences in the interests of different structural categories there is also no important reason to assure their equal representation in political decision making bodies. At the same time, however, this does not provide a sufficient reason for political involvement of the masses of individuals. They are officially declared to be the source of power and government and at least verbally »objective« interests of the working people (nearly everybody) are the highest criterion of any action of political leadership. Why then should masses of citizens be politically involved if they are already taken care of by leadership?

The meaning of their possible participation is in large extent reduced to a symbolic manifestation of their loyalty to the system, to the party, leadership and »general interests«. In contradiction with the reality it is assumed that the conflict between the individual and the general interest was essentially eliminated. Such an illusion seems to be predominant in the Soviet Union.

It is apparent, however, that such a conception has nothing to do with the dialectic reasoning. According to such a conception not a synthesis of different individual and special interests, but rather something what is a priori defined by the top political leadership represents the »general interest«.

Two sources of democratic political involvement are eliminated by such an understanding:

a) the conflict with different alternative and opposite interests. It is known that conflict with outside forces represents a strong stimulation for interval cohesiveness, attachment and involvement in favour of a given interest.

If different interests are not fully expressed, they also can not represent a mutual challenge for political participation,

b) If the difference between the individual or special interests and the general interests is not recognized, or is even suppressed, this necessarily leads to the paralyzation of the mechanisms of democratic control. Individuals are expected to show their conformity and satisfaction with the a priori defined general interests, rather than any deviation or specificity. Their individuality is submerged in the uniformity; instead of full self-expression and self-realization such a context demands passivization of the masses, and leads to political apathy and alienation.

Finally it should be mentioned, that also the ideological interpretation of the long-term orientation for socio-economic development often serves as a substitute of democratic initiative and public opinion. General ideological orientation was often used as the highest criterion even in very concrete issues in different countries and situations regardless of the specificity of the circumstances.

Even leaving this practice aside, the following contradiction seems to be generally appearing: the more strictly a given leadership is pursuing a certain a priori defined programme of political actions or direction of social change, the less important is the role of citizens (voters) and of all institutions of direct and indirect democracy.

Considering then the problem of low participation and influence of the masses, one can not avoid the necessity to clarify the role of the basic postulates of the socialist ideology as one of the important determinants of this participation.

The working class or the lowest strata of the society (in terms of income, education, prestige, etc.) is participating the least even in socialist countries; apart from not taking part in leadership positions proportionally to their share in the total population, they also have the lowest political aspirations. In other words, the ones who have the least influence are not the ones who would at least have high aspirations, but are rather inclined to preserve the division between the rulers and the ruled. This is a crucial handicap for democratization of socialist society.

Findings of many empirical studies consistently indicate certain clustering or cumulation of the characteristics which are either enabling or preventing (narrowing) political participation of the individuals. There is a clear tendency of citizens with low income to be low participants. The same is true of the ones with low level of education, low qualification (skill), low prestige, of women, of certain occupations — like peasants, etc. At the same time there is a high correlation between all these characteristics or — in other words — a kind of cumulation of negative (or positive) characteristics for participation. The citizens with low income also tend to have low education, low qualification, and low prestige; they tend to be female, peasants and certain other occupational categories, etc.

At the same time there is a clustering at the opposite extreme — of individuals with characteristics favourable for political involvement and influence or power. »Cumulation of functions« (leadership positions, responsibilities) for individuals with such characteristics and concentration of political power and decision making in the hands of a few represents an open challenge to the principles of democratic management.

The basic contradiction of such a situation then is the selfperpetuating tendency of the division between the strata of population with low participation, with little or no influence, low information (knowledge), who are — inspite of this — contented with their existing situation and a small number of individuals who (inspite of the fact that they already have influence, control and power) have high aspirations to get even more influence etc.

SOCIJALIZAM

An Approach  
to the Discussion  
about  
Socialist Democracy

*»The nation of democracy is changed each time with the change of nation and therefore it does not lead us even a step forward.«*

*(F. Engels in a letter to Bernstein)*

An extreme acuteness and at the same time an extreme delicacy of the theme which is discussed by this assembly can be clearly seen in completely opposite directions which arise by mere presentation of this theme. On the one side it is considered that the development of the democratic forms of political organization is the basic question of the development of socialism in different countries and in the contemporary world generally. Because according to such assumptions just the question of socialistic democracy lies in the centre of social happenings of permanent historic importance which have marked the most recent phase of the development of socialism as the world process — from the XXth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the events in Czechoslovakia and their repercussions. On the other hand, just putting such a question causes suspicion and even angry reactions. In the approach itself for which the starting point is the basis that these problems are not solved yet and that there are no generally accepted and acceptable prescriptions and already finished models which should be copied and used, there is implied, although implicitly, also the criticism of negative bureaucratic deformations and autocratic self-will which have been expressed in political reality of individual socialistic countries as well as in the relations among them, throwing shadow on the basic human values of socialism. Therefore it is considered that even putting of socialistic democracy in wide discussion among the Marxists from different countries is at least undesirable, and that it can even be of use and produce arguments for the antisocialistic forces.

Just this shows that it is essential in a discussion among Marxists about the problems of socialistic democracy to state clearly the initial ideological basis. This initial ideological basis is represented, in my opinion, in the scientific Marxist criticism of the bourgeois political — representative democracy and its ideological postulates. Starting from this basis we are not going to be in danger to forget the essential social-historic and class dimensions of democracy in any society. But this danger is completely real. One should not close eyes before the fact which has had and which still has a great influence on all the discussions that have been led about democracy in the field of labour movement and socialistically orientated social forces: legal-political guarantees of personal and political freedom, the organizational forms and institutions of the representative democracy which have developed in the framework of the bourgeois society (equal and direct general right of voting, parliaments, plurality of political parties and organized political opposition) have represented until now in the eyes of the large majority of progressively orientated people not only essential elements and indisputable models of the democratic organization of the process of political decision making and limitation of political power, but are in its whole identified with the democracy.

The Marxist criticism of bourgeois democracy has not denied and does not deny the progressive character and instrumental value of those democratic political institutions which have grown on the historic basis of the capitalist social system and class rule of the bourgeoisie. But it stresses continuously, from the beginning, two essential moments:

first, these institutions of the political-representative democracy have their *value of instruments* in the constitution and defence of democratic relations, in the assurance of the broader influence of the »people« upon the direction and contents of state policy, and

secondly, that the real value of democratic institutions from the point of view of creation of democratic freedom and democratic forms of political decision always depends upon a broader political context, upon that which and to what degree are the real social class forces, capable and interested in using democratic institutions as forms of their political activity and realization of their social aims and aspirations.

We are fully aware of the fact that by these suppositions we came to the field of old and, according to the old rule, sterile discussions about the question whether democracy is for the working class only the means of creating class aims or whether it is its own aim. The difficulties to give a clear

answer upon this question arise from the fact that in most cases the exchange of notions takes place already when the question is put: it is spoken about democracy, but one thinks of such and such concrete democratic institutions which are falsely identified with democracy.

It is logical that there cannot be any democracy without and besides democratic institutions and in this sense their development and their qualifying to function effectively is the *aim* of political struggle of working classes and all social forces connected with it, for which the democracy is a necessary form and manner of creation of their own social emancipation. But it is also true that functioning of democratic political institutions cannot be independent of real social-economic position and total situation of living of those social forces which are, in a certain society and certain historic conditions, the main bearer of the tendency that political life and the whole process of decision making about vital questions of social existence is placed on the broadest and most firm democratic basis. In this sense concrete institutions through which the democracy is created are the means which has to be in agreement with political needs, interests and aspirations of those social forces which are objectively, because of the social position, the real bearer of democratic processes.

Even the most ideally conceived political institutions are not worth much in real life if they are not joined with the progressive social action which is realized through them, giving them through this a real sense of their contents. To realize their historic interests, to free itself and with this the whole society from class levelization and exploitation, the working class has to conquer first the political power, «to conquer the democracy», as Marx and Engels wrote in the *Communist Manifesto*.

This »conquering of the democracy« is always and necessarily a deeply revolutionary political process in which the working class is building up a democratic organization of the state power and political system completely in accordance with the needs to provide the nationalization of production with political means, the abolishment of the hiring position of workers and such socialistic transformation of social relationship which will enable the unified working population to govern in a larger and larger degree with the social conditions and results of their work. »The conquering of the democracy«, understood in this way, can never be narrowed down to »taking over« of more or less developed democratic institutions and elements of democratic organizations of society created in different social conditions. This is always a crea-



tive, revolutionary act in which the found elements of democratic organization are further developed and transformed by joining the new forms of democratic organization, which are born directly out of the tendencies of the revolutionary masses, and first of all out of the working class, in order to strengthen and make more firm their social position by deepening and strengthening of democracy in all directions as towards the defeated classes of exploiters as towards their own bureaucracy and its attempts to become independent in its economic and political functions.

The concrete forms which are to be undertaken by the development of socialistic democracy, and the question whether the latter is going to be characterized by more or less continuous development or quick revolutionary break, this depends and has to depend upon *the total social situation of those forces which are the bearer of the socialistic transformation*, including here and the specific elements of such a situation as e. g. concrete historical forms of class conflicts and the way in which the power was conquered, the achieved degree of economic and cultural development, social structure and general arrangement of the class forces, the width and the forms of gathering of masses of workers around the workers' class and its political party, the existence or non-existence of democratic political tradition, international position of the country etc.

Each attempt to ignore the specific position of the socialistic forces in different countries, and canonization and prescription of certain generally compulsory forms of socialistic democracy and ways of its development, necessarily cause harm to socialistic democracy because they bring restriction to the possibility of the working class and its political avant-garde to use fully all those objective possibilities for the development of socialism which are implied in the definite social situation. Such an orientation brings the subjective factors of socialistic development in the struggle with the objectively given conditions of social development, what necessarily causes convulsions and retrogression in the progressive social movement and also pushes the socialistic forces to the road of failure and defeat.

In 1917 Lenin defended in his »April Theses« the position that in certain circumstances — when the Soviets as a form of revolutionary political action and government of working and peasant masses have already been formed — the creation of parliamentary democracy would represent a step backward in the development of revolution. History has proved him to be right. But history has also proved his foreseeing that the concrete forms and institutions of the organization of govern-

ment of working classes, the concrete forms of socialistic democracy will be necessarily different in various countries, although their class essence will be the same, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The socialistic revolution in Yugoslavia bore original forms of the directly democratic participation of the masses in political life — The Front of National Liberation, The National Front and later on The Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia, by mobilization of the broadest powers of society which gathered around the Communist Party on the platform of the national liberation war. All this, among other things, left a mark of some permanent specific characteristics in the system of social democracy in this country. Later on, the decisive importance was given to it by the sharp ideological-political confrontation with Stalinism and, of course, by the development of the workers' and social self-management which led to the deep change of the objective social position of common efforts.

In Italy and France, developed capitalist societies which have a powerful labour movement, rich with revolutionary tradition, and Communist Parties which have become — because of their power — an important factor in political life, these parties have decided to conquer the socialistic democracy in the framework of the parliamentary system of several political parties. On this basis the perspective of far-reaching democratic reconstruction of parliamentary institutions is opened by introducing new democratic elements in the whole social-economic and political structure (wide regional and local selfadministration, the participation of workers in management of enterprises, the democratic control over the whole policy of economic development etc.).

In Czechoslovakia, where in the last few years, just because of the high degree of economic development of this country, a heavy crisis of the centralized system of the administrative bureaucratic government in economics and other spheres of social life broke out, the Communist Party has — conquering the opposition in its own ranks — raised the flag of struggle for socialistic democracy. What is said about in the well-known Programme of Action of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia clearly shows the tendency to begin the process of democratization of political relationship and institutions from the specific Czechoslovak conditions, from the existing economic and cultural conditions, from the democratic parliamentary traditions and habits, from deeply rooted aspirations of masses for freedom. Shortly, »socialism with a human picture« for which the programme of action stands, implies such a system of socialistic democracy which

suits in all aspects the specific conditions of this country and truly expresses the possibilities and aspirations of the working population of Czechoslovakia.

There is then no single, everywhere acceptable and generally compulsory model of socialistic democracy. The theories about a uniform model of socialistic democracy hide in themselves hegemonistic tendencies for domination which are incompatible with any real democracy.

Nevertheless, the variety of institutional structures and concrete forms of socialistic democracy in different countries does not show any disparate social-historic and class contents, disparity of that, what these forms really represent in the historical process of socialistic transformation of contemporary society. Different forms of socialistic democracy are linked with one general legality, one common historical determinant.

These are in their essence all political forms in which there is realized and expressed the basic process of socialistic transformation, the process of social liberation of work. The forms and institutions of socialistic democracy are in a complicated dialectical relationship and unity with the fundamental process of liberation of work through the transformation of productive relations. They appear — depending upon the phase of development — also as an instrument of change of social position of work as an expression of the already realized changes, then as an essential component part of the new position of joined work. Because they are simultaneously the instrument of socialistic transformation of social relations and a part — one side — of this process, the forms of political organization, the forms of socialistic democracy are themselves transformed in this process. This relation of mutual conditions and mutual conditioning among political and social-economic side of the process of socialistic transformation, among the forms of socialistic democracy and common social-historical situation and needs of socialistic social forces, has then all the characteristics of a dialectic relationship out of which there can come mutual accordance on the same line of development as well as a conflict which delays and closes this development. The forces which are consciously fighting for socialism must constantly bear in mind, when they are making decisions and in practical-political action, in their struggle for democratic political institutions, the dialectic nature of the above mentioned relationship. As concrete forms of democratic institutional organizations of political power must not be made a fetish, so their characteristic of an essential presupposition and component part of socialistic social development must not be underrated.

Marx considered that democratic organization of government in the Paris Commune, which cut off the institutional roots of alienation and bureaucratization of political power, represented that »finally found political form under which the economic liberalization of work could be done«. But he also called attention to the fact — on the pages of the same work dedicated to the Commune — that the democratic institutions of political power of working class cannot be stabilized and cannot be preserved unless there is created a social-economic basis by abolishment of hired serfdom and liberation of society upon which these institutions can rely. Because »political rule of producers cannot exist parallel with the eternization of their social serfdom.«

Discussions about models of socialistic democracy and institutions necessary for its establishment and successful functioning were surely devoid of being abstract and of dogmatic exclusions if they started from a precisely put question: what is the relationship of the institutional structure of a political system and its individual parts towards the basic socialistic process, towards the change of complete social position of common efforts. This relationship is the basic factor upon which depend the real contents and extension of socialistic democracy.

In the history of the development of political systems in socialistic countries there have arisen and have been proved some facts which make possible the very essence of the problems of socialistic democracy to be seen more deeply. On the one side, the formal acceptance of the institutions of political — representative democracy was not, by itself, neither a basis nor an indication of the real democratization of political attitudes. The constitution of the USSR, accepted under Stalin in 1936, established and guaranteed a number of democratic rights and institutions: general, direct, secret voting, the concentration of state power in the Soviets as the representative bodies of working population, the responsibility of the executive organs to the Soviets, as well as all political rights and freedom of citizens. Nevertheless, the period of bringing the constitution was a period of strengthening of rough personal power, insecurity of citizens and transgression of elementary legality in broad scope. Introduction of the system of rude administrative centralism in governing in all spheres of social activity and more and more complete subordination of the working class in the arbitrary power of the administrative bureaucracy in enterprises and in the whole sphere of production and sharing — which was arrived to at the same period — had an incomparably greater effect upon real political relations than all the democratic

institutions and guarantees of freedom foreseen in the constitution.

On the other hand, in the development of the socialistic countries one general rule is always affirmed: the period when there are realized in the economic life changes which represent greater possibilities of the participation of produces in the process of governing with their products and results, and strengthening of social-economic position of united efforts (work), are always also periods when the struggle for the socialistic democracy gets strong impulses and brings concrete results. The last persuasive confirmation of this rule were also the events in Czechoslovakia before and after January 1968. Economic reforms are bound to have the tendency of outgrowing in social and political reforms. As in previous historic epochs there is also in socialism the question of socialistic democracy foremost the question of social-economic position of the *demos* which brings and realizes such a system of governing.

# TEORIJA in PRAKSA

Ernest Petrič

## Some Dilemmas of Socialist Democracy in Connection with the National Problem

(Summary of theses)

1. The happenings in the contemporary world affirm the actuality of national question in the present time and deny the opinion that the significance of national component in the contemporary social development and especially in the socialist world will be in the decrease. Just in our time the process of national awakening, and affirmation of the peoples in Asia and Africa and elsewhere in the world, have been quicker. The spread of socialist relations lessens the national oppression and inequality and creates conditions for national liberation of all nations. Lenin's theses about the national question have their actuality also for the contemporary hap-



penings. The national liberation and national affirmation are at the same time a degree in general liberation of man as well, in forming the complete creative human personality, and in creation of truly human social relations.

2. There are two apparently opposite, but actually closely connected processes characteristic of the contemporary world: on the one side there is a quicker liberation and emancipation of numerous, until recently not independent nations, which the other, the links and cooperation among nations which demand quicker development of productive forces are much closer.

3. The principle of the right of nations to self-determination is getting in this connection a special validity, so that nations can, in accordance with their special wishes and their specific characteristics, decide their social-political arrangement. The specific concretization of this principle is the demand that the right to »one's own way to socialism« and right to secede is acknowledged. The forceful constitutional arrangement or »guardianship« on behalf of some »higher interests« only leads to the deepening of disagreement and distrust among nations. The social relations can not be based on foreign armies or on any other kind of force, but they can only be the expression of real social relations in a state. Lenin's policy to Finland remains even today an example of correct and right solving of relations among nations.

4. The problem of sovereignty and equality of nations is shown in two basic forms: in the relations among nations, in the framework of multinational state, and in the relations among groups of states, especially those, which are joined in different political and economic pacts, organizations etc. In the framework of the multinational state the tendency for federalism, which should be based in principle on the self-governing agreement of nations on the bases of their real interests, is met with tendencies for unitarism, which does not respect the specific traits of nations — members of the multinational state, but it establishes the hegemony of the leading nation and of its interests. On the level of the interstate relations the tendency for equality of great and small nations and for the autonomy of social development is struggling with the pressures on behalf of »higher interests« of the community, which do not recognize individual way of social development and which believe to be bid to judge and to arrange the relations among separate nations and states.

5. The Yugoslav working people and the Yugoslav communists have endeavoured and still endeavour for the corresponding formation of selfgoverning socialist federalism in



the Yugoslav community, and for the establishment of principles of equality, nonintrusion, international cooperation and autonomy of the progressive movements in the interstate relations. A real common interest of nations united or states united is only that which is based on their real tendencies and wishes, united or cooperative nations and not on the intrusive will of the stronger partner.

6. We endeavour to organize such a dynamic, social-political arrangement in Yugoslavia, in which there are going to come to the full expression the specific traits of development of each nation along the basic unity with regard to ideological, political and social-economic orientation. When looking for an equilibrium among the common and the individual, among specific traits and basic unity, the collisions often take place and they demand concrete answers to separate questions. In the period when there were, on the one side, e. g., abolished the limitations in the taxation of personal income of employees and the latter is defined by the republics themselves, or even by the communities, there is, on the other side, the panic because the autonomy of the republic at arranging the private catering activity, private transportation etc. saying, that the principles of unity of social-economic system would be endangered. This case shows that even with regard to such relatively unimportant questions some people do not find enough confidence in the republics, in their capability in arrangement of such questions in accordance with the common policy and also in accordance with their specific situation.

7. After the IVth (Brioni) plenary session of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia the orientation to transfer more and more functions of the federation to republics, and even to communities, has been consequently performed, i. e., the so-called exclusive competence of federation, which is nothing but the community of interests of republics and therefore there can be nothing exclusively federal what were not also to do with the republics.

8. One of the major problems in front of us is, how to realize consequently the sharing of profit also among nations along the further mutual help on the bases of solidarity.

9. The really democratic and socialist federation has to ensure the highest possibilities for the development of each nation joined in the federation. The real fraternity among nations in the federation and among states is only possible as the cooperation among free and equal partners on the basis of their real interests.

Planing as a  
General Link  
in Social Work  
in Socialism

SOCIJALIZAM

*The social basis of the mythical representation about the productive power of planning and the dogma about the »absolute incompatibility of socialism with the material production«. (Thesis and the framework of the problem.)*

1. Planning is *social relationship*. This, most condensed definition of planning, includes several important moments, its different aspects:

a) the historical moment, the real historical development, the genesis of this relationship;

b) the social function of planning

— in the context of the existing relations in the production, that is of the relations in the sharing of the total and pure incomes of social contribution;

— in the inner mechanism the so-called normal prices; the average regulated prices, of which that is an essential composite element;

c) the essential irrational side, which is in practice and in theory, as a rule, foreshen;

d) different systems of information, the so-called planned factors, and

e) the developed technical relations and instruments because of which the planning is considered by a common, uncritical mind, as something »strictly exact«, rationally and politically, nationally and from the class point of view, uncoloured, »neutral«.

2. With regard to the historic point, the circumstance that planning only in the last few decades, so to say »since yesterday«, became the world tendency. This circumstance is to be ascribed to the *state*, in the West, and to the so-called revolutionary state policy, »administrative socialism«, in the Eastern European countries and in China.

3. The relations of the *unification of work*, self-government, the so-called joint decision making and »participation«,

bring about certain corrections and new elements in the existing system of planning; according to the fact where and in what degree these new relations in the production and sharing of profit appear as a real solution of the present *general crisis of the state policy*.

4. The social function of planning is essentially determined by the basic character of the relations in the production and the sharing of profit. If these relations are relatively developed, and if they permit and even demand planning as a *general link of social work*, and an elastic social potency of that work, then planning has become through this the constituent element of that »normal price«, that is, of a certain developed, modern form of the »*law of value*«. The latter problem would, no doubt, demand a special critical discussion.

5. An essential economic-political moment, which should be stressed now, is, that planning — according to its basic definition and logic — represents an essential limitation of free competition. If we say this in other words, every moment in the movement of the relations in planning represents actually a partial cancellation of the relations of competition as a former economic »lever«, the decisive cause of that capitalist transformation of »*the inner laws of capitalist production*« (the law of the general rate of interest and tendentious fall of this rate) in *the external law of necessity* for each single given capital — an economic enterprise, or the capitalist.

6. Looking from the historic and economic point of view, planning had to appear first in the framework of the completely private capital, this is in the very cells of the capitalist organism of the material production or »*the value of production*«. And this, naturally, only on a certain, relatively developed degree of the concentration of the capital, and of course, it is natural that it appeared on the corresponding technical — technological basis which not only permits an unlimited perennial of the capital — value, its qualitative identity with itself, and its »normal« growth, but also the corresponding external connections, a mutual power of the attraction of individual, private capital. From the development and perfection of the internal economic parameter, i. e. the elements of the calculation of expenses and prices, reckoned up to a relatively long period, planning is changed into a relatively permanent social link, which constantly holds together the whole groups of private enterprises, and it becomes in time that general link, the elastic potential power of the total national economics.

7. This extensive spreading of the relation of planning *outside* the narrow borders of an enterprise, is specially quickened and intensified with *the tendency of the association of capital*. The characteristic and more and more alarming tendential fall of the average rate of profit, which is in the final result the consequence of the more and more turbulent technological development, has only stressed the above mentioned tendency of planning. The appearance and the development of the monopolies in national and international circumstances can be apprehended as an original real »counter-poison« of the tendential fall of the general rate of profit, in which planning, i. e. the determined and conscious control of »economic resources«, the prices of the raw material, »the price of work« (rent), the division of the spheres of thus united private capital, etc., plays an important role.

8. The above mentioned tendencies, the historical process of capital and the unexpected break of capitalism which happened in the latest great economic crisis between 1929—1933, again brought to the world economic scene the state, which, in order to »save capitalism«, performed a number of spectacular measures; first, in the most alienated and most irrational spheres of economic relations — in the field of money and credit, of the international movement of material, working power and capital, for example, and then also in the inner relations of the sharing, by the means of allinclusive, determined and far-seeing *control of profit*, progressive taxation of profit, regulations with regard to the height of »the price of work« etc.

9. But this process necessarily surpassed these limitations which were for the earlier period of capitalism absolutely unthinkable. The state namely advanced also in the field of the so-called primary sharing, it attempted to regulate the relative relations among the prices of different, and from the point of view of the existing national economy strategically important material and services. So e.g. it performed a systematic and relatively constant revalorization of prices of the most important raw materials and agricultural products, in order that these vital branches, sections of real production, were protected from destructive influences of the competition in the home and world market, and, at the same time, removed or only moderated a number of social-political problems linked with these relations.

10. All these different and necessary phases in the historical development of capitalism and neocapitalism, can be viewed only as different phases, degrees, in the development of the *commodity production*, naturally, and the relationship of planning, inside this production. On the opposite, such a

process denotes an eventual abandonment of the »orthodox« logic of private capital, and that development of socialism in a negative, inverted sense, which was discussed by Karl Marx in his work *Das Kapital*.

11. In what degree a real movement was made in the direction of closer link between politics and economy, and of creation of relatively permanent elements and forms of conscious and longranging control of the whole process of social reduction, can best be shown by a parallel analysis of the existing matter on that plane, with respective real relations which Karl Marx had in mind when he wrote the following lines: »Every *thought of united, decisive and long-ranging control of the production of raw material* — and this control is mainly and completely incompatible with the laws of the capitalist production, the consequence being that it always *remains a humble wish or is limited to exceptional common steps* in the moments of *great danger and isolation* — gives place to the belief that the demand and the offer will be mutually regulated.«<sup>1</sup>

These old pretensions of the private capital, and the embryonic forms of the relations of planning which this capital developed in its own scopes, seem to be very humble if compared with the present general control of profit, colossal conditions in taxation of the profit, the policy of »full employment« and relatively high percentage of economic development (viewed in natura), the policy of »cheap money« and characteristic absolute weight down of the credit over the monetary system (in national and world conditions), pretensions and practical realizations of neocapitalism in the field of super-national, in essence of the state economic links and of the state regulation of the world monetary and credit relations.

12. In the recent time the official statistics offer an abundancy of data, relevant information, which indirectly serve the economic policy. The tendency of the continuous spreading of the spectrum of »indicators of planning« can also be noticed in the Western national economies, which in addition to the purely *evaluative*, include, more and more also the natural-technical indicators, the so-called inter-sector »input-output« matrix, capital coefficients etc. It is true, the West has to be thankful for the acceptance of those also to the practice of »balancing the national economics« in the USSR dating from the beginning of the thirties. The theoretical summary of this practice and the scientific anticipation of the respective tendency of planning, included in

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, *Kapital*, III, p. 91, my Italics by Z. R.



the works of Wassily Leontief who was even in 1925 the most active participator in the theoretical preparation of the above mentioned »balancing the national economics« in the USSR, had a direct influence upon the creation of original »inter-sector analyses, linear programming, etc., in the practice of the United States.<sup>2</sup>

13. Although the application of the mentioned input — output matrixes, linear programming, capital coefficients, coefficients of the usage of productive capacities, and numerous other econometric forms and models of analysis and programming of the economic development in the West, is only *conditioned and limited*, it even now offers an abundance of material proofs about the fact that the true social and empirical basis of planning is *the state one*, i. e. the economic function of the state, in the broadest sense.

14. The above mentioned forms and ways of planning are still in the absolute power, competence of *the state*. Let us leave aside otherwise inexorable differences of the so-called institutional character, this is the specific forms of planning which originate directly out of different relations in production, and out of different character of political government, there remain, so to say only the quantitative differences, which are conceded by such planning. In such circumstances the real causes, the social roots of different wrong opinions about planning, the wrong identification of planning as an absolute function of the state should be sought.

15. The present world practice and tendency of planning, and the increasing application of sciences (especially of political economy and mathematics) in this field, has essentially slowed down the formal leading dogma, according to which planning presupposes the developed administrative, state-centralistic relations, and, so to say, completely extinct laws of market economy, the »anti-material production«. In the degree in which the inner logic of the unification of work itself demands more and more developed relations of material values the market economy on a higher social potency, this dogma is becoming more and more senseless and reactionary. Taking it strictly, the real causes of the present general *crisis in planning* in the Eastern European countries, and the failure of the so-called economic cybernetics in the scope of the systems of planning existing there, should be sought in the notorious fact of the extremely slow and unsteady realization of the economic reform in these countries and the absence

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. »Studies in the Structure of the American Economy«, by Wassily Leontief and Hollis B. Chenery, Paul B. Clark, James S. Dueseberry, Allan R. Ferguson, Anne P. Grosse, Robert N. Grosse, Mathilda Holzman, Walter Isard, Hellen Kistin. New York, Oxford University Press. 1953.



of some developed relations »of the productive value«, the laws of the market economy. It is more and more apparent that the »economic cybernetics«, this is the different methods of planning and application of mathematics in this field, demand »the production of values« (and advanced teaching of material values) as their own basis. The seemingly paradoxical fact that the above mentioned modern methodology of planning is applied in larger degree in the existing systems of planning in the West even much greater in the USA than in the USSR and other Eastern European countries, is becoming more easily understandable.

16. The solution of this general crisis of planning in the Eastern European socialist societies should therefore be sought primarily in the field of the already begun processes of the reform of basic economic mechanisms, i. e. in the closer linking of different institutions of economic system with the logic of commodity production, and only in the second or third phase in those attempts of the reduction, annihilating the unlimited number of natural planning indicators. In the correlation with this processes, the present tendency of »cybernetisation of planning« will get an unforeseen increase and a real economic-political dimension, a function.

17. The unification of work (self-management) apprehended as a productive relation in its formation, lawfully arises and is based on the fundament of the commodity production. »The field of commodity production« (Karl Marx) is wide enough to hold in addition to private capital, different forms of association of capital, public corporations, neocapitalism or state funds, the so-called revolutionary state governing etc. and different (at the present still undeveloped, embryonic) forms of unification of work, the so-called co-decision making, »participation« and the relations of the »self-management«, that is, its specific economic forms.

Self-management follows the relatively scarce material conditions of the existence as developed by »the revolutionary state governing«, and only eventually and accompanied by many difficulties and convulsions, it masters the relations of the central planned governing and administrative distribution of brutto and netto social income.

18. The history of the development of the relations of self-management offers an unlimited number of empiric proofs with regard to the fact that the practical annihilation of the so-called ponderous values (administrative »prices«), inconvertible money and credit, natural-technical and quasi-financial indicators of direct planning (in the absolute power of the state), and its opposite, the development of general legality of material production, was an inexorable condition,

the decisive lever of the real negation of etatism and of the development of the economic forms of self-management.

19. Limitations and relativity of selfmanagement have — in a sense — triple nature. Its purely qualitative limits, not taking in consideration its relatively limited material basis (insufficient technological foundation), are the following:

a) the still existent, or even dominant, etatist, economic relations (not entirely omitted administrative system and control of prices, still prominently alienated character of the administrative — centralist planning, overemphasized and complicated foreign currency limits, great »state capital«, i. e., the movement of the main part of the social accumulation conducted by the means of mediation of the economic functions of the state, etatist forms of »payment for labour«, still existent material nature of labour, etc.)

b) the so-called national relations, tending towards a relative independence, autonomy, and corresponding to the function of distribution; recently also — increasingly — in the sphere of strengthening the »strategy of the economic development« of certain republics, or rather, the autonomous provinces, with an unavoidable and increasingly emphasized differentiation in the policy of taxation, investments, social affairs and credits, etc. further in the policy of valorization of individual contributions to the collectively created income, territorial differences in the movement of the »prices of labour« for the performance of the same work, which is of essential importance as regards the basic economic nature of the process of uniting labour within the boundaries of Yugoslavia.

c) the production of commodities itself, »market economy«, with according alienation of labour and thus necessarily a sphere where »the process of production dominates people« (K. Marx) while the latter, vice versa, only dominate this process *indirectly*, through the mediation of several »mediating links« as represented by various measures and instruments of the monetary-credit policy, the system and technical instruments of planning, the so-called self-agreement, etc. Naturally, this is still rather limited, relatively depending on conditions, inspite of the great scientific discoveries about the nature of this process and partially already created association of labour with the widened boundaries of the application of the scientific elements to program the most appropriate, rational combination of the »factors of production« in the general social conditions.

These limitations, taken together, represent the presuppositions of actual socialism. Naturally besides the »countless various empirical circumstances, natural conditions, rational

relations . . . which work from the outside, etc.« and »show infinite variations and nuances in appearance, which can be understood only by means of the analysis of these empirical given circumstances« (K. Marx.)

20. The errors about planning, considered to be the basic law of the socialist production and the mythological concept of its manner of production, economic effects, which should result from it, have their deepest roots in the practice of *early socialism*, for which the state was so necessary as the capital in its embryonic stage.

The destruction of the private-capitalist relation of appropriation at the very beginning of socialism did not stop, unfortunately, at the destruction of the neuralgic production relation of the bourgeois society — the relation of the hired labour and capital — this historical process of socialism rather turned into odd and deformed forms. Together with the destruction of this capitalist relationship it began to frustrate and to destroy also the production of commodities itself on which this relation was founded, that is, it raised the question of the *economy of labour* as the primordial element of any historical form of the *law of value*.

Instead of establishing and developing its own specific historical forms and relations of the »value of production« based on the world historic, universal logic of the production of commodities, i. e., producing and distributing the material wealth of the society on such an economic basis, and functioning and structuring in a certain way these *relations of value* and *relations of planning*, socialism »chose« an essentially different and only apparently radical way. Thus the *ultra-tatist disintegration of the value of commodities* (value of production) became an essential, inseparable element of the social practice of this socialism.

The total experience so far, the practice of socialism, absolutely contradicts to the »theory«, to the dogma about the supposed incompatibility of socialism and the production of commodities; or, viewed from another point of view, about the existence of some mechanical identity of capitalism and the production of goods, thus the need of a critical examination and abolition of social barriers in the way of a given original uniting of socialism with the relatively developed relations of production of commodities, and a pressing reform of the relations of planning, on this basis, necessarily come into the very centre of our interest.

21. The present process of uniting labour (selfmanagement relations), even though only at its developing embryonic stage, creates possibilities for a change in the relations of appropriation and in those typical »general characteristic

relations of social labour« — *combining of labour* of several individuals inside a given working collective group and combining of several working collectives (collective producers of goods and services) and, naturally, in the relations of planning itself, as an integral and essential part of them.

These historical processes, changes in the ways of appropriation and actual changes in the relations of the »value of production«, constitute the reason that the worker, as a »united worker«, is no longer in the relation »of an alienated force« to the mentioned relations of social work; even more, these relations, elastic potentials of social work, are treated and understood by him as something which belongs to him, upon which his economic and political position essentially depends.

Thus he is no longer indifferent to the waste of social labour, but rather tries to economize his own past and present work. Every change (an actual increase or decrease) in the productivity of labour in a certain branch of economy, as well as its necessary reflection upon the productivity of labour in another branch, is understood by him as something of essential importance for himself, i. e., for the process of the »fertilization of the value of his own labour« (K. Marx).

That is why the »united worker« is not, and cannot be, indifferent to otherwise unavoidable differences in the technical and qualitative (organic) composition of the elements of production; he is naturally also not indifferent to the regulation processes of economy (average regulation price and »average income«) which always hide something »more« or »less« than these regulation average; hence the possibility — now getting more and more a reality — of »extra income«, differential payment, etc.

These circumstance force the uniting of labour to create in practice various forms of »compensation relations«; thus it neutralizes or reduces to a minimum extent the actual differences in appropriation; and, in accordance with this, emphasizes the tendency towards the appropriation of »income« according to labour. This also means that the trade risks, necessarily entered by enterprises, can be temporarily spread, that is, they are borne by larger groups of the producers, connected by mutual business relations.

22. Planning and so-called self-agreement (business agreement, agreements of enterprise) are only given their actual content and social effectiveness on such an economic basis.

This selfagreement has relatively close boundaries now. Selfmanagement decisions regarding the highest or lowest limit of accumulation, the amount and unavoidable national differences in the »price of labour«, the degree of amortiza-

tion, etc., cannot and must not go beyond these boundaries, similarly as the western national economies cannot go beyond a certain empirical, highest limit of the degree of the economic increase, even though we have to do only with halves or thousandth parts of the statistical point by which this increase is measured.

A serious transgression of these boundaries would expose the »united worker«, i. e., selfmanagement, to the dangers of voluntarism and also to the danger of an *expensive* and insufficient material production, with endless negative social consequences.

23. Planning is also a concentrated political power of the »united working class«. It represents an important instrument of the working class, actual arms in the establishment of the relatively permanent and determined control of all the main economic processes; at the same time it is also a destructive, corrosive power if it is applied voluntaristically, that is, in a way absolutely contradicting to the logic of the production of commodities and the fundamental social nature of uniting labour. This neuralgic economic political process of our age — viewed from a historical point of view — stands or falls with commodity production.

24. The system of planning, and the corresponding politico-legal codification of the relations of planning (which is being made now) and various techniques and methodologies of planning, are interested today in putting the actual economic mechanism the »production of value« into service of the uniting of labour: they want to submit this mechanism, as much as possible, to the conscious and far-reaching control of the relatively independent and free »united worker«. But the fact should never be lost sight of that the development of the technical side of planning, i. e., the emphasis on mathematic »cybernetic« elements in its daily practical functioning, increases the chances of the deformations of the normal movement of the social reproduction, and even a great, real danger of various social unrests and convulsions.

25. The inner economic laws and actual contradictions in the relations of uniting labour, as for instance: the contradiction between the independently changable »price of labour« and the degree of the accumulation, further, between the inner process of the creation of the value of goods and the »expenses of production«, as well as the external and alienated lawfulness of economizing with various consumptions of labour and social capital (so as to influence as strongly as possible the productivity of labour), and numerous other contradictions of the »socialist production of goods«, necessarily request the planning (and self-agreements of the direct



producers within the framework of the relation of planning) as the real way of raising and solving these contradictions.

This, naturally, presupposes a profound reform of the existent system of planning:

a) a relatively independent and locally differentiated process of taking decisions in the very cells of the social economic organism; and a closer connexion of the relatively independent economic decisions of individual enterprises by means of the uniform »system of information« (by means of social book-keeping, a well developed statistical service, and technical means, like electric computers and communications).

b) the circulation of the so-called *value indicators* through the »system of information« (information about the foreign and domestic prices of the most important products and services, course of money and credits, the stage of »current economy«- further, the movement of interest, foreign currency exchange, foreign currency reserves, changes in the »price of labour«, regulation average degree of the accumulation and amortization, etc.) together with several »classic« indicators of the technical technological side of social production, movements of productivity of labour, technological innovations etc.,

c) the closer and consistent relying of the economic policy of enterprises and socio-political communities on the essential results of scientific research, on relatively reliable, theoretic and methodological concepts of the mentioned indicators and also on these indicators themselves.



# TEORIJA in PRAKSA

Zdenko Roter

## The Dilemmas of a Communist Party »In Power«

(Proposal for Discussion)

The suggestion and questions raised in the present contribution should be understood as a personal wish to launch an open discussion on the theme »the role of the party and of the progressive forces in the struggle for socialism«. The basis which I propose for such a discussion is necessarily limited. My point of departure is our Slovene socio-political »practice« (this being the first limitation); further my own, personal experience (this being the second limitation); and it is not my purpose to offer a definite outline (this being the third limitation).

1. In its revolutionary struggle for a change in the social order, against the capitalist social system, and for the establishment of the revolutionary power, the Communist Party is of necessity *a movement* with the widest mass-basis. It lies in the essence of this *movement* that it suffers no stiff institutionalization, self-complacency, aristocratism, and superiority over others. The communist revolutionary movement demands of the communists to be open-minded to anybody who defines from different theoretical standpoints the same fundamental aims and values. The movement claims the dialogue to be the principle of action and the pluralism of viewpoints to be the basis of the alliance of all the democratic powers. After the victory of the revolution, the following question comes up: *how to preserve the communist party as a movement*, how to prevent it from becoming institutionalized, bureaucratic, aristocratic, and self-complacent in the sense of a social group in power? What can the experience of the socialist countries and of our own country tell us about that?

2. The continuity of the revolution is another question which presents itself when the communists establish the revolutionary power in a particular country. It is my considered

view that the revolution is not a single act but a process which has to have its unbroken continuity; a dynamic activity that cannot be reduced to a few legal acts (e. g. the nationalization of the means of production, the agrarian reform; and the like). The revolution cannot be limited to a few ideological postulates (such as e. g. the destruction of the bourgeois state apparatus, the struggle against the class enemy, and the like) and then go on living in the belief that the development will of its own accord follow the direction of socialism. *How to ensure the continuity of the revolution* which we understand primarily as a process of shaping the interhuman relations?

3. Is it possible to reduce the relation between a communist party and the power in a socialist country to a formula of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the name of which the dictatorship is being carried on by the proletariat's most class conscious section, by the communist party? How to prevent a total fusion of all party organs and state organs at all levels, a fusion which practically means that it is the party organs which practically make all the decisions while the state organs (from the parliament to the government, to take just one example) are mere executors of the party decisions? The Yugoslav experience tells us that the separation of the party from the authoritative powers, the establishing of the party as a league of communists which is to act merely as an ideological and political factor of influence, is one of the possible and successful ways of superseding the party dictatorship in the name of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

4. The method of exercising ideological and political influence on the social development, which results from the situation when the party is accepting the principle of the separation of the party from the authoritative powers, is of extraordinary significance. This method is a method of ideological pressure, of ideological monopolization and manipulation by means of indirect, informal power over the political, cultural and other kind of institutions. It can also be a method of the continuous advance of the leading ideological and political role of the communists and their alliance on the strength of the theoretical arguments and of the practical actions of communists. The theory of the league of communists is Marxism — but Marxism understood as an open social theory which does not pretend to own all truth and the definitive truth and which continuously enters the dialogue with other theories. This is a method which implies a sincere interest in the pluralism of views and standpoints in the society as well as for their equality in all the fields of

social life — from culture to political. Does this method ensure an optimal social and individual freedom and a social progress?

5. What are the consequences in the internal relations in the communist party if the communists strive for a pluralism of views and standpoints in the social life? It is possible to assume that the word of communists that they strive for a pluralism will have a serious response in the society if inside the party such fundamental principles which are to direct these relations remain: forum work, lower ranks and higher ranks, the right and the wrong »line«, organizational hierarchy, and the situation when the biggest amount of political power is in the hands of various informal groups so that the categories of ortodoxy and heresy enter the inter-communist relations?

6. Does it mean that if, as a communist, I strive for a political pluralism in the society, I necessarily strive for a multi-party system? Is a multi-party system of necessity the only model of the political pluralism in the socialist society? Does the model of the self-governmental type of socialism in our country not point also to the possibility of no-party political pluralism?

7. In the European area, Christianity is a significant religious, cultural, and political movement. Christianity is also in our country the dominant religious and cultural movement. Does this mean that, if and when I am interested in a dialogue between Marxists and Christians, that I am less a Marxist when I am withdrawing from the basic values accepted through my being a Marxist? Consequently, does a dialogue between Marxists and Christians have a present and a future? And what does it mean for the Communist Party which is in the socialist country »in power«?

The reader of these notes will by the end of them realize that they contain only *some* dilemmas of a communist party in power. I shall be delighted if the notes lead to an evaluation and an excahnge of our views at the moment when at the colloquium »Socialism and Democracy« we are coming together from various countries, with varying experiense and views — but all of us with a sincere wish to become enriched by this meeting.

## Some Principal Problems of the Construction of Socialist Political System on Democratic Bases

### I.

The problem of democracy is one of the most acute problems of socialism today: in many of its aspects the problem of democracies is presented as the problem of realization of the very essence of socialism. Although the verbal condemnation of democracy as such is seldom to be found, there can be noticed in the socialistic movement powerful social forces which either do not apprehend the character of democracy or bypass this problem out of particularistic interests or ideological dogmatism. They may also avoid in practice to take measures which would give the democracy in socialism a concrete character, and even the practice of undertaking direct and rude measures in order to suppress the democratic trends is also known, sometimes even under the title of »the defence of democracy«, a phenomenon which behind the phrases about democracy or »its highest form« hides an antagonism to any true synthesis of socialism and democracy.

Taking in view the ideological-theoretical and historical roots of socialism we can establish that it was begun as a movement and with the concept of the broadest and most complete form of democracy in order to enable the working class and other classes of working population to participate in arranging the conditions of their work, participating in the division of the results of social efforts according to the individual contribution to these results, and to participate in governing the socio-political conditions as political subjects whose social position is characterized by wide economic, social and political rights and freedom. That is to say, the idea of social democracy, which sprang as a criticism of formalism in a political democracy, remains empty until the real social position of the majority of nation is characterized by the lack of basic economic conditions for the production and reproduction of life and conditions of living. Socialism

and social democracy are not planned as a system which is going to abolish political democracy, the equal political participation of all citizens in managing social affairs, political rights and freedom which are the suppositions of this participation and an essential part of man as social and political being, but as surpassing the limitations of political democracy. Surpassing in such a way that an »abstract« citizen as a carrier of certain political rights and freedom will be made possible to give to these rights and freedom such contents by spreading the political rights on to economic and social rights so that man is freed from economic and social serfdom, exploitation and that he gets »a material basis« upon which he can realize his political and other rights.

Socialism is not an abolishment of political democracy but spreading of democracy to other spheres of social life (mainly upon the economic and social) through which the political democracy as such gains new social contents, in the framework of which every member of the society has got the bases for creative activity, satisfaction of his individual, group, and communal needs.

Political democratic right, political democracy, is also one of the possibilities through which man presents his social aspect. But, political democracy which satisfied the middle classes, the classes which »have got«, could not present a solution for social classes, mainly for the working class, devoid of basic needs for life and directed to sell their labour as the only thing they can offer. Upon this simple fact, the whole concept and practical revolutionary movement of socialism is built. Shortly, the political democracy had to be made wider and real and not to be abolished. This is one of the basic premises from which one must begin in building of political systems of socialism, in »conquering the democracy« (Marx) for the working class.

The second premise, which is one of the fundamental stones of the Marxist theory and which should be interpreted in connection with the first, is the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the essence of political forms of the revolutionary transformation in a transitory period.

The concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat has different interpretations even among Marxists themselves. These different interpretations are of essential importance for the questions that are discussed. One interpretation lays stress upon the social, class-political contents of the dictatorship of proletariat. The second one is interpreted in a narrow sense, leading it actually to a form of political system, to dictatorship in the formal, political sense. A broader understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as it was



understood by Marx, Engels and Lenin, sees its essence in the governing of the working class. As a form of a political system this governing should be the fullest democracy which can be created. Out of Marx's treatment of the Paris Commune as the »finally discovered form«, out of his whole analysis of the Commune, and out of the manner in which the problems begun by the commune, one can undoubtedly make a conclusion concerning the great importance which was given to the forms of direct democracy and economic sphere, through the communes and associations of producers. The great importance which was given to the Commune by Lenin is also well known, considering »the Soviets« as one special type of power of the revolutionary working class and as one in which the government of the Commune type can be realized, stressing at the same time the need »to the bringing of masses into the management« with regard to realization of a new type of democracy, socialist democracy.

Meanwhile, a narrow interpretation of the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat not only omitted all the elements of direct democracy in all essential questions, but it left to democracy only an empty word, and the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat degenerated into one specific political dictatorship performing at the same time the revision of Marxism done by the state. This was an attempt of the ideological rationalization of the existing autocracy and system of personal government, which is also often called the cult of personality and which was the degeneration of Lenin's idea of the Soviet system and which left deep traces and consequences also outside the Soviet society.

Because of the misuse of the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat, because of the attempts to rationalize one group or personal dictatorship by using the formula of the dictatorship of the proletariat, because of the possibility of different interpretations, etc., there is a tendency among many Marxists and Communists to make the concept of political system of socialism more precise, to lay special stress upon the element of democracy, and they use different derivations and new coined words of the word democracy to determine their political concept. Parallel with this, it can be observed that because of the past practice and because of possible wrong interpretations the usage of the term dictatorship of the proletariat is more and more often avoided.

The sphere of questions which are put in connection with the classical statement concerning the dictatorship of the proletariat is spread by facts brought by the present reality.

First of all, the dictatorship of the proletariat as the direct governing of the class has not been performed in

practice anywhere yet and it is possible to speak only about the different degrees of its realization. Maybe one realization which is the nearest to this ideal can be found in the short lasting period of the Commune. One can conclude from the above said that it is necessary to have accepted institutional arrangements and to build up a political system in which the representative elements are going to play an important role together with the elements of the direct democratic participation of producers and citizens.

Further on, the basic supposition was that the working class will, at least in developed industrial countries, represent the majority (at least of active working population). The statistical data concerning the structure of the active working class population in the industrially developed countries show that the greater part of the development after a certain climax represents also the lessening of that class of people who are traditionally called the working class.

At the same time, it was supposed that the class interest of the working class population will so much surpass the class consciousness that it will build one homogeneous working class and that it will dominate — with regard to all special and group interests which are constituted upon the structure of qualification — geographical determination, attachment to one or the other ethical group etc. But now these various antagonisms represent the reality and they can be fought against only by strong elements of unification, reglementation, distributionalism, which has got a completely opposite effect to stimulus upon all creative potentials, and so on.

Finally, the agrarian structure and a large part of inhabitants living in villages in the not sufficiently developed countries and, no doubt, also among all the countries which have taken the road of socialistic development, presents from the point of view of democracy great problems. Because the majority of population are peasants. This means that in democratic conditions such a platform should be found on which the peasants or the majority could be engaged in this process, this demands »the class union of the class of workers and peasants« to which Lenin paid a great attention. In so far as this is not done then this demands an enormous amount of force and this causes the reaction of the whole net of things which lead to the negation of democracy and to the authoritative forms instead of the creation of socialistic democracy.

If we take a look at socialist democracy, at its implementation in practice and its realization from the spreading of political democracy of the elements of social

and economic democracy, then we cannot be satisfied with the results. The theoretical concepts of the socialist democracy are not realized in such a way as it was intended. The effects of the certain real spreading in the field of economic and social rights were lessened and often even completely negated by lagging or even decaying at another level — at the level of political democracy, with regard to its lessening or abolishing, or limitations and abolishment of a number of political rights and freedom, in order to achieve certain economic, the so-called political aims.

In its more developed forms the socialistic democracy as a concept presupposes and means the growth of the participation of citizens and producers, but in the practice of the majority of socialistic countries this participation, even if it existed, it was limited to certain micro-communities, and on the other side the contents and even the forms of this participation were strictly determined, determined by accepted views of programme and ideology and limited to unessential questions and questions of realization of »higher decisions«.

## II.

Thus far the basic premises have been presented, the ones on which the concepts of political system of socialism are based in theory. This is the spread of democracy to economic and social sphere, the acceptance of economic and social rights, economic and social democracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat as a condensed expression of the fundamental social-class interest which dominates the political system of socialism and is created in its highest possible degree by the direct activity of this class. The expounding of these premises led us to the problem of certain limitations of socialistic democracy. The question concerns the limitations of the programme and the limitation with regard to the change of the direct carriers of the power of state and the power of the party, the limitation which springs out of specific personal structure of centres of political power.

According to its character socialistic democracy is a directed or guided democracy. It is a political framework in which one economic and social programme is realized and determined by ideological positions. The state and all of its organs and carriers of power are not completely free in the choice of their activity, but this activity is determined by the presented aims. This determination of the activity of the state organs by the type of ideology which was accepted (as it is shown by practice there exist different interpretations

of Marxism and different apprehensions of the question what socialism is) often leads individual authors to speak about »ideological state«, i. e., about a state which is bound by a certain ideology and in which the freedom and rights of an individual and democratic acceptance of decisions can be tolerated only as long as the behaviour and the decisions are in accordance with the accepted ideological postulates.

In this way there begins to grow a gap between the broadness with which the socialist democracy believes that it disposes — in view of possibilities so that the masses could take part in management of social matters on the one side — and in the intensity and contents of such participation, on the other. That is to say, as long as the theory of the socialistic democracy and in some institutional solution the spreading of this democracy by social and economic elements and upon the inclusion of the masses is insisted upon so long this spreading and inclusion does not reach the level at which the decisions are taken about the programme and about the basic questions of social development.

This implies the limitation as well as the great reserve, a great field of potential democratization which is offered to all socialistic countries.

With regard to the fact that basic elements of the socialistic programme and of its historic determinants, which, as we saw, present certain limitations to socialistic democracy, are not given in concrete but a certain general view, in abstracto for the future, and this without regard to frequent stresses of the classics of Marxism that it is created depending on the concrete conditions of each separate country, this general character of the socialistic theory, if it is to be implied, demands a great appropriateness and creative ability. When this is lacking the schematism and dogmatism appear which then make bigger »the limitations« of socialist democracies of which we have spoken to such a degree that they are beginning to form resistance, opposition, they demand the force in order of the realization, the force which is not taken only against the enemy of the class but also against the adherents of the working class and other classes of working population, because the programme which is to be realized seems to these as an abstract, illogical, incomprehensible, not rational, etc.

With regard to the fact that the socialistic programme is supported, and after the ruling has been gained it is realized, by one special political organization, »the political avant-garde«, in practice we often come across the phenomenon that the adherents of this avant-garde consider that each position in the state management should be filled by them and that

each function which is socially necessary can be only successfully performed on condition that just the adherents of this group are the executors of these functions. Because of the tendency that the adherents of the political avant-garde constantly have certain important function in the state administration and that they regulate the policy of a certain state not according to the wish of the electors, but according to the programme which this avant-garde has, such a state is often called »the state of the avant-garde«.

In any case, because of this a number of problems arise from the point of view of creating a democracy. This personal aspect of the »limitation« of socialistic democracy is closely linked with the appearance of the bureaucracy and bureaucratization of a socialist state. Marx, Engels, Lenin and other Marxists often pointed out the danger of the winning proletariat not only from the restoration of capitalism but from its own bureaucracy which can be alienated from its class so that, instead of leading the class and gaining its members with the power of arguments of its theory, it begins to use the power and the leading positions in the state in order to manage the duties more »quickly« and more »easily«, but in reality in order to manipulate with the class and with other classes of working population.

The rank which governs the socialistic state gets in the first phases of its establishment great authorization, the execution of the functions which are intended to be done by the state demands great concentration of social power in a small number of centres or persons, the realization of the nationalization of the means of production, the concentration of governing the political and economic affairs by the same bodies, the external and inner dangers which threaten the socialist revolution and very often a number of other circumstances, all these create objective conditions in which the concentration of power becomes an important factor on the development of which in the later period, as well as on the position of the subjective elements, there depends whether the socialistic state is going the road of the development of socialistic democracy or the road of different undemocratic deformation.

The tendency to present the interests of the class of governors, of the bureaucracy, as the interests of the whole community and socialism are natural, and therefore we encounter a whole mass of ideological constructions which begin to excuse this special privileged position of the bureaucracy. These are also very deep roots of dogmatism when the individual status is apologized by dogma.



The solution of this list of problems and the surpassing of the limitation which we have spoken about seems to us should be found on the plane of political institutionalization of socialistic society as soon as there arise situations — after the revolution had been successfully completed — which enable a peaceful social development and with regard to this also the development of democracy.

### III.

As of each complicated social process so it is also true of the process of the revolutionary transformation that it is full of contradictions. One of these contradictions appears in the question of political institutionalization of socialistic society. In spite of the fact that socialistic revolution with one of its aspects represents the destruction of relations and institutions of the old society, to strengthen the results which it has brought it must be institutionalized in a certain way, i. e., the results which it bring must be made stable. It must regulate on a new basis the whole range of questions of the participation of the masses in governing social, economic and political affairs. It cannot remain simply an idea, but it cannot remain just a movement, a permanent spontaneous activity, a permanent »direct action«. It has to build new institutions to have its aims realized, the institutions in which new relations will develop, according to which the social relations will be regulated in a new way.

There are a number of misunderstandings among socialists and Marxists with regard to this view. First of all, there exist pseudo-revolutionary tendencies and opinion that nothing is so alien to socialistic revolution and to the transformation which is initiated by it as a repeated modelling in institutions. The appeal that the revolutionary rule of the proletariat is the governing unlimited by law is frequent. There also appear opinions that each institutionalization is characteristic of bureaucratization, because bureaucracy is active through institutions, and so on. Therefore we consider that it is necessary to point out what we believe to be political institutionalization of the socialistic society.

Political institutionalization is, in our opinion, mainly the control which is performed by the class or nation upon the democratic basis over the direct executives of the ruling power in the post-revolutionary period, when the old classes have been thrown from the power and politically destroyed, when the political avant-garde takes over the power »on behalf of the class« in order to develop further the socialism



upon the democratic bases. It has to come to the limitation of power and to the regulation of the manner in which the power is executed. This means that in the period of the stabilization of the socialistic state the citizen had to take a different position towards the authorities than it can be possible in the armed period of the revolution. This citizen and predominantly the adherents of the working class, must be in a position, in such real relationship so that the direct carrier of the governing power can work only as an authorized person, as the person who got the mandate from the electors, citizens, in order to perform some communal affairs and who is responsible for the way these affairs are conducted. The process of the political institutionalization then means that the citizen has to be in a position to influence essentially the constituting of the organs of power and their performance. This then, by itself, means the abolishment of the strongly stressed elements of personal power.

It is natural that the power apprehended in such a manner has to have limited competence, especially in relation to citizens and producers. The rights and freedom of citizens and producers appear then as a border and as a limitation of power. If the guaranteed rights and freedom of citizens is not the border which the bearers of power cannot cross unless they damage the basic principles of political relationship of socialistic society then it is hard to speak that the socialistic democracy has been realized.

The legal aspect of such a process of institutionalization is legality, socialistic lawfulness. This is again considered by a number of Marxists and socialists in a narrow legal — dogmatic sense as putting into practice the laws by those to whom they are related, as a form of governing, as a form of issuing orders to those who are politically manipulated and who are pressed to a certain degree. For the socialistic legality and development of socialistic democracy it is extremely important that the relations and the positions of the highest carriers of power, the most significant political subjects, are regulated by certain publically presented and known rules. This means that the basic questions of political relationship are solved on the single plane of legally regulated relations and not only on the plane and on the basis, of quantity, of rough force with which some subject disposes. In other, words, law must not be only the means of politics, the form to communicate with those »down« what kind of behaviour is expected from them by those »above«, but also a certain border of politics, something that must be respected by all political subjects. Only thus the subjectivism and voluntarism can be excluded, the damaging consequences which are brought about

by the fact that the highest carriers of making the political decisions are not bound by any norms, and that ideological norms which they, so to say, follow, interpret in a pragmatic way according to the political opportunity or advantage.

In so far as the socialistic legality was introduced in life in the given sense then the processes of democratization of social relationship could not be looking forward not only to success but also to the permanency of results which are achieved in this sphere. By this also one of the questions of socialistic society which has not been solved yet in a satisfactory manner neither in a way which would avoid bringing enormous dangers, would be solved. This is the question of »succession« to the highest positions. Political institutionalization has to solve this question too the field of legal and other democratic politic rules.

There is surely no need to speak about the fact that such a global demand which is according to our mind one of the essential questions related with the further development of socialism, includes the whole range of changes in the relations among political subjects and in the position of political institutions.

The problem which has been discussed as the essence of the process of political institutionalization demands above all a democratic system of elections in which it were really, and not only formally, possible for the broad masses to decide about their political representatives, it were possible to constitutionalize democratic representative organs.

The domination of the executive gives to the representatives in socialistic political systems the role of a facade. This is the thing that there is no real socialistic democracy in many spheres and that the whole complex of relations which begins with the electors, citizens, and is concluded in the highest representative body, is not filled with the spirit of democracy and not placed institutionally in such a position that it could represent and develop democracy. Undoubtedly, the question of the structure of representatives in socialistic society would also be of great interest for the further development of socialistic democracy. Because the expansion of political democracy through economic and social contents should also bring new elements in the structure of the representatives, and not that the expansion keeps it back in those forms which it got in the classical bourgeois political democracy. It is not only the case that economic and social components of social life should get in total view their expression on those levels on which the decisions of general significance are taken, but the problem of the autonomy of social groups is, according to our

opinion a definite preliminary condition for the democratization. Contemporary political science has arrived at a definite conclusion that political and social life generally is not life in which individuals participate on the one side, and abstract society, on the other, but that political and social life is composed by the existence and activity of different groups, communities with different interests (with regard to professions, people living in communities, interests for a single question to be solved in such and such a way, adherence to different aesthetic and artistic directions, even adherence to different religious groups, etc.). All this leads to the fact that one group has a different attitude to certain questions than another group (it is enough to say, e. g., that those who do not own cars are not in the same degree interested in a scope of questions as the owners of cars, let us say in the regular provision of petrol, organization of services, keeping of roads, in bringing of different regulations concerning the traffic etc.). On the whole the interests can be easily indentified and articulated in a really free society and it is therefore natural that these interests come into conflicts. The theory of the society without conflicts is more a propagandistic slogan than a real reflection of the conditions. Such situation could be only apparently created by forceful suppression of differences and by making it impossible for different views and interests to be proclaimed.

The whole range of such question can be solved only if their local communities, their professional and other associations, their trade unions and political organizations are relatively autonomous. The surpassing of the role of transmission, which is intended to all social and professional organizations and even to the organs of power, and in this sense the surpassing of that monopoly of power which is concentrated in the highest peak of the party organization, is an essential preliminary condition for the development of socialistic democracy.

This, of course, includes also a radical change of the position of the political avant-garde, of the Communist party, its different attitude towards citizens and their groups and associations, its leading of society towards socialism instead of a commanding position with regard to the society. Total partocracy, i. e., governing of all social questions and relations by the party bodies, immobilizes and destimulizes and often even makes a »surpluss«, it makes unnecessary all other social organizations, and even the organs of power, and their responsibility towards citizens, towards the class, it is replaced by the responsibility for the execution of the orders to those in a higher position.

Finally, socialism does not mean only the welfare society, but it must also bring freedom to man. This freedom cannot be comprehended only as something which is going to come in the far future. It is present on each degree of development, naturally as a differently realizable and necessary element of socialistic democracy. Socialistic democracy exists in that degree in which an average man feels free to create and decide about that which he has created in society with others.

In this sense the development of socialism and socialistic democracy is in the closest connexion with the development of selforganization and exclusion of the state as the highest arbitrator and governor of all social, economic and other affairs. But with the regard to the fact that the dying away of the state is the case of far future the democratization of the state is put as a biting problem nowadays.

It is not rarely the case that the Yugoslav Marxists are reproached for speaking about self-government not as about one alternative but again as of a general model. With this respect it should be noticed that when self-government is spoken about in the deeper sense of the word as of the contents of democratization in socialism, contents of socialistic democracy, then certain forms and organs are not meant by this (workers councils, managing boards, one or the other body, one or another manner of decision making). What is predominately thought of is the fact that it is essential for socialism of democratic type that those who create, produce economic values, those who get more profitable functions according to their work also participate in these values, and created goods, and that on the other hand, as the adherents of certain territorial, professional and other communities also have their say, they participate themselves in governing and decision making in social affairs. The meaning of self-government is in the self-organization, in order to manage the surplus of the work and also in participation in political life with the aim of organizing such activities which are important for the existence and development of the community, because only if man becomes voluntarily organized to make common efforts, man can feel free and can at the same time realize economic and other aims of his community. Therefore man's freedom and the ability of its realization as freedom of choice in the broadest sense (the election of representatives, the choice of products and services, place of work, profession, place of dwelling, artistic direction in which man is going to enjoy etc.) is the criterion of the development of socialistic democracy, of the stage of development, democracy and of socialism.

Zoran Vidaković

SOCIJALIZAM

**The False  
and the True Problems  
of Socialist  
Democracy**

(Theses)

**I.**

Labour movement and socialism still have not freed themselves from a wrong and distorted consciousness, and also from some other characteristics, processes and the results of the structure of class-society which underlie this wrong and limited consciousness. Labour movement and socialism (the historic period of the revolutionary transformation of class-society into a classless society) are processes, means of liberation, but as long as this liberation is not terminated they will encounter the counteraction of the processes and results of the structure of class-society. This counteraction is dangerous and it threatens labour movement and socialism in their very foundations, especially when it comes to an expression as ideological work in forms of consciousness (in theories, in political opinions, in ideological currents, in political programmes, in social psychology, and in the activities of the people, etc.) which therefore is wrong and distorted, so that the idea of totality of the socialist transformations of society and its essential elements vanishes from the forms of consciousness. At this moment the forms of social consciousness hypostatize, develop in one direction only, and support exclusively only those concepts which stand for one side only, for one sole part, or for one sole dimension, for one sole method of social change and development. The historical experience proves that such distorted revolutionary consciousness is not far from ideological degeneration, which hampers labour movement and socialism, diminishes the revolutionary power of the working class in capitalism and in the initial phases of socialism, adjusts the class consciousness of the working class, its avantgarde, its political and ideological representatives and leaders, to the class structure of initial socialism,



which is transitory and in essence always contradictory, and represents a channel of coming of those ways of thought which are contradictory to the revolutionary aims.

It is characteristic of the forms of distorted and limited revolutionary consciousness, which really represent a tendency towards degeneration, that they mutually confront one-sided opinions, partial knowledge, hypostatized decisions for the one or the other side, for one sole way, for one sole method or form of social action. For these reasons the ideological confrontation in the field of labour movement and socialism can reveal the following harmful characteristics:

1. *Mutual contradiction.* From the point of view of one distorted consciousness other forms of revolutionary consciousness — no matter whether they themselves are distorted or not — appear to be some form of revision of revolutionary thought, some ideological or political heresy. Instead of unity and ideological relations — including discussions and the confrontation of opinions — helping to proliferate and to develop revolutionary consciousness and knowledge and widening the horizon of everybody who tends to strengthen the total social consciousness, there arise ideological antagonisms, characteristic of the class structure which the proletariat wants to abolish.

2. *Establishment and preservation of distorted consciousness.* Due to the ideological antagonisms there exists the tendency that each of the forms of distorted and partial consciousness in labour movement and in socialism become firm and fully self-sufficient and exclusive, that it closes against the influence of revolutionary practice and becomes uncritical of that part of revolutionary practice which it itself represents (it expresses its relatively insufficient development and its social limitations and contradictions). The more certain forms of partial consciousness get firm, the more they are closed and persistent, and the more they contradict each other.

3. *Suitableness of the mentioned forms of consciousness to the partial interests* inside contradictions established socially-historically by labour movement and socialism. The mentioned forms of revolutionary consciousness express more or less, or even quite truly, the development level and stage of social circumstances of a certain layer of labour movement as a whole, of socialist societies, and also of individual social groups within these societies. The development of different parts of labour movement — or rather, of some socialist societies — is not only wrong but is even determined by various processes of the previous historic development. In various periods it has to encounter permanently different

actions, pressures of the opposite social forces, and to solve various contradictions. Special interests and aims, different from other special interests and aims of the state, i. e., special national, economic and political aims, etc., appear as one of the expressions of these contradictions of labour movement and socialism. The entire revolutionary practice of the proletariat gets established by solving these contradictions, by uniting the basic interests and aims, by surpassing the fundamental differences and contradictions, caused by the social-historical circumstances. One of the essential conditions of such revolutionary practice is that the forms of limited and distorted social consciousness within the framework of labour movement and socialism must be surpassed. However, there exists a tendency to adjust such forms of limited and distorted consciousness to special aims and interests; the tendencies to emphasize even stonger the differences and contradictions within the framework of labour movement and socialism by means of ideological contradictions, thus the preservation of ideological contradictions prevents strengthening of total revolutionary practice. The more the adjustment of consciousness to the interests and aims is necessary, the more the differences in circumstances turn into contradictions in interests and into differences in aims; contradictions in interests emphasize even stronger the strengthening and contradictions of partial consciousness.

4. *The tendency towards the ideological hegemony of certain social groups — separated from the working class — by means of various forms of limited consciousness and forcing of partial aims and interests.* The tradition which has conditioned the variety of interests and aims in the working class has also given rise to the tendency of certain social groups to get separated from the working class and to strengthen their economic, political and ideological superiority in relation to the working class. This is most obvious with the social-democratic reformism, as a way of integration of special interests, of the limited forms of social consciousness, and of the organization of the working class acquiring the capitalist structure, and with the bureaucratization of the leading layer in state structures of initial socialism, when we have to do with a layer founding its political and economic power upon the ideological superiority over the working class. The forms of limited and distorted consciousness show a tendency towards stopping and discontinuing the revolutionary process, or rather, the tendency to develop this process only in certain fields of social life; this makes possible the preservation of the superiority of social groups which got separated from the working class. The working class can use

them as mediators thus realizing its aims and interests *only partially, and realizing only one part of the objective possibilities of the revolutionary transformation of society*. The more they become a means of such an ideological superiority the more they *break the unity of the working class* and of the various parts of labour movement; the more the unity disintegrates, the more limited consciousness gets adjusted to partial aims and interests, and the more the aims, interests and the content of social consciousness in labour movement and socialism are delimited the more likely it is that the superiority of those social groups which got separated from the working class will remain preserved. The real revolutionary practice of the proletariat and of all social groups following social-historical process and serving the interests of the proletariat must permanently break out of this »vicious circle« of ideological degeneration and particularism.

5. *The movement from the essence of the contents of the revolutionary working class in the forms of limited and distorted social consciousness*. This movement is caused by the mentioned conservative and frustrating ideological processes.

a) The proclamation of a certain kind of revolutionary possibility as the only possibility, and the denial of all other kinds, ways, dimensions or forms of revolutionary thought and practice — while the essential revolutionary content can be realized only within the framework of such a totality.

b) The exploitation of distorted and limited consciousness as a means of ideological superiority over the working class always means a rejection of ideological decisions, of theoretic anticipations, of social sciences, etc., which have deepened the revolution of the working class.

c) The ideological disunion of the working classes and of various parts of labour movement always pushes the parts in disagreement to the limited interests and aims and to such forms of consciousness which contradict the fundamental aims of the proletariat.

Even though all the forms of limited consciousness in the field of labour movement and socialism take over the marks of the working class, and refer to its aims and interests — at this they use one-sided actions, ideological and political decisions, one-sided management of social processes, etc. — the characteristics differing from the fundamental interests of the revolutionary class gradually come to prevail. There exists a tendency to force these marks as the only valid criteria of determining and evaluating of revolutionary consciousness, ideas and actions, of the confirmation of programmes and political decisions, and of the evaluation of

the social institutions, and of the estimate of the nature of some parts of labour movement, etc. Because of the possibility to transform society, the fundamental interests and the revolutionary aims of the working class should be acknowledged the position of the source and of the supreme measure of the development of all the forms of social consciousness, ideas, science, programmes, decisions, etc.; instead of this an attempt has been made to give this position to several factors of secondary importance, which in the time of the development of labour movement and socialism can have a really important role, even the main role, in one of the possibilities for the revolutionary activity of the working class, but which can never replace the supreme measures of revolutionary thought.

6. *The ideological confrontation with the false problems of labour movement and socialism, with false dilemmas concealing and distorting the real problems of workers' revolution and socialist transformation of society.*

The false problems arise because of the perpetual confrontation and contradiction of science, ideas and partial programmes, and above all, because of the confrontation of secondary criteria, with a tendency to establish themselves as original and supreme criteria. The ideological supremacy over the working class is made possible by a frivolous »ideological struggle« in the framework of false problems. In this framework the ideological contradictions are favourable for partial interests and aims, while their real significance is hidden behind the mask of the »highest truth«, of fundamental principles«, and of basic measures«, advocated by the opposite side; in this case they represent one-sided ideas and directions and express the limited nature of their own revolutionary practice. The false problems move away from the fundamental revolutionary and class content of social consciousness, and this means that they put the real problems of labour movement and socialism upside down, represent them in a hidden way, thus making it impossible to discover the essence and to strengthen the fertile ideological communication among various parts of the working class, developing in different circumstances and attaining the totality of revolutionary practice by various ways.

Among the false problems of labour movement and socialism in this sense the odd »couples« of mutually exclusive alternatives (for instance in connection with the ways of acting and the methods of the socialist transformation of society) are of special importance; so for example: a »peaceful« or »forcible« way of the revolutionary transformation of society, parliamentary or un-parliamentary forms of the struggle of the working class or, speaking in more general

terms, forms of the struggle inside the institutions *or* against the institutions of bourgeois society, the complete and immediate transformation of society *or* profound, gradual changing of the social structure of society, taking possession of power by the working class *or* the abolition of political institutions, taking possession of power in global society *or* the establishment of the power of workers in various parts of society, the political and ideological subordination of the working class in a political structure *or* the political and ideological confrontation of various parts and organizations constituting the same. Further: the international integration and unity *or* the autonomy of labour movements and socialist societies, the leading role of the revolution in the developed countries of the West *or* in the less developed countries of the East, etc. In the framework of socialism: the decisive role of the political power of the working class *or* the decisive role of workers' selfmanagement and social selfgovernment, the centralization *or* decentralization of political decisions and economic management, the planned economy *or* the economy governed by the market laws, the leading role of the party *or* political pluralism, representative *or* direct democracy, uniform ideology *or* ideological liberalism, the trade-unions as the transmission of political administration *or* as an institutionalized opposition to this administration, etc.

We are not saying that these alternatives have no contents, no significance, that they do not cause real problems in labour movement and socialism, but we are saying that the way in which they are expressed — in the form of one-sided and exclusive views denying and neglecting the main measures of the revolutionary class, its interests and functions — represents a deviation from the real problems, and this diverts the attention in seeking a solution.

The fruitful ideological contacts, which are so necessary for labour movement and socialism, become possible only if the many-sided problems — identical, similar or different problems of various labour movements and socialist societies — are united into a uniform theoretical basis, deriving from fundamental revolutionary thought on the development and the role of the working class.

## II.

Several problems of socialist democracy cannot be discussed, let alone solved, unless we take their essence as the point of departure: this essence is understood in the social-historic sense, in the sense of the historic possibilities of the



origin and development of the social power of the working class as the subject of the socialist transformation of society, abolishing all the forms of economic and political supremacy and also ideological monopoly and strengthening the real power, autonomy and union of all the social subjects. The essence of socialist revolution is the establishment of a social power of a historically new type, a united social power taking the place of social supremacy. In this moment all the forms of the revolutionary power appear as a kind of introduction, as a starting point, as a constituent element of the united social power. The discussions on socialist democracy grow watery, and the practical tendencies become illusions if we remain in the framework of the social power of political and economic institutions, within the framework of the relations which are typical of class structure of society, and if we do not find a historically possible means of a qualitative change of the social power, institutions and relations. Such qualitative changes cannot be imagined, and cannot be realized, otherwise but on the basis of the revolutionary nature of the working class, because in its main aims, consciousness and class organization, in its uniting methods which are typical of it only, and in its economic, political and cultural activities, in the development of productive forces and in surpassing the social division of labour and all the forms of antagonistic society — this class has and expresses the possibilities of a qualitative transformation of the social power.

We feel that, above all, the following are the real problems of socialist democracy:

1. The possibilities of a qualitative transformation of social activities, institutions, relations and power must be discovered in the revolutionary nature of the working class.

2. The working class and its abilities must be developed so as to realize profound changes in its own activities and in society as a whole.

3. The pre-conditions, methods and forms of the realization of the authentic social power of the working class must be realized and determined in concrete terms — in each period of social transformation in accordance with the level of the development of the entire society and in accordance with the development of the working class.

4. The social conditions, factors and processes which tend towards the alienation of the social power in relation to the producers, towards the reestablishment of the economic and political supremacy and of ideological monopoly, must be discovered and kept in mind — in each period of the transformation of society. An ideology and a critical relation of the working class to such tendencies must be created.

5. The social structure of the working class must be created and further developed — maximum clear regulations regarding the interests and their realization, the ways of self-decision and activity in all social processes, the strengthening of social power, the system of organization (avant-garde political and ideological organization, political power, selfgovernment and trade-unions, etc.), the system of social ideas, knowledge, values, social norms, etc — which are to constitute the social framework of completely equal rights of the working class and of a profound change of the entire society.

6. All social processes should be directed towards the integration of numerous social groups with the working class, to a social framework based upon the structure of the revolutionary class, i. e., towards such forms of activity which are characteristic of this class only, towards the expression and realization of its interests, its organization, towards strengthening of the social power, towards social consciousness, etc.

If in practice or in speculating we forget these fundamental problems, fictitious contradictions and mutual exclusion of various forms get established, exclusion of methods, views and dimensions of the revolutionary activity of the working class. And it happens that various forms, means and methods of social activities, various political and social institutions, and forms of settlement and management of social relations and processes, etc., bereft of their basis in the working class and of their content, become incompatible, contradict each other and exclude each other.

Outside the revolutionary activity of the working class there are the state and other forms of political life — still necessary in the time of the transformation of society — which are incompatible with the selfgovernment of social subjects in economy and in other social activities. Thus a false problems comes into being: the state or selfgovernment, the antagonism between the political power and selfgovernment in socialism. If the social structure is not based upon developed democracy of workers, if the political power does not develop as a historical form of abolition of social supremacy and as the establishing of the social power of the producer, then the political power appears to be a power contradicting to the possibilities of and tendencies towards workers' selfgovernment. This is also the case if the main interests of the producers in insufficiently developed selfgovernment do not prevail, both in economic and in social units, if selfgovernment is not the basis of labour movement and of its developed content, if it does not succeed in realizing the workers's selfgovernmental integration in social activi-

tites — then such a form of independent social units resists the development of the political power of the working class. With a real basis on the working class and with a developed content, the political power and selfgovernment represent constituent elements of the social power of the producer, at the same time they are necessary, complementary and interdependent. This fact does not exclude contradictions inside a political structure, inside selfgovernment, and between the two of them, it rather makes possible the solution of contradictions in the system of socialist democracy, which — as a whole — tends towards a socialist power of a new type (selfdecision and uniting of the producers).

The planned economy, torn out of the framework of the activities of the revolutionary class, inspite of its socialist pretension preserved the etatist nature and anew strengthened the forms of social power and proprietary relations, characteristic of the structure of class society. This is also the case with the commodity economy in socialism (unless it is directed exclusively to the interests of the producers, united and organized in developed selfgovernment): it is realized under the control of the united producers, but as long as it does not encompass all of its historic possibilities, it gives rise to tendencies towards the alienation of the economic and political monopoly and labour for wages. Combination and making uniform the social planning and the conscious and rational exploitation of the market processes in socialism can be realized only within the framework of the development of social power of the working class, based upon the main common interests of the producers and their communities, which strengthen the selfgovernmental integration of workers in social activities. Outside this framework the alternative: the »planned« type of socialist economy or the »market« type of socialist economy cannot be solved and can only give rise to sociological contradictions.

The same is true of the confrontation of centralism and decentralism, or rather, of the comparison between the technological, economic and political integration on the one side, and the independence of a community and of social subjects on the other. Inside the social-economic-political relations, social institutions and structures of social power, characteristic of the system of social domination — not based upon the working class — these categories (both in theory and in objective social donnée) exclude each other and contradict each other. The social power of the working class, self-decision and association of the producers, which can develop only inside the working class, represents a qualitatively new historic phenomenon, if only because it does not

see the integration as the opposite of autonomy, the association as the opposite of selfdecision of social subjects, the common and uniform realization of actual and common aims as the opposite of self-decision of all the participants who want to realize their own aims, the representative system as the opposite of direct democracy, and because it does not establish other similar alternative »couples«, which are manifest in class society; instead of offering such alternatives it makes possible and requests both of them — their organic unity.

Thus the main problem of the revolutionary party in socialism is: how to guide and not to govern, how to express the historical interests of the working class in a society which is always heterogeneous without creating a monopoly of the social power for itself. This problem can be solved only within the framework of the genesis of a historically new type of the social power, in the process of the emergence of self-decisions and associations of the producers. The same applies to the autonomy of workers' trade-unions and to other social organizations. The problem of autonomy which does not mean, and cannot mean the contradiction between individual institutions and organizations of the working class, but rather their cooperation, mutual encouragement of positive qualities and possibilities of the revolutionary transformation of society, and mutual exclusion and frustration of qualities, which are not favourable for the revolutionary transformation also comes into this complex of things. The question of socialist democracy posed in the wrong way remains within the framework of the institution of the social power and social organizations in class society. On this level it cannot be solved either in theory or in practice. If in the time of the socialist transformation of society the revolutionary action is obstructed by strong elements of class structure, then it can lose its direction. Inability of the direction comes to expression also in decadent theoretic thought, slipping into the categories and contradictions of class society.

The definition of the highest criterion of revolutionary thought cannot itself solve the complex problems of socialist democracy. On the contrary, only when this criterion has been defined these problems are revealed in their full complexity, they can be studied in detail and treated theoretically and evaluated by revolutionary practice. In order to secure a success of this exceptional endeavour, which has only begun in various circumstances, we must open a new way, we must refuse the ideological remainders which have overburdened revolutionary thought because of the exceptionally complex and contradictory processes of the socialist revolution.

France Vreg

## Socialist Democracy and Opinion Pluralism

Socialist democracy is going through fatal periods of its own development. It believes that the only way leading into socialism is the etatistic imperial model of dictatorship of the proletariat; the limited sovereignty is proclaimed workers' internationalism, autonomy of patries is branded as bourgeois nationalism and in foreign policy socialist democracy is consenting to the conception of super-powers and war-power. Thus it is altering into a closed system, cut off from socialist and democratic aspirations of people throughout the world, into a gloomy apology of despotism, mediaeval inquisition and dogmatism. I see the crisis of socialism above all in the inability to overcome rigid dogmas, to cast off Stalinist schemes of the feudal-despotic model of socialism and to assert effectively the humanist renaissance of socialism and the free man.

1. The etatistic model of dictatorship of the proletariat leads the way into the dictatorship of a narrow party group and an oligarchic top. As a closed system it is compelled to exert the concentration and centralization of political power and gradually to eliminate other social and political forces that accompanied it through the revolution and construction of socialism are an exception. Socialist fronts and popular fronts are changing into mere transmissions of centralized party headquarters; as political subjects they are losing the last remnants of their autonomy, disintegrating into atomized individuals. The declared hegemonistic role of the party is passing to an authoritative despotic structure, intermingled and mastered by the police agency as its vanguard part. As the etatistic — bureaucratic stratum cannot respond to new needs and demands of society it asserts the policy of violence, direct hegemony and ideologic dictatorship. In this closed and contradictory system the political power finally concentrates in the hands of the party top forum and formal concentration of the highest functions in one single person or in an oligar-



chic clique is carried out. The dictatorship of the proletariat changes into the dictatorship of a narrow group.

2. Institutional political pluralism, normatively asserted in some countries of popular democracy, remains only a formal facade of democracy or otherwise, it experiences a political murder at the first attempt of revival. Popular front is losing the role of integration of autonomous political subjects, the allied parties and their leaders represent »mechanical and automatical unity« dictated by the hegemonic role of the communist party. At the same time the proletarian »internationalism« asserts »mechanical and automatical unity« at a higher level, the uniformity dictated by the hegemony of the Soviet party over other parties or by the Stalinist despotic elite over satellite despotic elites. Lenin's idea of truthful and authentic class alliance among classes, social strata and parties, assuring identification of the communist party with the tendencies, interests and aspirations of proletarian and non-proletarian masses, turns into the dictatorship of the avant-garde over popular masses, into the hegemony of a large party over small parties.

3. The Stalinist model of socialist imperium brings forth profound antagonisms: centralism, concentration of power, oligarchic commanding, formal democratism, reinforcement of the bureaucratic stratum, directed economy, political indoctrination all these are requisites of the feudal despotism but not of the modern society. The society of automation, electronics, and atomic power, however, is being managed in a democratic way; it follows self-government in all domains and it does not suffer despotism. Structural and functional changes of society as well as of the working class demand another way how to manage men and things. The creative force of an individual is becoming a basic postulate of further progress of mankind, and the investing into creative forces and scientific research activities is a decisive factor. Sharing of decision, exchange of experiences and searching for best solutions are gaining significance in the modern industrial process. These laws of economics are at the same time a principle of the entire management of society as well as of the political process. Thus, the Stalinist model is confronted with the other alternatives: decentralization, distribution of power and responsibility, autonomy of political subjects, national sovereignty, social self-government, political co-decision, pluralism of political subjects, publicity of the decision — making process, a free system of communication.

4. Pluralism of political subjects is a form of political social self-government, based on autonomy and equality of political subjects, by which we do not think of parties only

but other social organizations, interest groups, associations, societies, clubs, and other forms of organizations as well. Such pluralism includes competitiveness of political subjects and public formulating of alternative decisions in order that the public can participate in the decision-making process, assured by the institutionalized self-government mechanism. The fact that political subjects are autonomous and exercise self-government, guarantees the control of the state apparatus and prevents the concentration of political power in the hands of a narrow, oligarchic group. Dispersion of political power signifies dispersion of decision-making and responsibility as well. Pluralism of political subject initiates horizontal as well as vertical joining together into the system of social self-government. Pluralism does not signify hegemony of one political subject over another; the communist league ensures itself its vanguard role with the ideological-theoretical capability to convey and suggest the best solutions.

Pluralism is a permanent form of socialist democracy and does not mean the abolition of allied parties in the further development. Political subjects have the right and obligation of disagreement and objection to the state policy or to socialist forces if they consider the majority policy to be opposed to the interests of the working people.

5. The socialist democracy considers that a free, autonomous and self-governing public is a prerequisite for functioning of pluralism of political subjects. The public is a structure, politically differentiated and as such it represents the opinion pluralism. Institutional opinion polycentrism ensures expression and crystallization of opinions of various political subjects, social groups or strata. Political polycentrism signifies the revival and functioning of several centers, shaping political opinions quite freely and have their own communication systems; consequently, they compete in forming the public opinion. The process of opinion shaping is an interaction as concerns the controversial and contradictory problems.

The quality of the public opinion depends on the effectiveness of the public discussion. Mass media therefore must make free discussion possible, and not impose censorship and act as a selector of orthodox opinions and as a center of apology. By preventing one of the contradictory views from being presented to the public, by neglecting it and giving its interpreter less possibilities for explaining the arguments to the public, we hamper an effective public discussion and impose a political monopoly. In socialist democracy the hierarchy of information is not acceptable in the sense that the concentration of power is linked to the communication

monopoly. The principle of public discussion is: equal time and equal possibilities for every partner in a public dialogue. The common practice of the topmost etatistic or party leadership to usurp public media must be abolished when there is a question of a public dialogue based on equal rights.

6. A free public discussion, dialogue based on equal rights, equal possibilities of representatives of all political subjects to reveal their views in public are prerequisites for an authentic public opinion. Can we speak of public opinion in socialism at all if it is shaped by the state-political propaganda mechanisms directed from a single center? Such unanimity of opinion is opinion uniformity supported by conformism and pressure exerted by the police. Many authors are justified in their establishing the fact that we are experiencing a profound crisis of the institutional formation of public opinion throughout the world. Political communication is in the hands of monopoly centers of political power and thus, it is being turned into political propaganda as a new, mighty force in the hands of despotic political power. Mass media are exposed to the pressure of the despotic elite, therefore becoming uncritical and apologetic. Mass media are able to fulfil their mission only if they act as an organ of the democratic public, as an instrument of social control and a critical, uncensored organ of self-governing society. If the critical organs of expression are not at the public's disposal, a public confrontation with the government is not made possible either. The proper, relevant public opinion does not even exist and the government is not compelled to dread the pressure of public opinion and to take it into account. Public opinion has the function of imposing the will of the people and of turning it into law.

7. Democracy is the very form of the political system where the citizen may declare his opinion, freely and without fear. Democracy, however, also implies the citizen's courage to declare his opinion freely in public. Freely to express one's opinion has been and still is one of the fundamental human rights closely connected with freedom of thought, freedom of conscience, freedom of press and freedom of political association. To express the opinion publicly is the constituent element of determining the public opinion altogether. Therefore socialism cannot content itself only with one's private opinion anonymously professed to an employee of the Center for Public Opinion Research; the opinion arrived at like that is not subject to the confrontation of opinions, to competitiveness of alternatives and to public criticism. In spite of that such registration of non-public public opinion can be a useful

instrument of politics as well as of the public, however, if the Research Center itself is not a mere appendage of the political elite.

8. Public opinion is shaped in a public discussion by means of arguments and counter-arguments, by the exchange of experiences and by mutual abating and smoothing of views. Thus, a central tendency is brought forth, formed on account of proportionality of power and of antagonistic play of different views. In this process the minority can have a greater influence upon the formation of collective opinion. Public opinion includes opinions of the majority as well as of the minority or all minorities at a certain time. The opinion must express a high level of agreement so as to make it possible for the minority to approve of it though its opinion is not the same. But it must be approved of on account of conviction and not for fear.

The minority has also the right to disapprove of the majority opinion and not to consent to cooperation. The minority has the right to continue arguing about correctness of their assertions. The unity of opinion cannot be obtained by exerting violence over an individual, group or minority.

The Soviet political scientists believe that in socialism public opinion is unanimous, denoting a general harmony of all classes and social groups and is therefore of a higher quality. The general consensus can be attained only about questions of fundamental values of socialism, about the general direction of the way leading into socialism, while in a healthy democratic society concrete questions are always exposed to public discussion, criticism, competitiveness of alternatives and differentiation of views; consequently, different suggestions and solutions are inevitably shaped. The opinion of the bureaucratic stratum cannot possibly be the opinion of the working people. Only the system of pluralism of political subjects can ensure the opinion pluralism which on a problem is shaped into a collective majority opinion of a certain public. The system of political polycentrism, can guarantee competitiveness, a true dialogue and fair play of the public discussion. Such system does not articulate a unified opinion and does not suffer conformism of thought. Minorities and minority opinions belong to the functioning of public opinion mechanism and are one of its important participating creative factors. Thus, public opinion becomes a constituent part of functioning of the political system and one of the forms of crystallization of opinions and of representation of interests by political subjects.

The continuous opinion confrontation leads the way to a growing stage of consensus about important national ques-

tions. The mechanism of public discussion directs individuals and political subjects to the interaction and by that to the confrontation of views and opinions. As a result, firm opinion blocs are formed, capable of exerting political influence and bringing fresh air, of the healthy spirit of public opinion into corrupt-aired offices of etatism, according to Marx.

9. The existing institutional forms expressing the public opinion and political decisions cannot articulate all differences in opinions, needs and interests of political subjects. The structure of political organizing (arisen under the influence of dogmatic marxism) is out of date and remaining behind the actual needs of crystallization of opinions, views and interests. Thus, the opinion pluralism is being expressed through non-institutional channels if this is possible, however; for the Stalinist totalitarianism was hampering informal interpersonal communication as well in order to prevent the shaping of the consensus on the noninstitutional level. The bureaucratic-etatistic stratum is obstructing the affirmation of opinion pluralism since the latter would disclose a deep gulf between the advocates of everything old, conservative, expressing etatistic political platform and advocates of authentic socialist forces, capable of answering new needs of the working class and creative forces of society. The crisis of orthodox marxists manifests in the very fact that, because of their ideological weakness, they are not able to confront with the new ideas of the time and to develop marxism in a creative manner. The polarization of ideas and opinions is taking place on all levels of political decision-making from the base up to the leadership; it appears in all political subjects and interest groups; the conflict of opinions exists among communists as well as noncommunists. Among the countries of popular democracies this contest has matured to the highest point in Czechoslovakia where authentic socialist forces succeeded in breaking the system of Stalinist dictatorship and where they are practicing political pluralism though in the shadow of Russian tanks.

10. The Yugoslav socialism has asserted the pluralism of self-governing decision-making which manifests itself mainly in the sphere of social work but less so in the sphere of the political process. Investigations show that in the League of Communists there are differences, much greater than manifested in institutional channels. The existing structures of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia are not assuring the articulating of all different opinions, views and interests of various political subjects. In its forums the Socialist Alliance is not uniting the representatives of different views and ideologies and therefore the actual confrontation of



alternative political concepts is not made possible. The opinion pluralism is appearing in informal communication channels and is existing more or less as a latent opinion or rather it is registered by opinion researches as non-public public opinion.

Investigations prove that here we have to do with opinion blocs which are not congruent with the existing institutional political structure. The adherence to some organization (The League of Communists, The Socialist Alliance, The Youths' Alliance, The League of Veterans) does not include the adherence to the opinion bloc. The opinion polarization takes place on the basis of a dissimilar relation toward socialism, different values and ideas, conservatism and democratism, on the basis of different relation toward national sovereignty, centralism, etatism, pluralism and similar criteria. The process of differentiation is reaching up to the top of political decision-making and appears in the League of Communists as well as in state organs. It is not possible either to speak only of polarization into two opposite blocs (progressive and conservative) though the majority public opinion is shaped on the basis of »progressive« values.

11. The public opinion in a self-governing society is expressed first of all through the institutionalized mechanism of self-government in the sphere of social work as well as through self-governing and political institutions — as far as these are organized in a way to enable articulating and crystallizing of the will of the people. Public opinion as always broader than any self-governing mechanism and thus it remains a non-institutional political force of the self-governing public, a critical voice of society, capable of expressing its disagreement and able to suggest better solutions. Only in this way the public opinion will remain the instrument of autonomous, critical, reasoning self-governing public.



# I.

## Socialism

## and Direct Democracy

*Round table discussion. The discussion was conducted by: Najdan Pašić, **Socijalizam**, Belgrade, Detlev Claussen, **Neue Kritik**, Frankfurt, Irena Dubska, **Sociologicky časopis**, Prague, France Hočevar, **Teorija in praksa**, Ljubljana, Ion Mitran, **Revista de Filozofia**, Bucharest.*

N. PAŠIĆ, BEOGRAD:

*Dear colleagues, comrades and friends,*

*in accordance with our agreement yesterday I have got the pleasant and responsible task to preside our first round table, devoted to the discussion about direct democracy. Already yesterday we had talks with comrades who had come to Ljubljana and we discussed the proposed working-rules, the proposed way of work, and after a live, democratic discussion, promising also for the future, we agreed with what had been proposed: this meeting will operate so that three round tables will be organized; the first round table — today — is devoted to the problem of direct democracy; at the second round table, tomorrow, we shall discuss the problem of the socialist political system; and the third round table is planned for the discussion of the problem of the role of political parties in the building of socialist society. We also came to an agreement as regards the way in which our discussion is to be conducted, so as to make possible necessary discipline and maximum freedom of discussion, and a live, interesting dialogue. That is why we had to limit the time for each speaker to 15 minutes, especially since everybody can apply for word for a second time after the list of those who have applied for the first time has been exhausted. On the behalf of the elected presidency I would like to promise to you — though not like Churchill to the British people »only sweat, blood and tears« — our firm determination to be strict in executing your will as expressed in this working-rules and in our agreement of yesterday, regarding the way and atmosphere in which this Colloquium is to be conducted to yield the best results. I am absolutely convinced that we all desire that this Colloquium succeed, that we all desire an open, sincere and tolerant discussion, and for this very reason I also think that the duty of presiding will not be hard. Since all the comrades were not present at yesterday's meeting, be-*

cause they were not in Ljubljana, I would like — before passing to the discussion about the first theme — put the question, if anybody has any comments to the proposed working-rules and manner of work of this meeting. Am I to understand your silence as an expression of agreement with the working-rules and everything we said yesterday?

Dear comrades now we could proceed to the discussion about the first theme. I will say a few introductory words, not wanting to repeat what I say in my paper and what some other comrades say in their papers. These contributions are scarce, still we have not had the opportunity to investigate them more closely. That is why I am going to limit myself to a few considerations and suggestions concerning those questions upon which our discussion should concentrate according to my opinion.

The discussion to take place today and in the following two days is at the same time facilitated and rendered more difficult by a characteristic fact. In the contemporary world and in the contemporary transitional age there come to a prominent expression the pressures, aspirations and demands of the masses for broader forms of cooperation in management of social affairs and for political decision-making, for a wider democratization of political systems. On the other side the crisis of the classic, political-representative institutions is open at a wide range. Marx's and marxist criticism of the political-representative system of democracy has thus been historically proved; still this criticism has not been sufficiently thought about to create a developed, rounded-off theory of socialist democracy and a form of the democratic organization of political power in socialist countries. That is why the question — as has always been put by the enemies of socialism — is still asked today in the world, namely the question whether socialism is compatible with democracy at all.

I think that all the peripeteia of the development, all the commotions of the development of socialism in individual countries, furnish more and more elements, on the basis of which a few theoretical generalizations can be made and an advanced view given of the fundamental tendencies and fundamental characteristics of the development of political relation in the states building socialism and of the problems of the development of socialist democracy in general.

Speaking about the theme to be discussed today, about direct democracy and socialism, I think that we could begin with the following hypothesis: **socialism and direct democracy are inseparably connected with the very essence of the socialist transformation of society.**



*I think that this fundamental hypothesis can hardly be contradicted, if we agree about the understanding of socialism and the understanding of democracy. If we understand socialism in that historic and humanist sense as was developed by Marx, as we understand it, as a process of social liberation of labour and of working man, as a system in which the united people directly control the social circumstances of their existence, and if — on the other side — we understand democracy itself and measure it above all by the level of real influence of the plain people upon the conditions of their existence in narrower and broader units, that is as the abolition of those forms of the organization of political power which make it possible for the political power to become bureaucratized and independent as a supersocial power. Thus socialism is directly connected with the development and realization of direct democracy.*

*Today the fundamental preconditions of representative democracy have become questionable because of the social development itself. In a world in which the process of an objective, technological collectivization of the means of production is taking place, in which the private capitalist monopoly in the management of production and in decisions about distributions is revolutionary abolished, or gradually vanishing, the institutions of political-representative democracy are less and less capable to prevent the process of the bureaucratization of political life, to prevent the concentration of political power at the top of the state and party organs. On the contrary, these institutions themselves get bureaucratized — political parties get bureaucratized, parliaments get bureaucratized, while the true power moves to the very top of the executive organs of political parties and of the state apparatus. At the same time, as a reaction to this, there comes into being in the whole world a wide-spread movement of pressure and demands that the old forms of democratic cooperation of the people in management of social affairs be renewed, or new forms be created, that various forms of participation of the working people in the management of enterprises and other spheres of social life be created, that organized interest groups cooperate directly in taking decisions about social plans and about other problems concerning social life and the development of narrower and broader social communities. Within the 100 years the working class has created spontaneously new forms of direct democracy in all the revolutionary positions and in all the positions when it could decide. This was the case in Paris Commune which Marx analysed from this very point of view, and this was the case in all other critical revolutionary periods passed*

by the contemporary society within the last 100 years. Thus the question how the new, changed position of common labour which has been made possible by socialism, or which should be made possible by socialism, is to be expressed as directly as possible also in the broader social sphere, in the organization of the process of political decision making, is becoming the fundamental question of democracy.

It is taken for granted that the democratic participation in political decision making cannot and must not be limited to individual enterprises and to the local level of the organization of authorities. On the contrary, it must mean a unique global system of management in social services and in social matters. The problems of such a transformation of the political system on the basis of self-government have not been treated yet theoretically and appropriately; that is we have not got a developed theory of socialist democracy yet.

It seems that theoretical marxist thought is still stretched in a way between two tendencies, which are both one-sided in essence. On the one side there is the tendency to understand direct democracy as a mere addition to the system of the representative political institutions; and on the other side, the tendency that direct socialist democracy and democracy in socialism in general be equalized with the original forms of the organization of political power as manifest in the states where the capitalist social system has been broken down, and especially in the states where this system was broken revolutionary.

The first tendency is characteristic of the developed capitalist states. In states with a developed tradition of parliamentary democracy, the labour movement, and labour and other progressive parties have inherited the progressive acquisitions of the former democratic development of society in the new circumstances. But there exists the danger that this acceptance of the institutions of representative democracy is understood in a one-sided, narrow way; since it has its progressive significance and its real basis **only** if it is connected with the development of a more direct co-operation of the masses in management of social affairs, that is, if it is invigorated by local self-government and by various forms of co-operation in the management in enterprises, by the freedom of expression and of organization of various social interests which meet directly and solve the conflicting interests in direct democratic confrontation. A tendency is namely apparent to view the problems of the development of socialist democracy through the narrow prism of the political-representative role of the political parties themselves. Even though the role of labour parties in the struggle for socialist democ-

racy is very important, it would be rather one-sided to measure socialist democracy by this one criterion. If we understand the struggle for socialist democracy merely as a struggle for preservation and defence of the existent institutions of representative-political democracy, then there exists a danger that parties and movements holding this opinion come — in certain situations — in conflict with some democratic aspirations and tendencies of the masses, who are not satisfied with the level of their co-operation and with their possibilities of influence within the framework of such a representative system, who feel excluded or insufficiently engaged in taking decisions regarding their life conditions.

On the other side there appears in socialist countries a tendency towards an apologetic relations to those forms of organization of political power which were created in the revolution or immediately after it. In revolutionary situations the working class and the socialist social forces need a strong, centralized state power as a strong and efficient instrument for the exchange of social relations. Thus there appears a contact, characteristic of the revolution, between the new forms of direct co-operation of the masses in political life, a co-operation much broader than has ever been possible before, and a simultaneous great concentration and centralization of political power at the top of the state and party apparatus. This coexistence of direct democracy and strong centralization of power cannot last for ever. The concentration of political power is justified only if it serves such an exchange of social relations which will make it possible for the working people to become the main subjects of social life, that is if it opens the way for direct democracy. But there appears a tendency to understand certain principles of the organization of power which came into being in this period as permanent and essential characteristics of social democracy. The principle of the uniformity of power and the principle of political monolithism are understood in this sense. There appear contradictions between bourgeois democracy and socialist democracy; which do not reveal the true essence of the problem but rather take the discussion about these problems into a wrong direction. Bourgeois democracy is namely equalized with the distribution of power and pluralism, while socialist democracy is equalized with uniformity of power and political monolithism. The dilemma put in this way is essentially wrong and hides the real essence of the thing. As long as a society is heterogeneous, as long as the division of work itself conditions various positions of individual social groups, and layers inside the working class itself and in a broader society, so long there can be no direct democ-

racy, no direct co-operation in political decision making without a certain form of pluralism. We are not encountering the question — yes or not pluralism or monolithism, but the question: what kind of pluralism, and what is its real political content. Pluralism of political parties and other organizations in the struggle for political power is one thing, and pluralism of expressions of social interests in the process of direct democratical decision making regarding social affairs quite another thing. This second kind is — in my view — beyond doubt characteristic of the democratic socialist system. This is one of the questions which merits all the attention in our discussion: the question about the form, the content and the ways of expression of pluralism in a society organized in accordance with the principle of socialist democracy.

The second question worth our attention is the relation between the political-representative institutions and direct democracy. In its essence political-representative democracy is still a form of fixation of the division in the rulers and the ruled. At best this is democracy based upon the consent of the ruled. On the contrary, socialist democracy represent a historic form of surpassing the independent political representation, of abolition of the division into the rulers and the ruled. Our discussion should also touch upon the concrete relation between these two historic and logical kinds of democracy; in what way a certain historic synthesis is connected and developed, which must mean the progress of democracy in the sense of a permanent strengthening of the direct democratic co-operation of the masses in political decision making.

The third question which also belongs into the framework of this theme is the question of surpassing of direct democracy into a global system of political decision making. Also in those countries where direct democracy has made the greatest development, low democracy has in a way been preserved, that is the real influence of youth is to be felt mostly at the level of enterprises and at the level of local communities. Their influence is much smaller — if it exists at all — in the centres of political decision making of a broader social community. A characteristic contradiction appears, the contradiction between the wide possibilities (coming into existence above all with the development of self-government) of a free expression of various interests, of an expression of various social demands and aspirations, and the possibilities of changing these democratic initiatives into efficient political action, leading to a concrete solution of political questions. If direct democracy remains limited to the local level, if it remains low, then there arises a danger that

*direct democracy is a mere curtain hiding untouched monolithism of political decision taking on the part of the state and party top. For this very reason the question regarding the ways which direct democracy is to take to grow into a total system of political decision making is a question only to be answered by practice and theory.*

*The fourth question meriting our attention is the question how to bring in accordance the direct, democratic process of political decision making and to realize effectively the long-term policy of the planned development of society. Socialism cannot be imagined without the conscious directing of social movement, without a certain programme of social development. The direct democratic deciding means above all the decisions of citizens and of working people regarding the concrete questions in which they are guided by their direct interests. It is quite possible that individual decisions taken in this way — small decisions and also important ones — will be in contradiction with the long-term policy as accepted and proclaimed beforehand. How is the direct democratic decision making regarding individual, concrete questions of social development to be brought into accordance with the total policy and its consequent and efficient realization? What role is to be played in this by the political organizations, political parties, and by other forms of the political organization of the masses, as for instance various forms of national fronts, generally national political organizations and similar, which have emerged and got established in socialist countries? This is a question which belongs to our discussion of the third day, still I think this is one of those questions which cannot be avoided today either in the discussion about the problems of direct democracy.*

*These are a few questions which — I think — should be given our attention in today's discussion. As you can see there is much room for the discussion and I hope that this will make a fertile exchange of opinions possible. Thank you!*

W. HAUG, BERLIN:

I would like to put only one question: as I have understood you proceed on two assumptions, the will of the masses for greater participation, and the crisis of institutions. My question is: how is it with the will of the masses for greater participation, what do you mean by this? The general position in some countries, taken especially? It is namely possible that one becomes addicted to a certain wishful thinking, that one assumes what one desires and thus sees further possibilities which are really nonexistent.



N. PASIĆ, BELGRADE:

Comrade Haug wanted to express his view regarding the discussed questions to make a better discussion possible. Comrade Haug obviously has his views regarding these questions. That is why it would be most useful for all of us if he at least shortly explains his thought on the problem about which I spoke, about the problem of surplusage of some institutional forms of political-representative democracy and of the pressure of the masses towards new forms of political participation.

W. HAUG, BERLIN:

Everybody proceeds from immediate experience in his domain, and in my case this is West Germany, and West Berlin. A certain movement came into being there which is directed towards democratization, towards the participation of the masses. On the other side there is the experience that the masses are supposedly not prepared for this, it seems to many people that the reason is often to be found in the fact that they are manipulated in such a way that this participation actually does not take place, or takes place in a bad way. We encounter the question: what to do in such a situation? Should we try to clear away the barriers keeping the masses and then expect that the masses will show their will for participation and activate it? Or is the problem how to make the masses interested not only in freeing themselves from the pressure of the institution, in avoiding this pressure, but remaining passive in everything else? I do not know whether the position in socialist countries is also the same, or whether it is actually possible to build on the will to co-operate and to co-govern, existing in such an extent in society as to provide the material possibility for the realization of self-government. Our situation is characterized not only by the independence of the institutions but also by the passivity of the masses. Here we have to do with a mutual influence. The question is how to escape this circle. It is not possible to assume that the masses will come, if only the barriers are removed. The question is: how to move them to express their will for participation; since we always have to do only with individual small groups expressing this request on behalf of the masses — but really isolated from them.



M. SPINELLA, MILAN:

I am Mario Spinella from the Italian communist review *Rinascita*. I would like to answer the questions put by our comrade, since in Italy we have rich experiences in the field of mass movements and recently, that is in the course of the last two years, we have also experienced the tendency towards direct democracy in these struggles. It is important that we can say that this tendency towards direct democracy has emerged spontaneously in a movement in a highly developed society, as is Italian society, in which the communist party is strong and in which severe combats have taken place recently; these struggles were not directed towards direct democracy until two years ago. But now these demands have been spontaneously established. They first got established in student movements and immediately afterwards they got connected with mass movements in factories. It is typical that the working class put the question of direct management in Italy in 1968, in mass struggles in Valdagno, in textile industry in Mestre, in the chemical factory in Piza, in bottle factories, etc. These struggles have resulted in the demand of the Italian labour movement (formulated for the first time in history this demand got established also at the 12th congress of the Italian Communist Party) for the assemblies of workers in factories as officially recognized bodies which can discuss all the questions concerning the life in a factory, not only the problems of trade-unions and of wages, etc, but also all the vital problems of the factory, including the problems of production.

I am going to give you an example. In the factory Pirelli, which is the largest chemical factory in Italy, the workers organized a strike in which they worked with half of their production speed. They did not succeed in establishing their demands, but they attained something else — they established workers' assemblies. It was proved that the question of direct democracy is a question of the masses — since it moves the working class and millions of students. This is an urgent problem in some capitalist countries. We can put the question: why is it more urgent in some places and less urgent in other places? In Italy I think that this tendency could get established because of a favourable position resulting from the existence of a strong labour movement which always stood for a mass struggle. Thank you.

(unauthorized discussion)

## A. TANASE, BUCHAREST:

The problem we are discussing here is certainly very important and topical. The problem of direct democracy which we are discussing today is for me a problem of the relation between democracy and creativity of the masses. I do not conceive the masses as an antithesis to the creative spirit or as the uncritical masses, I rather conceive them as the masses of emerging personalities at various levels, still they are personalities. Some very important elements come in consideration here and I would like to call your attention to them. For instance: one element of the problem we are discussing here is the international problem. The democratic life of individual countries — we all agree about this — is not a result of compromises and diplomatic agreements of foreign forces, of international agreements, it is rather an exclusive result of the development of internal forces, of the width and depth of the activity of these forces for the strengthening and the development of democratic life both in direct forms and within the framework of the organized, institutionalized system. The first and the second, the institutionalized and the direct, are two poles of an inseparable, uniform process of democratization.

In connection with direct democracy I feel that its necessity does not proceed from the negative factor only, for instance the tendency towards the bureaucratic self-alienation of the state organs, as it might be understood from some contributions to this symposium. This problem is closely connected with the essence of socialist democracy itself which must ensure unlimited possibilities of the expression of the creative energy of the people. In this we see the dialectical unity of the two poles of socialist democracy. I also do not believe that the bureaucratic tendencies — which I do not underestimate — are a kind of organic fatality, historic fatality, objective fatality, which of necessity demands direct democracy. I am repeating: the forms of direct democracy proceed from the essence of socialist democracy itself. They are organically connected with the representative and institutionalized forms of democracy. With your kind permission I will use a Rumanian example as an illustration. It has become a daily practice that all the categories of workers have consultations regarding the development ways of our society, or the scientific foundations of the policy of our economic or cultural development, or the establishment of the new and the progressive in our social thought and work. For instance: the main documents of the national conference of our party, the proposals for the reorganization of districts

and of communal centres, the recent law concerning the school system, and even the basic legal documents (as for instance the Criminal Code, or the Law Concerning the Organization and Management of the District Committees) were subject to wide public discussion, and were accordingly improved on the basis of the proposals and tendencies which came to expression in these public debates. In this connection I find of special significance the manner in which we use social communities, relying in a similar extent upon profound studies and scientifically proved facts and upon the organized cooperation of the large masses of citizens. I shall use as an example a problem which is of essential importance for the operating and progress of the socialist system. The way of distribution which is not carried out automatically, in accordance with the principles of socialism, just because we have socialist productive relations. In the establishment of the socialist principles of distribution various anomalies, disproportions and distortions can arise. At present a new system of rewards is being established in Roumania on the basis of the experiences attained so far, and in accordance with the results of these experiences; the fundamental purpose of this system is to bring in accordance and to simplify the general and the individual interests by means of an organic connection between income and the concrete contribution of each person in economic, social and cultural activities. Not going into details of this problem which would divert us from the main theme of this symposium, we must still say that the way in which we have solved this question reveals a certain element of direct socialist democracy — offering a possibility to the people to co-operate in the management of the state, in the preparation and the realization of its policy — and also an element of socialist humanism: the noble humanist ideas about social justice and equality, which get established in the permanent improvement of the new system of the social relations, the highest measure of the evaluation of man and of his work being his actual contribution to society. I have given this example to lay emphasis upon my opinion that direct democracy is a necessary, absolutely necessary, still not the only element of socialist democracy.

M. BÜNING, FRANKFURT:

I would like to put a question to the speaker. He spoke about the activity of the party in Yugoslavia; at the same time we could see that a kind of mobilization against a potential foreign »friend« took place in Yugoslavia recently. I would

like to know: in what relation is this kind of mobilization of the masses to direct democracy of the masses about which this speaker spoke?

#### PRESIDENCY'S REMARK

This speaker comes from Roumania and he spoke about the experiences from his country.

#### M. BÜNING, FRANKFURT:

I am sorry, I see that I did not notice that the previous speaker came from Roumania. Still, I think that this kind of question is important for all countries, for all socialist countries.

#### A. TANASE, BUCHAREST:

It is hard to answer in a few words, but I shall try to use an example: the law which concerns one of the essential fields of social life is, for instance, the law concerning the people's committees, and the reorganization of these committees. People's committees are a representative organ of the state. Still, the preparation of this law establishing new organs and determining the way of their operating was a subject to a wide public discussion. To prepare the draft for such a law and to submit it for discussion to all the people, to accept several proposals regarding the contents of this law and the democratic competence of people's committees — these represent direct democratization. Such a law was passed in Roumania. I am repeating, people's committees are organs of representative democracy, but the cooperation of all the people to make them better, more developed and real democratic organs — this is a question of direct democracy. Thus in every case (and I could give you other similar examples) the forms of direct democracy concerning the improvement of social, political and other structures and the forms of representative democracy are brought into harmony, unified and connected. In my view this reveals two typical aspects: we are not concerned with the fact whether there exists one or several models of socialism, since these models do exist, they are real. The question is whether these models which are different from the traditional models are legitimate or not. Some comrades have doubts about this. That is why a new element appears; the

interpretation of these models. Are they legitimate, or do they represent a distortion of the fundamental principles of socialism and internationalism? Everybody judging in this way is mistaken. We must first clear up the problem how to understand the idea of models.

According to me there exist three possible explanations of the idea of the models of socialism. The first explanation: a model of socialism which is generally valid and synthesized, if you want, the essence of the experiences of all socialist countries; this is a purely theoretical model, unavoidably abstract and as such cannot be applied. It represents a treasury of general ideas, which can become applicable only in a concrete historic perspective. The second explanation concerns again a theoretical model which is not international but rather national and proceeds from one sole country, or a group of countries. This is a more concrete model, but it remains on a national level deriving from the national experience of socialism. I would like to call your attention to the fact that this very model of socialism is today considered to be the only valid model, and this means that a theoretical, national model of socialism is arbitrarily conceived to be a uniform, international model. And finally the third explanation: an operational model of socialism including all the social structures and superstructures (economic, democratic, national), particular to any country and from which there arise the concrete forms of the solutions of all problems relating to the development, organization, management, and improvement of social life. This model is not theoretical but practical; it is the only model which can be used by everybody who has attained a certain experience in the building and development of socialism.

#### A. BIBIČ, LJUBLJANA:

We have already spoken here about the essence of direct democracy. The question has been put whether direct democracy is only that kind of participation which takes place outside institutions in a physically direct manner. I think that the direct, physical participation — which has a historic tradition since it can refer to the authority of ancient democracy — is a very important form of direct democracy; still, at the same time we must emphasize that this is not the only form of direct democracy. In my view, we must not speak about direct democracy as the opposite of institutions. The problem of direct democracy does not arise outside institutions only, it rather arises above all regarding the institu-



tions themselves, on the one side regarding the amount of directness penetrating into these institutions, while on the other the problem is that inside their structures such relations are established as to enable the foundations of the institution to influence in some way the functioning of the entire institution. I think that direct democracy is not only the physical directness of individuals in decision-making — even though this is its utmost limit towards which we should struggle — but also the structural integration of interests into an institution, their presence in the institution and with it limitation and surpassing of the pure political principle. In Yugoslavia we have certain political forms, which are only at the beginning, still we have already some experience with them — I expect those sociologists and political scientists who have these data will illustrate this assertion of mine — such forms which make wider participation possible because they proceed from this very principle of directness. This is so not only because the direct democratic forms in the ancient sense are present in a larger extent but also because, and above all because, the interests of larger social groups, as for instance, the interests of culture, of health policy, etc, are included in the very structure of the political system itself. This certainly means a greater possibility of participation, even though in this ambient of democratic structures there arise special problems which I am going to discuss tomorrow.

#### D. CLAUSSEN, FRANKFURT:

I am sorry that I cannot discuss on the basis of a preprepared theoretical contribution, which would be really necessary here, but I would still like to call your attention to a few aspects in this discussion. I think that with the last contributions to the discussion we have come to the central question, namely to the question of the actual relation between direct democracy and the valid institutions. The decisive question concerns the legitimacy of traditional institutions, which has not been discussed by anybody. I think that we should examine it in which extent the traditional institutions are legitimate, both in socialist countries and in capitalist countries in which we live. By means of a historic analysis we should distinguish — this, of course, cannot be done here — the specific differences between the political strategy as led in West Germany and the strategy which should be developed in accordance with the analysis of society in socialist countries. The question of the existence of a seeming parallelism of a widespread apolitical state of the masses in socialist countries and in capitalist countries, as touched upon



by our colleague from West Berlin, is an important question for us. Attention should be certainly called also to the specific difference. With us, in capitalist countries, it is necessary to practice resistance measures against a developed »strategy of contrarevolution«. The interests of the masses must be represented in a certain way — and this is our difficult position — exemplary by the student movement; this movement must try to attract the large masses and get them involved in the struggle by means of a strategy of explanation of action. This presents for us decisive problems, thus for instance it brings us in conflict with the revisionist Communist Party of Germany since we no longer can and also do not want to politize the masses through the parliamentary system, because we believe that political power cannot be attained through parliamentary ways. That is why we have come to the opinion — and I think that it can be also theoretically derived from the analysis of the position of latecapitalist countries — that, due to the modification of the capitalist system on the basis of the capitalist way of production, we are in such a historical phase, a new phase, that the concepts as relatively little explained by Marx and Engels, and represented only in their historical philosophical dimension, as for instance in *German Ideology*, represent a central problem for us; so for instance the concept of communism as the production of the forms of mutual relations, the concept of communism in concrete practice against an authoritative state.

May I add just a few short sentences about the circumstances in socialist countries: it is a question what the relation between a legislative organ and the masses should be like, the masses from which the legitimacy of these legislative organs derives. The changed relation between the party and the masses should be investigated by means of a historical analysis, if there has come to exist a position when the fundamental problem is no longer how to preserve the party as a movement — as we could read in some papers yesterday — but rather how to create a movement, and how to abolish the principle of representation and the organizations based upon principles of elites, and how to reach actually a new development of practice. This will be very hard since the established communist parties will certainly make every effort to destroy the organizations outside these parties, left organizational forms and explicitly revolutionary organizational forms in socialist countries in order to keep their leading role in society. This phenomenon should really be determined tomorrow by a historical analysis in order to establish the relationship of the dictatorship of the proletariat to the masses in this historic period.

#### M. JODL, PRAGUE:

I would like to put three questions to comrade Claussen from Frankfurt. Please, do not consider my questions to be a provocation. My first question is: what are the masses? How does comrade Claussen use this concept and can he define it and make it more precise? My second question: Do comrade Claussen and the student movement in West Germany and in West Europe in general feel to be a member of the masses? If this is not the case: can we conclude on this basis that the masses are passive as regards the methods and practice of the student movement, for instance in West Germany? Should this really mean that the masses are practically »immature« and for this reason cannot accept the ideas of students? And my final question: if the student movement and the so-called new left as a whole in West Europe do not consider themselves to be a part of the masses, doesn't there exist a danger that the student movement and the whole new left tend to a political messianism? Thank you.

#### D. CLAUSSEN, FRANKFURT:

I would first like to say a few words about the concept of the masses. I think that it will be very hard for us — and that is why our terminology presents a danger — to furnish a concrete definition of the classes in the Federal Republic Germany. At the time being this is not possible since the inherited theory of classes has become so problematical that we have no concrete analysis of the classes, and also the theoretical definition of the position of students and intellectuals in the class struggle is a part of this. I can only say, or rather state my thought, which cannot be further developed theoretically, that the student movement feels to be a part of the system of dependence upon wages and also the political system as a whole, while on the other hand it sees its own privileges of consciousness, acquired through the process of education, and knows very well that the student movement as the student movement cannot raise the question of power in metropolises. That is why we are in a position in which we have to consider the strategy how to spread the basis and how to change the structure of the student movement so as to finally create a mass movement in West Europe.

I would further like to speak about the problem of the passivity of the masses. In West Germany we are in a specific position since a wide consciousness of apolitical resignation

has spread here because of the destruction of the classic labour movement by Fascism, and because the masses in Germany were subject to an incredible terror, and this consciousness can by no means be overcome by a propaganda for a parliamentary system with a communist party. The isolated position of the student movement results from this resignation, and our agitation is very hard for this reason. The problem of political messianism actually exists, but we are trying to overcome it by our specific, new organizational forms. We try to offer organizational help for self-organization in enterprises and to the people employed in institutions outside universities; this may not take the course as originally imagined, that you simply come and say: »Dear masses we are for you, we shall make a revolution and success will come!« We must be patient and wait that also people outside universities, who have to work in very reactionary institutions, acquire such experiences from political struggles which have brought the student movement to explicitly consider itself a socialist movement, that also these people have these specific experiences through direct action, which must be made into organization afterwards.

The problem of the entire West European student movement remains open; because of its persistence in and its endeavours for direct democracy this movement cannot positively judge what the future organization of society should look like, and cannot indicate any way how to attain the centralization and what the structure of a new society should look like. I think that this results from the nature of this movement as a resistance movement, and that specific forms of organized society can only be created at a higher level, that is why this should not be demanded from us.

M. SPINELLA, MILAN:

I apologize for my applying for word again, but since nobody else has applied for it I am going to use this opportunity.

The questions raised by our West German comrades are of high interest for us from Italy, since also we live in capitalism. I do not find appropriate the way in which our Czech comrades put the questions to our West German comrades since I think that it is too schematic, that it derives from a too general definition of a left movement, of the new left, etc. When using this word we must be very careful. Because the new left in a country like Germany, where there is no organized labour and socialist movement, is something quite different from the new left in any other country, for instance

in Italy, where there exists an organized socialist movement. I think that it is quite clear in both countries that the new left has performed a very positive function within the last few years: it has been very positive in West Germany where it has created new germs of resistance and of the struggle against capitalism; the new left was similarly positive in Italy also, since in a way it encouraged the spontaneous movement of the working class, it gave greater strength to the organized labour struggle at the same time helping with clearing the critical views of the Communist Party.

It was clearly acknowledged at the congress in Bologna that the student movements — also in Italy they are even »more left« than the Communist party itself — performed a positive function, that the students had to preserve their autonomy, that they should not be absorbed by the Communist Party or by other political forces, and that these movements represented a constituent element of a general movement; we call it a historical »bloc« by means of which we want to give the decisive blow to capitalism.

(unauthorized discussion)

#### Č. SADIKOVIĆ, SARAJEVO:

In order to really weigh up and to raise the problem of democracy in socialist society, we must begin at the very *foundations* of the marxist conception of democracy, we must pose the question on the theoretic *basis* of the new society and of political order, which should be the foundation of the entire building and operating of democratic institutions at the same time representing also an instrument to *measure the value* of democracy. Those watching from outside have not been able to establish for a long time what is that cohesive, motive essence around which the development of socialist society takes place, of its political and social institutions, because they are sure that the theory of the class struggle can no longer satisfy a society in which private ownership and the state as an explicit organization of the classes have been abolished in a revolutionary way, that the new society — if it wants to develop on firm foundations — must have an elaborate theoretic basis, which alone can make possible a more sure and equal perspective of movement, which is conscious of directing and planning social progress in general. Today it is becoming more and more clear that — unless we strengthen these profound theoretical foundations of power and democracy in socialist society — we shall not be able to appropriately estimate the *level of already created* in the development of democracy and socialism; in actuality we have

to apply the *criteria* and *measures* of liberal democracy, where everything formal, proclaimed and institutional is of primary importance, while the role and function of democratic, political institutions is of secondary importance.

In accordance with the true marxist criterion, the engagement of fundamental political and democratic institutions in the creation of a humane social atmosphere, in the realization of the true interest of every man, in deeping and enobling *equality*, *liberty* and *integration*, is of primary importance for the evaluation of democracy. Marxist criticism raises objections to the liberal state and democracy because — apart from ideal theoretical definitions and »broadness« — no *essential changes* have been made inside society, no satisfactory results regarding the *living circumstances* of man have been attained, since behind the phrases about liberty there are hidden real social inequality and exploitation. The merit of the marxist political theory lies in the fact that it has clearly shown that distancing of the state from the fundamental currents of social movement does not create freedom, as emphasized by liberalist thinkers, but that it rather makes possible real enslavement, subordination and confiscation of the rights of broadest social layers. The fundamental weakness of liberal democracy lies in the fact that its political institutions are thoroughly *inactive*, *non-engaged* and *uninterested* in making welfare accessible to every man, as it stands in their programmes; in this context the »state-night guard« is one of the fundamental reasons of social inequality, absence of freedom and of disintegration because of this *negative-neutral relation* to society.

The *common interest* as a category which synthesizes, characterizes and expresses the *real welfare of each man* (even independently of his consciousness about the concrete ways of its realization), in the spirit of the most valuable democratic tradition of European political thought, can be the only basis of the order in socialist society, in the name of which we have negated liberal democracy and any other form of true democracy. Here it is easy to see that we have to do with that epochal concept of Marx of the interests of the proletariat — which according to its fundamental structure and content represents the true interest of each man irrespective of the sphere to which he belongs inside bourgeois society, in the time when — after the revolutionary abolition of the state and private property the proletariat can no longer exist as a class. Since it is the realization of welfare of each man that is why the common interest is the *basis*, the *main aim* and *content* of all democratic and political institutions, the *kernel* which shapes democracy, dictates



its breadth the level of political co-operation, and its intensity and rhythm. And the common interest is not only the *fundamental inspiration of power and democracy* in socialist society the fundament of order established among »former enemies«, it is at the same time also the *only true, scientific measure* of the value of democracy. Speaking in concrete terms this means that democracy is at a higher level when — irrespective of the institutional-organizational specific qualities — it more intensely realizes the common interest as the *true interest of each man*, when society in a more sharp rhythm realizes the *general progress*, and when the outlines of Marx's true human community are given a more precise shape; contrarily, democracy is at a lower level of development when its institutions realize this interest in a slow, inappropriate and undecided way, when they *speculate* with political co-operation, when they demand the *approval and consent* of the masses regarding all their actions, and when they know that the masses are objectively *not capable* of this, when they are *not ready to increase* the ability of the people so as to make them able to use appropriately their democratic rights, when under the cover of democracy and general interest they realize primarily their own *particular interest*, and finally, when they direct their action above all towards preserving the social *status quo*.

The principle of common interest as the »soul« of the new order and the criterion of the value of democracy is the only way to separate and limit Marx's »true democracy« from various possible deformations of *power and democracy* in socialist society, no matter whether we have to do with *Stalinism* as etatism in the circumstances of social property of the means of production or with *anarchism*, which is really the opposite of Stalinism, but is still an extreme, and this means that it is not less dangerous from the point of view of socialist democracy, since it is based only on the initiative of society, on the action »from down«, and thus *excludes directing* or an *intervention of subjectivity*, without which a revolutionary change of the existent society cannot be imagined. Only by means of a postulate of the common interest it becomes possible that — according to the system of liberal democracy which is a true perfection at its own level — we build political and democratic institutions which are capable of a *revolutionary transformation* of society, that we limit and separate them from other similar institutions, that we give them their task and indicate their way of performing their functions, and thus avoid any *inadequate use* and *misuse*, which would have very harmful consequences because of their intensified role.



If democracy in socialism is revolutionary, at least with new contents and dimensions of action, then the *negation* of previously introduced and created formal-democratic habits is necessary, since these are created so as to *reflect* bourgeois society in the political sphere irrespective of the existent democratic processes, struggles competitions, rivalry, and enforcement, that the sphere of policy is *animated* by this society, radiating this same relations from its high position. Really democratic democracy represents above all breaking down this *vicious circle* of democracy in bourgeois society, its thoughtless conservative, traditional logic of opposite political and social currents, and this not because of the desires of some direct animators of the new political and democratic institutions, but rather in accordance with the directives dictated by the fundamental inspiration of this order irrespective of the source from where the saving *democratic impulses* in the given moment come, from the »bottom« or from the »top«. If the *continuity of the social revolution* is preserved, and this coincides with the determined struggle for the realization of the common interest, this inevitably brings about a permanent »spread« of democracy, since the authorities — even if they are most ambitious and allinclusive — can never regulate all the social relations, which in this context are more and more varied, rich and complex. And finally, the principle of the common interest is the only way to make *possible maximum* democracy permanently, from the very »take-over« of power and in accordance with the marxist concept of democracy.

#### I. DUBSKA, PRAGUE:

I would also like to call your attention to one problem, not only of the speaker, but of us all. Our colleague from Frankfurt put a very open and real question, namely the question of the activity and mobilization of the masses. Instead of an answer I could ask him a question also: Does he doubt the mobilization of the masses in Czechoslovakia last year? But this is not so important for the fundamental question which I would like to put. In this connection also our experiment could be interpreted as merely a new form of the same phenomenon, which has been mentioned here already, namely a phenomenon of a long-term passivity of the masses and a spontaneous outbreak of activity. Such a phenomenon cannot be established only in well developed countries in West Europe, but also with us, in socialist countries. There is a certain honesty in these phenomena, but there are also very

important differences not only in the way of manipulation but also in the existent basis of institutions. Thus if we try to develop this problem we come to a more general question: Is it possible to develop the perspective of socialist democracy only from the inner relations of socialist countries and from the political sphere — either from the crisis of parliamentary democracy or from the crisis of the so-called bureaucratic political regime? And if we try to formulate this question as the question about the common alternative of the modern consumers' society, then there are very important differences also as regards the level of development of capitalist countries in Europe: it is rather hard to speak theoretically at the same level about the circumstances of the masses in the Federal Republic Germany and in Italy. This is also true of socialist countries: the circumstances in Czechoslovakia differ very much from the circumstances in Bulgaria, and I do not think only of the political circumstances but also of the economic, general civilizational and cultural circumstances. On this basis — which, in my view, is more important than the special question about direct and indirect democracy and their relation — we come to a more philosophical question, upon which all these sub-questions depend, namely the question, not about direct and indirect democracy, but rather: What is subjectivity?

#### Z. ST'ASTNY, BRATISLAVA:

I would like to say a few words about the problems of democracy, of activity and participation, above all in connection with our position in Czechoslovakia. I would like to mention above all the problem of passivity of the masses and the problem of activity and participation of the masses. The experiment of establishing the public opinion made with us gives us objective data for the analysis of this problem. In our political spring — in January, February and March 1968 — after the resignation of the former party and state leader Novotny, 75 % of the respondents participating in our experiment to find out the public opinion believed that what we wanted to introduce was socialism and democracy, and that we wanted to strengthen democracy. When our spring continued in June and July, when the 2000 wellknown words were written, 86 % of the respondents believed that we wanted to introduce socialism and democracy and only 5 % were of the opinion that our movement was directed towards capitalism while 9 % did not know where the movement led. The participation of the masses in politics and in democracy

was immense, still this was not at all a disorganized or anarchical participation, it rather took a certain course. What do our people term socialism and what does this word mean for them? Our people feel that socialism means also a rise in the standard of living, a better planning and a better production in economy, and they also include into this concept political questions, as for instance liberty, and democratic discussion. The politization of the people reached its maximum in March and in April. Political newspapers, TV and radio were in the very centre of the interest of the people. Over 80% of the respondents in our representative pattern stated that the press, TV and radio were expressing their opinion, their own concept of socialism and democracy. Some 50% of the respondents stated that at that time journalists enjoyed a higher esteem than ever before.

Then August 21st came. 95% of our people identified their views with the views of journalists, with their work for radio and television, with their political comments of our way, of our vision of socialism, of the new way of life, and of the new form of democracy. Our people knew in August and in September what should the leading role of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia look like, and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia never lost its leading position. 95% of the respondents feel that its authority is general. We must be sceptical in so far as the percentage over 90% is unreal, since also the people who are content with any concept are included in it. This was proved in September. The general investigation of the public opinion showed that 87% of the respondents thought that socialism was in no danger whatsoever with us, while 8% to 10% felt that socialism with us was in great danger. What kind of people were they? In general this were older people with fundamental education, some of them members of the party. The following were the arguments by which they tried to prove that socialism was threatened with us: 1. the censure was destroyed and it no longer existed, 2. liberty was too wide, and 3. that we criticized a lot not only ourselves but also others, the so-called brotherly socialist states and their policy. In the opinion of these people socialism was not threatened from the internal problems but rather from the outside. In May the percentage of people believing that socialism with us was in danger rose to 30%, thus their number is increasing. 33% of them feel that the reason of danger lies in the internal conservative forces. Only a smaller part was of the opinion that there existed an external danger for socialism. The questionnaire in September showed that the respondents felt that socialism was safe with the government at the top of our state.

Socialism will exist with us only if the leading people will make possible such a participation of the masses and such a democratic way as we had it before. In my opinion this is a clear sign of the reaction in the sociological sense of the word regarding the problem of the participation of the masses and the problem of unformal democracy. Thank you!

#### M. BUNING, FRANKFURT:

I find it a kind of suspicious if the concept of politization is illustrated by the results of the public opinion inquiry.

Figures like 88 % for socialism and 93 % for higher democracy do not tell us anything, if the formulation of the question in these well-known questionnaires is given in advance, and if in his answer the respondent has only the possibility to say yes or not, or at best three alternatives. One can at best say that with these figures — like 88 %, or as far as I go 70 % or any other per cent — an unpleasant feeling comes to expression that in a certain existent social position, for instance in Czechoslovakia, certain manners of behaviour are manifest, bureaucratic manners of behaviour and similar, that have a deforming effect not only upon the individuals but also upon the collective development of their possibilities; if it was stated that this politization was at a higher level at a certain moment, and if this is proved by certain figures of the public opinion inquiry, then I consider it to be a wrong concept of politization. Here we are finally not concerned with the fact that certain masses have a rather vague attitude to certain questions, which are then finally solved for them by some institutions of parties. In the process of politization we are concerned with a process in the course of which the participating masses become aware of their needs — I cannot express this in a more clear way, I can only say their needs. I can try to illustrate this by an example from the West German student movement.

In the struggle against the laws on emergency state, which was based upon a rather abstract liberal consciousness, an extremely high degree of politization, in the sense as mentioned above, could be established at universities. But in the same extent in which the struggle against the law on emergency state was ended by a defeat, this was probably necessary, there began a process which polarized anew this pseudo-politization. This is a process in which — our experiences of the last term at West German universities show this — only in the struggle for self-organization, not only in the simple advocating the abstract or empirically established

interests, like planning, better research, higher scholarships and similar interests, but in the very self-organization in this term, in an increasing extent and with a growing part of students, in hard struggles and in the split of the movement itself, there emerged needs, which I can only vaguely evaluate as direct needs. And the problem you mentioned before, namely the problem of subjectivity is connected with this. I think that we can concretely define this here by asking the people present about their practical interests in this Colloquium; this means that we establish the concrete interest of the participants, apart from their interest to publish the results attained here. In what connection with the masses, in what connection with a certain movement — no matter whether it be an abstract-democratic or socialist movement — have the present individuals come here, what do they expect to learn or to hear here of importance, what they practically do in their position and not as individuals.

#### J. HYSEK, PRAGUE:

The economy and the social aspect of democracy in production, and above all in industrial enterprises, are my special field. Now I would like to disclose my thoughts on some more general questions which we are discussing at this Colloquium.

The first question: How can we prove the statement that there exists a general tendency towards direct democracy, towards greater participation, or even towards some forms of self-government in the world? I think that we must openly admit that this assertion is a hypothetical, theoretical construction, a logical continuation of the belief that we are at the beginning of a new age of reason, the age of rationality. In the sphere of participation there exist some signs which can confirm this belief. We can, for instance, refer to the experiences of the so-called Autonomous Collectives, established by the Tavistock Institute, London, and similarly also to the experiences of some socialist countries. As regards practical proofs in this field we must say with Shakespeare: »that is the question«. Still, it is not only our right but even our duty to be optimistic as regards this.

The second question is the relation between direct democracy and various institutions. I think that in the contemporary technical society we cannot master the complicated tasks raised by the economic, social, and political life otherwise but by means of certain institutions. The idea that we could live without institutions is completely utopian. This would bring us to a complete destruction. As a matter of fact,



this question should be posed in a different way: which institutions, how are they to operate, which internal and external conditions will make it possible that they work appropriately, how to fight the permanent danger of bureaucratization, etc. We are sure that the key to those institutions which will not govern the people but rather serve them is to be found in the development of non-formal democracy. We must not only ensure a full right that the people elect their representatives in these institutions, we must also give them the right to control their representatives in all their activities; we must try to establish a continuous exchange of information between the representatives of collectives and the members of these collectives. I hope that later I shall have a chance to explain how these demands are to be realized in the field of self-management in industrial enterprises.

#### V. STANOVIĆ, BELGRADE:

Already when discussing the list of agenda of this Colloquium some comrades expressed their reservations as regards the proposal that also the problem of direct democracy be included in the list of agenda. That is why I would like to emphasize a few facts which persuade us that the question of direct democracy must not be avoided when we investigate the problems of socialism and democracy. Even the form of representative democracy is considered to be democratic only because in the process of elections there participate voters, that is, relatively broad social groups.

The term direct democracy is used in various senses. Some people use the concept of direct democracy to mean only some democratic movements — the so-called mass movements. Others emphasize democratic institutions in which direct decision-making and co-operation take place, thus they mean regular channels which make co-operation possible for citizens, voters, and members of various professional groups. In my view the concept of direct democracy should include both elements, that is movements and institutions, since if we leave out the first or the second element, the concept of direct democracy is made poor, and at the same time the most fundamental, daily use of the word democracy is offended. It is easy to notice that the term democracy, or rather a democratic movement, is used for both some spontaneous movements of the masses and for the democratic, programmatic demands of organizations and similar.

In every mass movement, as well as in the institutions of direct democracy there arise certain problems, difficulties,

obstacles contradictions and even paradoxical situations with the realization of »direct democracy«. I am not going to go into details, but I think that everybody knows that on the one side we encounter technical difficulties while on the other we have to struggle against political resistance.

Irrespective of society we are concerned with, political resistance is offered above all by those groups which have already obtained a monopoly of political decision-making or a dominant influence. Technical troubles proceed above all from complexities of life in the contemporary society, and from the fact that all questions simply cannot be discussed in a direct democratic way. The fundamental means and forms of concepts and attempts to realize direct democracy have their own limits. Let us begin with the *general meeting*, the meeting of all the citizens, voters, members of a movement and similar — this form can no longer be used in a broader community. Because of technical problems and difficulties this fundamental and most important means can no longer be used today in more general circumstances, as it was used some time ago. In closer local and working communities we can still use this means. We further have the institution of *referendum*, as we have seen it is advocated by many colleagues in their papers, so much so, that they express several critical comments why this institution is not used more often in global society. Still, it is a matter of general knowledge that those who formulate the question for a referendum — usually a narrow circle of people, political elite, of a specialized body — can essentially prejudicate the result of the referendum by the very way in which they put the question, and thus they can use the referendum as a means of manipulating the masses, as a democratic facade for undemocratic aims and ways. The political history from the Roman times onwards abounds with examples of misuse of referendum, or rather plebiscite. In the years following the Revolution in France the transfer of power to narrow groups and finally to Napoleon took place by means of plebiscites and referendums; thus in a few years several plebiscites and referendums took place, each of them representing fundamentally a further step towards the non-democratic form of the political order at a mass support of rather wide layers. (So for instance: »direct people's voting confirmed the Constitution from 1795 establishing the power of a director, the Constitution from 1799 which gave all the executive power to three consuls, elected for a period of 10 years, the Constitution from 1802 proclaimed Napoleon a consul for his life-time, and the Constitution from 1804 which established the empire. In a similar way the regime of Napoleon III from 1852 to 1870

was confirmed four times by plebiscites.) In my view the referendum and plebiscite are used in a similar way today by De Gaulle in France.

Also the institution of *people's initiative* has its boundaries, if there are really many proposals then those on power make selection which proposal is to be publicly discussed, and this in turn means again a subjective choosing. Even direct elections, also being a form of direct co-operation of citizens-voters in democratic processes, are always limited in a way.

Let me end: when speaking about movements, various groups, exercising pressure upon the public opinion, about activities through the press and other mass communication media, we are fully justified to speak also in these cases about the direct co-operation in political life of these groups and layers. As regards the question which has often been asked: »Are the masses really interested in co-operation?«, I think it is quite obvious if we have a look at statistics that in a certain number of individual cases the people are not interested in co-operation, while in other historic situations — for which it is superfluous to give figures and proofs — the masses were very much interested. I think that in this connection an important question should be raised from the point of view of the democratic theory and practice, namely the question about the institutional channels and about the possibilities of the broad masses, citizens, and producers to influence in various ways, and to co-operate in those moments when they see that their interests are threatened, or when they want to influence the solution of a certain social problem. That is why I think that, even though the real, active co-operation only occurs some times, it is important that this co-operation is made possible by certain institutions.

The second reason why the masses do not like and do not always co-operate with enthusiasm is to be found in the fact that where the masses can be included in the process of decision-taking — that is usually at the level of local communities and working organizations — no decisions are taken about the essential things for the life of broader communities and these people themselves. Important decisions are taken at broader social-political communities and the forms of direct democracy are unsuitable in the process of decision-making about important questions. What is often offered to the masses is not a real possibility to decide upon the vital questions of their social life. Not having the possibility to co-operate in decision-making regarding the important questions, the people refuse the co-operation in decision-making regarding the questions of secondary importance.

As regards the relation between movements and institutions, today we very often encounter in some movements statements, declarations, and struggle against any institutionalism. Political history on the other hand shows that non-institutionalized movements represent really only the first phase of every movement. Let us remember only Christianity — it began as a non-institutional, religious mass movement and grew into a very rigid institution of the Church. Or the evolution of the movement of the British Trade-Unions — from chartism, a spontaneous and mass non-institutional movement, to the contemporary trade-unions, which are established and in a conformist way included into the wider context of social institutions. Let us remember that in accordance to the programme declarations of its leaders Fascism began as »a movement against all the parties«, but that immediately after the take-over of power it made its own party into »the state party«. Let us finally remember the communist movement which began with non-formal groups and with an indifferntiated movement, as for instance the »league« of adherents, but at the end, and especially where the communist party had come in power, it grew into a rigid, formalized organization. Next to the fact that each movement grows into institutional forms, at its beginning we encounter one more phenomenon: the charismatic leadership. We encounter it also today in the movement of the new left. If it has any »institutions« today, then they are represented by a certain number of leaders, but we — learning from history — do not want a movement in which personalities would be the only »institutions«, in which the leaders represent the only institutionalized and more or less formed »organizational units«. A considerable danger is finally hidden in this. Let us remember the role of Savonarola, Robespierre, Stalin, Hitler, and of several other leaders who finally institutionalized their charismatic abilities in a social power, in arbitrary and personal power. If we presuppose that every movement will finally get some institutionalized forms, then we would like to know today, in advance, what these forms will be like, which forms will be rejected or criticized by a movement, and which forms will be offered by it. Having experienced the terror of the regime of the so-called mass movements, the contemporary man cannot be satisfied to remain for ever a romantic, spontaneous activity of the masses, where most perfect democracy will be created: mobocracy is not democracy; mobocracy perhaps negates most exclusively everything democracy means and can mean in our contemporary life.

W. HAUG, BERLIN:

I am very grateful to our comrade from *Socijalizam* for raising this topic and introducing new concepts. I think that from what has appeared as a double monologue of two views we can proceed to discussion. I would like to speed the beginning of this discussion.

The theme »socialism and democracy« is perhaps first defined in a too vague way; because socialism and democracy either mean the same thing, or else neither socialism nor democracy means anything. I think that we agree in a considerable extent as regards this. But since this is so synonymous, it is rather hard to give a firm basis to the discussion. With the concepts as proposed now: *institution* on the one side, and *movement* on the other, this may be easier. The institution would thus mean the entire state-social-organizational organization, including also a part of what is meant by the concept of socialism, and a part of what is meant by the concept of democracy. As regards democracy we should perhaps state the rules of participation; also the rules of discussion valid in this room belong to institutions.

I would like to make a few remarks concerning the opposition between the movement nature of socialism and its institutional nature, referring to the comments of our discussion. It seems to me that we must be suspicious of those ways of participation which are limited to public opinion inquiries and elections. Even though the figures given by our comrade from Czechoslovakia may be important and instructive, and even though I myself share the great vision of socialism as entertained enthusiastically by the majority, I still think that we must be very sceptical as regards the meaning of such figures and as regards the political importance of such inquiries about public opinion. The results of these inquiries can mean *acclamation* only; a higher percentage acclaimed a certain regime in a given moment. This is not the content, the content could not be established at all; it remains a mere »opinion«. It remains an opinion which cannot be distinguished from preconception or delusion. It remains, so to say, a control mechanism of the success of propaganda or identification; but all this is not for what our comrade has hoped when stating the figures; namely the content of democracy. — In order to make the concepts of a movement and of an institution even more applicable in discussion we should perhaps introduce considerations of the material content of democracy in our discussion. This is no pleasurable business, since the first aspect is very prosaic, as we all know. Socialist democracy is first of all a question of social wealth.



Social poverty and impotence, domination of want and weakness can hardly be abolished by a democratic constitution; they can be abolished only by a change of the conditions of the material production and reproduction of social life which requires long-term work and much effort in order to accumulate social wealth. That is why, apart from the institutional aspects, another idea must belong to the definition of what can be called socialist democracy: how this process is to take place in those countries which have not reached yet the level at which all these questions are merely technical questions, how industrialization is to be organized in a country which came in socialism at a pre-industrial level? Democracy namely — this is my thesis at least — unless it is to be a mere fictitious enterprise, stands or falls if it manages to solve material problems. Socialists must organize this process: the abolition of want, misery and ignorance, this process and the material basis for the possibility of this abolition. In the view of the group with which I have come here — this perspective must be included into the concept of democracy.

There exists another aspect which is contrary to this one, and also contrary to the aspect of participation. This third aspect means something what we have learned recently under the pressure of the arguments of the student movement in our country. Impulses for this student movement came from far, from Cuba, China, earlier also from Yugoslavia. We have learned that what is usually called the subjective component is not unchangeable; in certain situations it can even be an authority, a power, which turns into the main obstacle of further development, which must accordingly be changed, or rather its change becomes the main demand of the day. We should consider the growth of mutual relations between the forms of participation and the changes of participants. Such considerations could perhaps move the rigid opposition between the comrades from SDS and other participants present at this meeting. Petty bourgeois fug, frozen standards inherited from bourgeois decline are becoming for an increasing number of comrades from the East and West a definite obstacle at their attempt to really carry out socialist democracy.

These comments are not meant to be instruction. They just want to explain why some comrades from West Germany persist in certain aspect in our discussion. The predominant experience for them is what is called Fascist potentiality in West Germany. On the order side we see no Fascist potentiality in socialist countries; this expression would be totally

meaningless here; but we consider it to be one of the gravest mistakes of, for instance, the regime of Novotny that it did not seriously bring in movement the »subjective factors«. That is why the political spring at first could not be anything else but a thawing of a corpse; so little had changed that when ice was thawed suddenly several views became powerful which had never been attacked seriously and thus outlived the time almost unchanged. I suggest that in our discussion we consider also this problem: democracy cannot be simply called freedom, free activity for everything existing at the time; democracy must rather be a kind of freedom setting really free for the first time that what is free now; attacking and socializing the fundamental structures of behaviour and of organization, from the personal to the social life, and for the first time developing new socialist forms for them.

Perhaps the comrades from SDS could contribute their experiences and not only compensate for the lack of practicable clearness, or compensate for this lack by rigorism, a kind of mere swearing, having almost pietistical qualities. Instead of this they could contribute experiences which we have got in West Germany in the attempt to make possible a process of learning on the basis, of which — from the family life to sex, from the upbringing of children to professional activities — we try to find such forms in which there would be no split between the policy and the personal, or rather professional existence of individuals.

#### D. CLAUSSEN, FRANKFURT:

In a sense I fully agree with comrade Haug that various undiscussed problems, addressed to the discussion have resulted in the fact that we here advocate certain positions in the form of monologues. This was not at all our purpose, and perhaps this very misunderstanding, as explained by the last but one speaker, for instance about our movement — if these were not conscious misunderstandings — can clear up something. Of course, there exist various difficulties, for instance, if we investigate the dialectics of the reform in Czechoslovakia, we in a certain way speak past the people and also past the direct interests of the people of Czechoslovakia. This is an objective danger and I think that the same thing happens if we speak about our own movement, there exists the danger of speaking past the heads of the participants in this process. In this sense I consider very important what comrade Haug emphasized, namely, that at the begin-

ning of our movement we always spoke about the direct needs and that only within the last two years of the student movement in West Germany it became clear that the structure of the needs of the masses, as well as the structure of our own need was historically changable, and that we could not rely upon a direct expression of the structure of the needs and upon an immediate transformation of the same into a socialist practice. Here we simply forget the process of civilization and the organization of daily bourgeois life in general. I think that these problems concern also socialist countries, that the organization of daily life is still burdened with tradition, of necessity it is burdened today also, and that a possible strategy for the abolition of this tradition of socialization and daily life can only be developed after an analysis, and that only this transformation of daily life can open concrete perspectives for direct democracy. I would first like to say a few informative sentences about the nature of the student movement in West Germany. It is naturally quite clear that the bourgeois mass media, and mass media in general, convey an ideological idea about this movement, that mass media tend to make problems personal, to attribute them to the personal motives of the »leaders«. I think that the leadership structure as it existed in student movement, came into being more or less because of an inflammatory-rhetorical advantage of certain comrades who could formulate the problems at a higher niveau and with a certain degree of abstraction and at the same time a degree of concretion, and naturally all the authoritative fixations produced by an university or in daily life were put on these left leaders. But it was also quite clear, and I think we attempted in the last two years, and simply had to attempt to abolish these structures, and I think that we succeeded in this only through the fact that — due to the *active struggle situation* — an increasing number of comrades had to participate in decision making, and then through the beginning of self-organization, as for instance the self-organization of theoretical work, self-organization in the political-practical sphere as it took place, we could abolish these authoritative leadership structures in a certain way. Of course, this could not be done completely, nobody can do this, and I would like to see a movement which has completely succeeded in this. This does not mean that we must not further struggle to abolish this authoritative leadership structure, from this it follows for us that the processes of political decisions were conducted by all the participants in the great teach-ins, etc. (from its very beginning the student movement proceeded from the

principle that it is an explicit plebiscitary movement). It is taken for granted that speakers with inflammatory and theoretical advantages pre-formulated these decisions. This resulted in the recognition of this theoretical advantage and afterwards such working collectives were organized which led to the self-organization of the theoretical and practical political work.

The second problem concerning socialist countries is that the abolition of Novotny's regime in Czechoslovakia was a necessity — I would like to say a historical necessity. In this connection we need not argue whether this was a counter-revolutionary or a revolutionary fact, or anything else, we must simply see that a certain process of severance from the established form of the structure of decisions was introduced there. On the other side this is connected with the question of mobilization — and this has not cleared up for me from the discussion of the comrades from Czechoslovakia — namely that there existed a wide participation, so to say at the level of formation of opinion, a wide participation and interest in politics, which must remain unpolitical as long as it can become practical. These decisions were naturally conditioned by certain external conditions and also by the threat to Czechoslovakia, and might be different otherwise. It certainly seems dangerous to us that for instance the idea of representative democracy and of bourgeois democracy were presented in a certain, perhaps necessary, naive way. Bound to the ideology of bourgeois democracy, one cannot realize »direct democracy«; one can almost answer to this with Hegel's words, referring it to the masses, »where they are represented they do not exist«. I think that in the real life process of society, in daily life, and in production itself, these problems are cut down technologically so that the masses are mobilized in order to make technology work better. In order to understand the dialectics of the reform, we must analyse the process of liberalization which permitted the necessarily suppressed, ambivalent structures of consciousness, produced through socialist daily life under the post-Stalinist conditions, to come to expression for the first time. In this process of liberalization there may open a dimension of political practice which must be newly discovered. This process can later change and become directed against the group which has led the process of liberalization. This is a process of experiencing and learning in independent political practice, in which the passivity, to which the masses were condemned by the bureaucratic apparatus, is broken for the first time.

I am going to begin with the question of some participant in our discussion: Can this — what we are speaking here — be connected with our theoretical-practical experience? Why have we come to this meeting? What is our major interest? I shall try to furnish a short answer to these questions.

The first and main reason for my presence here is the fact that here we speak theoretically about democracy and socialism. Working in political-theoretical disciplines, we know that democracy is a fundamental theme in political theory. All the contemporary books from the field of political theory treat this central theme. Lecturing on the field of political theory and investigating the same, I am naturally interested in what my comrades have to say about this theme. This is, in short, my theoretical interest in the present meeting.

My second interest is of a more practical nature. I am a member of the board of editors of *Kulturni radnik*. In the course of recent years this newspaper has been trying to work out the theoretical-practical problems of the position and the rôle of the working class in contemporary society, especially in socialist society, and we have paid most attention to Yugoslavia. And since socialism should be a realization of the rule of this class, it is very interesting to think about — from this practical point of view — the theme in what extent the ambition of the working class has been really realized.

Now I shall try to formulate, in short, my response to the previous contributions. In his preliminary contribution, professor Pašić showed that democracy was connected with the very essence of socialism, since in socialism, as he defines it, there is a system conditioning a social existence under the direct control of the masses. That is why socialism wants to abolish political mediation, and emancipation of power as a goal over society, and similar, as shown by professor Pašić. If there exists anything what can be called the political system of socialism, then this definition of his should be the matter of general agreement.

If socialism is *per definitionem* a democratic society, and this a society of such a democracy in which the working masses (not understood in the sense of the manipulations of these masses, but rather in an emphatic sense, in which the working masses mean workers, peasants and intelligentsia, that is all the layers of society) have the rôle of directing the fundamental social processes, that is they decide upon essential social questions. If this is agreed upon, that it is not appropriate, as some people did, to introduce in later discussion abstract considerations on whether democracy is a good



or a distorted picture of government, whether the forms of direct decision making can bring about also bad results and should accordingly not be advocated, and similar. In this same line a few hints have been given in our discussion that a man from the masses perhaps does not even know his real interests. That means that we should in a way whisper in his ears this »real« interest of his. These are very interesting problems belonging to a general discussion on the theme of democracy. Such questions could be raised indefinitely, and we could also ask whether it is permissible to force democracy upon those who do not want it. For instance, if somebody wants to be subordinated to an absolute rule of an emperor, is it permissible that we reject this will of his and that we force upon him something else? All these questions are very interesting, but it seems to me that if we accepted what professor Pašić said preliminary about the essence of socialism, then all these questions would lead us to abstract theoretical discussions, which have not thought about their point of departure, that is have no methodological frame as every discussion should have.

So I for my part would like to begin at the point that socialism is a society which realizes the direct rule of the working masses. This is »direct democracy«, this is what it means. Proceeding from this theoretical assumption, I would like to ask, whether this has been realized in socialism as we know it today as a society. I am asking this question in the name of that practical interest because of which we have been requested to join our theoretical considerations with practical experience, whose judges or witnesses we are.

My answer — and I am not going to use statistics or data in it — would be that socialism has not realized this yet. Including Yugoslav socialism. This is what remains our task. With all the progressive decrees and progressive arrangements which have been proposed or accepted and institutionalized, this has not been realized yet.

Why this has happened in socialism, in socialist countries — this is a long and complicated theme which I cannot exhaust here, and so I am not going to do this. But one of the essential obstacles to the realization of direct socialist democracy, which we are discussing, was and remains the historic fact that the professional, revolutionary, political avant-garde changes into professional, ruling, political elite. Of course, the role of the professional political elite in the global sense cannot be evaluated negatively because of this only; the professional political elite has — in our country for instance — made very

progressive and revolutionary interventions. Since its historical balance includes much positivity, it is quite possible that among us there are people who want to evaluate everything it has done as positive. Also if we agree that the professional political elite has done in essential things everything what represented its historical task, we can ask the following question: Doesn't there exist a danger that this elite is replaced by another elite which will not have these qualities? Or in other words: can socialism, if it really wants to realize itself, permit in historical practice what Pareto has defined theoretically?

From our work for our newspaper we are familiar with several facts which show that workers in our industry and in our industrialized economy do not influence essentially global social decisions, upon which their direct democracy depends in their collectives. Several data also show that the working peasants do not co-operate in many a thing about which they decide, and upon which their fate depends, so for instance about the social insurance in village, about the policy of taxation, etc. Several indicators also show that the working intelligentsia does not decide effectively on many things of its vital interest, even though it decides to a certain extent. This results from the fact that our political system is still not open enough to workers, working peasants and working intellectuals, it is not propulsive enough, for them to find room in this system, to effect themselves social decisions which are of vital importance for them. I think that this is the fundamental question for the analysis of our political practice, the fundamental question worth our thought.

It seems to me that our selfgovernmental system in Yugoslavia — almost two decades have passed since its introduction — by bringing democratic elements has developed a democratic atmosphere, has opened to some extent a democratic game after the administrative-etatist period, and brought about numerous segments and forces which are aware of this fundamental fact and which think how to get rid of a certain crisis situation. It seems to be of special importance for us in Yugoslavia that these segments and these forces come to an agreement as to what would be valuable to suggest, and what are the ways to realize this and to prevent the danger, coming to existence, that our political system make possible the rule of elites and their successive coming to the political stage. This danger can be prevented only if we effect the proclaimed principles of socialism, as explained very accurately by professor Pešić.

Q. HOARE, LONDON:

I have been very surprised in much of discussion this morning at the categories and terms used, and particularly I would like to pick out the use of the term participation. In Britain, at least, participation is what is offered by capitalist class to workers and students and as such is consistently rejected by all revolutionaries quite correctly, or if it is accepted, it is done for tactical reasons only. It seems to me quite clear that what marxists have always demanded is not participation but power, they struggle for power within the productive process, for the direct power of the producers. I think that this discussion in terms of participation and of whether the masses want this participation, is a completely false question. As to what the masses want, I would just like to mention first of all that in Great Britain at least 75% of all strikes are not for wage-rises but for different aspects of control over the process of production, control over the tempo of work or hiring and firing. I think if one looks at the events of May last year in France, it is quite clear that the mass of the French working class was very directly interested in power over their own working situations though of course the low level of their political consciousness and the lack of any adequate revolutionary leadership made it impossible for that power actually to be achieved, except in sporadic and impermanent forms. As far as the socialist countries are concerned, the European socialist countries at any rate, the fact is that in the majority of them there are not even the external forms of direct control of the producers over their own work situations in the productive process.

Yugoslavia is in a rather different category because of the worker's councils, but it seems to me at least that the discussions on it so far has been abstract. It is also true that in Yugoslavia in recent years the introduction of market socialism has been accompanied by a number of very serious problems and phenomena: mass unemployment, the export of labour to the capitalist countries, the considerable inequalities of income, and serious socio-economic dislocation, — for instance factories working under their capacities — created by the decentralization of planning. You can speak to any Yugoslav worker or citizen, and it is quite clear that these problems interest them and interest them directly. And if the Yugoslav workers have not collectively acted to prevent these phenomena, I think that we should ask our Yugoslav comrades why this is so, what does

this mean, and what implication does it have for the present institutions of socialist democracy in Yugoslavia. Clearly, these are problems involved here both of political consciousness and of forms of organization, and so on. I think it would be very useful to have a very concrete discussion about these problems. Also I would personally welcome a discussion of the forms of spontaneous, collective actions which have taken place in Yugoslavia outside the institutional frame work enshrined in the constitution, etc. I am thinking of the students' action in Belgrade and elsewhere last year. We should be able, as comrades gathered together from different countries, to discuss such problems in an atmosphere of frankness and concreteness. Thank you!

#### A. TANASE, BUCHAREST:

With your kind permission I would like to suggest only four theses.

The first thesis: the attitude towards democracy. Parliamentary democracy, similarly to direct democracy, does not end with electoral or plebiscitary democracy but rather concerns all the fields of social life.

The second thesis: institutional democracy which is not based upon direct democracy and which is not in agreement with direct democracy meets with bureaucracy, with non-democracy, with a formal representative system, without the actual cooperation of the interested people.

The third thesis: direct democracy which is against representative, institutional democracy or non-democracy meets with anarchy which is both destructive and anti-democratic. Their unity arises from the correspondence of the scientific criteria of organization and of management of social life with the democratic measures of cooperation and with the humanist principle concerning the only active subject and the only aim of democracy: free man.

The fourth thesis: in all its direct or indirect forms democracy cannot be conceived without the freedom of the individual and of the human community on the one side, and without the system of principles of leading and organization which must be scientifically based and which is in permanent change and improvement, on the other; even romanticism of democratic, revolutionary movements cannot abstract scientific criteria and terms in which all the questions regarding the structure and dynamics of social life are posed.

In our discussion several problems were connected, among them even the concepts of direct democracy and of its efficiency. On the other side we encountered the question whether direct democracy should be considered an institution or a movement, etc. I think that in Yugoslavia we above all investigate the problem of the efficiency of direct democracy.

I think that in a considerable part of Yugoslav theory there has been established a *concept of direct democracy* not as democracy which could be attained today in the sense of ancient democracy, of original democracy of the Greek city-state (whether this can represent a distant, final goal of the movement of democracy is another question, the Yugoslav theory has rather accepted the concept of democracy in the sense of a process and movement encouraging as many people as possible, as many citizens as possible to decide regarding essential problems at the global level of society and at the local, at the level of enterprises and of local communities.

This means that in Yugoslav political theory direct democracy is understood in a more general sense than what is comprehended by the concept of social self-government: workers' self-management was first introduced in 1950 in factories and later on in all the spheres of social life through the introduction of the so-called functional self-governmental communities in the field of education, health, etc., and through the introduction of a vertical association of the working people in a specialized second house of the parliament, from the commune to the assembly.

Thus speaking about concept of direct democracy we must establish that in Yugoslav political theory, speaking in global terms, direct democracy is if we confront society with the state, that is, direct democracy is understood as a process of the liberation of society from under the tutorship of the state, etc.

In this sense the selfgovernmental process represents direct democracy, still inside this process we must say that the process of self-government does not take place in purely direct forms, that is, it does not take place in the form of direct decision-making at the meeting of the workers of a factory and in the form of direct decisions of the voters at a referendum for a wider community — commune, republic or the federation — we rather have a complex of indirect and direct forms in this system of self-government and inside this system of self-government there come to expression bureaucracy, separation of the organs of self-government from their basis, that is the alienation of this self-government from the



basis, from workers in working organizations and from citizens at the level of social communities.

Thus these forms of and attempts at direct democracy are by no means idealized in our Yugoslav endeavours, in our political theory we are fully aware of the fact that these forms of direct self-government which we have are by no means ideal, and that the co-operation of workers and citizens in decision-making regarding the questions about which decisions are taken at a global social level is, at the time being, still minimal and not at all satisfactory. Several sociological investigations and numerous public opinion inquiries with us have established that the co-operation of workers of some working organizations in the process of decision-making, as well as their influence upon the work of the workers' council are insufficient and minimal, and that for this reason numerous workers no longer participate in this process.

That is why we must raise the essential problem of the further development of the institution of workers' self-management in two directions.

The first question is how strengthen the connection of *the representative organs, organs of self-management with their basis*, and the second question is the *problem of the responsibility* of representative organs to this basis.

Let us begin with the first question — the problem how to strengthen and increase the connection of the representative organs of workers' self-management, that is the workers' council in the enterprise and other organs, and apart from this also the institutional forms of workers' representation in the assembly, i. e., in the second house of the assembly, how to strengthen the connection of these representative organs with the basis, with the workers' collective. Here I must emphasize that efficient and good solutions are still sought in our practice, since here we have no efficient form of the representative organs to this basis, to the workers' collectives, to the working people and to the citizens. We are still trying to find a way to prevent the separation of the workers' council from the working collective, to prevent bureaucratization of the workers' council, to effectively resist these phenomena because of which a high number of workers says in their answers to the questionnaires that the workers' council does not represent the opinion of the majority in the working organization, while some investigations even state the number that only 20 % of workers think that the workers' council represents the opinion of the majority; still, this is the case in a rather small number of working collectives.

This means that the connections between the basis and the organs of workers' self-management have not begun to

function, that they are not sufficiently developed, in spite of the high number of the so-called direct forms of connection of the workers' council with the working collective; these are the assemblies of workers, the meetings of the trade unions in factories, and also various questionnaires; still it seems that all these forms do not suffice, since we can see that this connection does not function.

On the other side we encounter the second question, that is the *problem of the responsibility of the representatives*, the responsibility of the organs of workers' self-management and of the organs of other forms of self-government, the responsibility which these should feel toward the basis. With us this is one of the most urgent questions and it seems that the future development of our system of self-management will depend on it, on how we shall solve the problem of the responsibility of the representatives, of the organs of self-management to the basis. In this direction we encounter two aspects of this responsibility, which are of special importance. This is the problem of the responsibility of the organs of self-management, of the workers' council and of other organs of management towards the basis, towards the working collective, and the second problem is the question of the responsibility of the specialized services for decisions as accepted and approved by workers' council.

It seems that the first question, that is the question of the responsibility, or rather, of the forms of the responsibility of the workers' council has remained unsolved, since we are still in the dilemma whether it is possible or necessary for a greater efficiency of the organs of self-management at their work — apart from the political responsibility which is mainly manifest in the fact that the workers' council or other organs may be recalled — that we pass over to the forms of various legal responsibilities, and above all to material responsibility. Some people speak for this stating that it would be appropriate and also necessary to introduce also material responsibility for the workers' council (also because of the greater effectiveness of the workers' council at its work), that is that the workers' council — the members of it — would also be responsible materially for their decisions which have caused damages to the working collective.

Of course, this solution and this view have been rejected, because there arises the question whether after the introduction of material responsibility any worker would be ready to be a member of the workers' council. It seems that at this solution — with the workers' council having also material responsibility — nobody would be willing to become a member of workers' council. It also seems that in near future

solutions cannot be sought in this direction, we shall have to strengthen the forms of political responsibility, recalling, etc.

In this direction we encounter the dilemma of the responsibility of the specialized services for the decisions prepared by this specialized service for the workers' council, and later accepted by the workers' council, but which later on show harmful consequences: is the specialized service no longer responsible for its decision after the latter has been accepted by the workers' council, or is it still responsible for it afterwards also?

This is a dilemma which remains open. The majority seems to be of the opinion, that the view should be taken, that the specialized service continues to be responsible for the specialized aspects of the solution it has proposed to the workers' council and which has been accepted by the workers' council, in the sense that it must call attention of the workers' council to all the aspects following the proposed solution, to all the possible harmful and other consequences, and only if the workers' council does not accept these warnings, or if it takes a decision contrary to the specialized advice and warnings, the specialized service would no longer be responsible for the proposed solution and accepted decision. The investigations of this responsibility take this course.

There exist several other problems; I have discussed this one because the comrades from Frankfurt posed a concrete question how these things were done in Yugoslavia, what did we do in the direction of mobilizing larger masses in cooperation, in democracy.

I would just like to add this: Is it possible to put direct democracy as the opposite of various institutionalized forms? As has been emphasized by several other comrades I think that here we cannot have a dilemma in the alternative sense, that is solutions should be sought in the abolition of the representative, institutional forms of democracy only at a direct level. Even though this is not possible now, I think that we should search for the most efficient connection between the representative organs and their basis. Thank you.

N. PAŠIĆ, BELGRADE:

*I propose that we end our session for today; I hope that the questions put on the list of agenda for tomorrow — I think those questions which have been opened in the discussion today but have remained without an answer so far — will be answered in our discussion tomorrow, since all these questions are connected in many ways and we shall be able to speak about them in the course of our future discussion.*

## II.

# Political System in Socialist Countries

*The »round table« discussion was conducted by: Irena Dub-ska, Sociologicky časopis, Prague, Vlado Benko, Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana, Wolfgang Haug, Das Argument, Berlin, Quintin Hoare, New Left Review, London, Miroslav Kusy, Filosoficky časopis, Prague, Vojislav Stanovčić, Socijalizam, Belgrade.*

## I. DUBSKA, PRAGUE:

*I have the honour and the pleasure as well to open today's morning session. We are excepted to discuss the problems of political system in socialist countries. We shall have the following time schedule: the discussion will go on till one o'clock. I hope that we shall have one tea-break in this time. Between one o'clock and half past four we have leisure time for dinner and afterwards the discussion will continue. I was asked by the the interpreters here to kindly request the German speaking colleagues and comrades to be so kind as to speak very slowly, because they seem to have some problems with interpretations.*

*Well, before we begin, I have to express at least my apology because all the languages I speak I speak very poorly, and I am very sorry not to speak any French.*

*Secondly, the political system is not my special subject; and I have forgotten to introduce myself: my name is Dubska, and I come from Prague, from the Philosophical Institute.*

*To have a more composed discussion than we had yesterday, I would like to call your attention to some problems which were touched upon yesterday, and I think it would be of some help to go on discussing these problems also today even though our main problem is the structure of the system of political democracy. Just two or three of these problems, as far as I can remember them: firstly, the relation between the concept of socialism, between the socialist model as such and the crisis of today's capitalism, or of today's society. The second problem concerns the relation of the political system and the economic system of socialism. And the third one is the question whether there exist different models of socialism or not, and why. So this is just to remind you of some problems to be further investigated.*



The problem in which I am interested — and I am quite sure you will be interested in it also, since it concerns the very core of the problems of the political system in socialism — is the problem of the relationship between the state and society in the socialist political system. As it is known, so far in the history of the building of the practical political relations the role of the state has been emphasized in most socialist countries, the state has been subjectivized while the possibilities of the expression of individual social subjects, autonomous subjects at the level of the society, have been narrowed. When investigating the history of political science and doctrine, and particularly the experiences of socialism, I have come over the following question: Can there exist a dialectic between the state and society in socialist society, or does there exist an identity of the two, an identity excluding any dynamic relation between the state and society in the socialist political system.

The political system which, as I said, definitely emphasized the role of the state, abolished — at least seemingly — the dialectic between the state and the society; but in reality this was not so, since the real dialectic between the state and the society cannot be abolished by a subjective action in circumstances when the socialist society is really heterogeneous, when there exist immanent contradictions and an immanent conflict of interests in it, when it is for this very reason a topical question how to shape the political system so as to give an expression of all the essential interests of society in the political system itself. The political system which lay emphasis upon the state, or the statist-bureaucratic system, really suppressed the independent expression of social subjects abolishing the autonomous subjectivity in the decisive spheres of human activities, in economy, in culture and in policy itself, as the principle of the socialist society, reducing the problem of subjectivity to the problem of the concentration of subjectivity in a narrow political leadership, or rather, in the extreme case, in one person only. For this reason — I think — what in my theses I called »transmissional tautology« came into being; it came into being in the field of economy, where the direct producers no longer developed in that direction which would make it possible for them to act as economic subjects in the economic sphere. In the political field the contradictory and heterogeneous structure of the socialist social basis could not constitute itself so as to enable the expression of the articulated interests of socialist society, the entire political system was rather based upon a vertical

directive. Also in the sphere of culture we can establish the narrowing down, or rather expulsion of the subjectivity from this sphere, the abolition of the relative autonomy of cultural subjects, which has fatal consequences for socialism itself.

— For this reason it is quite clear that the criticism of what is usually called Stalinism cannot be a mere criticism of some personal characteristics of some men in power, it must rather be — if it wants to be successful and efficient — a criticism of the *institutional* structure, and this means above all that political systems should not be based upon the idea that the state apparatus is the main carrier of socialist construction. We, however, cannot say that in the present circumstances the state as a directive factor could be abolished; but its positive role can only establish itself if the state is connected with society so that society has a real possibility to express that real, dialectical pluralism about which professor Pašić spoke yesterday in his introductory word and in other discussions.

The fundamental position from which we should — as it seems — proceed is the belief that in socialist society (contrary to the harmonious, not to say apologetic picture of this society) there exists no unity of interests, that the integration is not given in it from the beginning, there rather exists an immanent heterogeneity of interests, immanent contradictions, and an immanent structure giving rise to conflicts inside this socialist society. I think that it is very important to know this, otherwise we can explain any stronger conflict in a socialist society as something caused from outside, representing a foreign influence, something imported by the contrarevolutionaries or under some other anti-socialist banner. If we proceed from this point of view (I am glad to see some common thoughts as regards this topic in political theory of our colleagues from Czechoslovakia and from Italy), it is necessary — at least I feel so — that in socialist society there exist a dialectics between the state and society, since the state in socialist society is still something what does not only represent the common interest but at the same time also represents something special: the state has not been merged into the society either through its personal structure or through its functions. That is why on the other side the social forces are similarly relatively independent in their functioning. If we build a political system from this point of departure, then we have to do with a re-structuralization of the traditional state, or rather the state called by Marx in his early works the political state, such a re-structuralization in which new bodies become a part of the state structure, on the one side adding to the state the social structure in its

direct form, and on the other side adding the dialectic of interests to the structure of the state itself. Thus those elements which in bureaucratic systems only have to break through spontaneously or around the corners here come to expression, or can come to expression, in a manifest way. I would not like to speak about the details of what consequences can result from such a structure of the political system. I think that this system limits the sphere of the traditional political state, that it makes possible a better control over power, since the various interests can in better qualified way or with more knowledge control the state power; and what matters most is the fact that the participation in political decision-making is greater than in the classic representative system, since the various social spheres have a concrete possibility to co-operate in the political system as such. With this also the participation of the individual of necessity increases. Of course, these are hypothetical assertions to be proved by sociological and political scientific investigations.

A construction of such a political system has of necessity its own preconditions. If the system is to be efficient, then the way in which its basis is organized is of high importance. A system which was not based upon man's position in his work, upon man's working organization, could not really increase socialist democracy to that extent in which it can be realized today. As it was stated yesterday, in present socialism the very idea that the state and the society were identical prevented the establishment of a free association of socialist society; all these — as I have already said — were rather subordinated to a transmissional tautology. The socialist political system which recognizes the dialectics of the state and the society — not only the dialectics between the state and the society but also the dialectics inside the state and inside the society — presupposes that a free association at the horizontal and at the vertical level can be realized in richly differentiated and articulated forms, in a greater extent than it has been the case in socialist societies so far, and perhaps also in a greater extent than is usual in the contemporary political system. What the contemporary political science calls »associationalism« should represent an important constituent element of the socialist political system.

In this way it happens that society and social subjects get what Irena Dubska called yesterday subjectivity, and this means above all that in the economic sphere there no longer exists the problem of the initiative of one centre only, the social-economic progress is expressed through the independent activity of self-managing working organizations accord-

ing to the principles of their own logic. Secondly, in the sphere of cultural creation and of science the bodies of the party cease to operate as arbiters while the culturists and the cultural and scientific institutions begin to have their own subjectivity. Thirdly, the political organizations cease to act as transmissions and become the centres of independent initiative and independent decision-making, they are not identified either with the party or with the state, there rather exists here a rich dialectic between the state and these organizations on the one side, and between these organizations and society on the other.

It is obvious that such a system opens possibilities of various phenomena, and above all there comes into being a greater variety. A monolithic mentality which has got used to a uniform, hierarchical society, in which everything can be foreseen, and which desires such a society — such mentality can react to this variety of expressions, of interests and of contradictions so that it designates such phenomena as anarchy, as a threat to unity, as a destruction of the very basis of socialism, even though these phenomena really represent the progress of socialism; this happens because the advocates of abstract monolithism equalize the foundation of socialism with a historically determined form of a socialist society and of a socialist political system.

At the end I would like to mention a few contradictions, or rather, a few difficulties, which arise in a political system which recognizes the dialectic of the state and society, which recognizes the autonomy of social subjects in the sphere of politics, economy, culture, science, etc. In our Yugoslav practice and also science, these contradictions, or rather difficulties, arising from such a political system, are sometimes neglected. I am not going to compare monolithism with a pluralistic socialist system, I would just like to mention a few difficulties, which are really the difficulties of our society, and I think that these same difficulties exist in one form or another in every socialist society. These difficulties — or at least some of them — are above all the following: if the interests and contradictions of a socialist society are freed from the bureaucratic yoke, there certainly arises the danger that the particular interest of a sphere may get established as the general interest. Still, I think that the bureaucratic system does not solve this problem, but rather gives rise to the same question, so the bureaucratic argument against particularism is not appropriate in such a system, since — as we have shown — also in the bureaucratic system the general interest passes into the particular interest. The second open question is the question how to ensure efficiency at all

points and levels apart from the participation in the political system. In discussions in Yugoslavia we speak quite openly that some of our institutions are not as efficient as they should be, that they do not solve the contradictions quickly enough. I think that this inefficiency and its source do not originate from the principle of the system itself, they rather originate from the realization of this principle, from the fact that we first have not got a democratic tradition, which could refer to the practice of participation in the political system, so the people only gradually get used to becoming the subjects; this is a process which cannot be learned from books, which only slowly penetrates man's consciousness and consciousness of social groups and their actions. A clear and concrete policy of cadres is another thing of high importance for these fields. Yesterday colleague Babić spoke about some difficulties from this sphere. The third problem is how to affirm not only the short-term interests but also the long-term interests of society itself, since when we have different interests getting organized it is quite clear that these interests try to establish their particularity thus there arises the problem how to attain integration and optimal contact between the immediate and the long-term interests. I would like to mention two more problems. In a system where the interests are no longer suppressed, where conflicts become a legitimate constituent element of theory and practice, there arises the problem that these conflicts and interests do not grow too widely, that they move within a certain framework, since if these conflicts outgrow a certain measure, if they become antagonistic conflicts this would mean that the state reappears in its classic dimension as a mass power against society. This is a real problem. One more open question. If in socialist society contradiction and difference are acknowledged as its immanent characteristic, then there arises the question how and by what means to attain solidarity of this society. Thank you.

#### I. DUBSKA, PRAGUE:

I would like to call your attention to a few theses which I find of special importance after yesterday's discussion. For the sake of discussion I would like to formulate these theses very sharply. Firstly, in my view, there exist several models of real socialism, because they have come into being and developed under very different conditions. The traditional model of socialism came into being in countries which in the time of the socialist revolution had no material, social and cultural basis which would enable the development of a



special model of socialism. Under these conditions they had to try to combine the revolutionary negation of capitalist society, of bourgeois social forms with the existent basis. In my view, this experiment was and still is functional and effective in certain aspects and in certain development phases. But a model attained in this way does not represent a positive overcoming of bourgeois forms. This model can no longer serve as an inspiring model for today's highly developed European countries, and thus has lost much of its attraction. It cannot offer a positive alternative to consumers' society. From the social-historical point of view it has no universal value. To criticize this model does not mean to give up socialism or marxism, in our view it means the very opposite: to be concerned and to struggle according to Marx for the realization and for the future of socialism and marxism. Real socialism of today is to be understood as an open system whose general features do not exist anywhere outside the specific forms and specific phases, and each country which is seriously concerned with its socialist orientation must independently choose such a socialist form which is suitable to its own potentialities.

Secondly: the so-called Czechoslovak crisis last year was — in my view — not a narrow political crisis, and even less a crisis connected with the personality of the president of the state and secretary general Novotny. We had to do with a profound, long and many-sided social crisis, with the crisis of this traditional model of socialism, which was particularly alien to the conditions of my country. I must remind you that in the time of the second phase of the socialist revolution in my country there existed a specific characteristic of its totality. It was a question of an industrially developed country, a country with an intensely orientated economy, and with a social structure which was more similar to the social structure of West European countries than to the present socialist countries, a country with a high — we can even say very high — cultural level, and a country with considerable tradition of democratic institutions and democratic habits. This tradition, for instance, lasted for a longer time than the tradition of the republic of Weimar. In January and after January 1968 we attempted to solve this crisis in a positive way, to formulate anew the significance and the content of our socialist orientation and to realize them. We can see this not only from the texts of the action programme of our party and from the texts of the resolutions of our party, but also from the texts of the relevant scientists and theorists, and according to me this attempt of ours is our first and most important, international, socialist obligation. To explain

this process in liberalistic way means to remain in pure theoretic terms on the surface of phenomena, and not to know the true, concrete, historical content of this process. We have never tried to export this project of ours in any other socialist country, and we have never attempted for a single time to interpret this project as universal.

Thirdly: as regards the contents of this project of ours. If I speak about this model, this means more the fundamental principles, the fundamental orientation of our action programme and analyses of our theorists than the existent reality in Czechoslovakia.

A few words about what we understand by this project: this may appear vulgar, but with my colleagues we tried to produce a positive alternative of the modern civilization in our project in a book, and this book has more than 400 pages, so it is rather hard to give a short and adequate report here. In short: socialism means for us firstly an actual and real collectivization, not only the nationalization of the means of production and of productive forces; secondly, it means to create a more penetrating economic structure of interests and at the same time also a system of co-operation. This combination of the long-term and of partial interests is particularly difficult to realize. Thirdly, this means to constitute own organs of the democratic process of decision-making, which could guarantee a higher level of liberties and rights than the bourgeois organs. And finally it means to create an adequate material basis, to bring the productive forces in such a movement that a permanent growth of the life process of everybody will be made possible.

From this point of view several problems discussed yesterday are seen in a new light; so for instance the problem of the unchanged daily life as mentioned yesterday by our German comrades represents a problem with which we are familiar, but the interpretation why such a reality exists would differ and so would differ the perspectives. The problem of the unchanged daily life is not at all president Novotny's fault, this would be nonsense, this is not a problem at the political level only. In a similar way, and from this point of view, it is not possible for us to seek the possibility of a definite debureaucratization at a political level only; the political level is important, perhaps even most important, still as long as there exists the sharp difference between mechanistic labour of the majority of society and the productive labour of the minority — and this is an economic problem — there exists also the basis of the alienation of the rulers and the ruled, there exists the basis of bureaucratization of any kind.

This would be a very long discussion and I will just recapitulate in short what proceeds from this point of view regarding the problem of the political system: restructuring, the transformation of the bureaucratic system into a system of socialist democracy represents in my view only one aspect of this complex whole, which can be developed inside this structure as a constituent element only. Of course, this is a theoretical thesis, since we all know that this reconstruction must begin at the political level, because this corresponds to the specific level of socialism in our system.

Further: before we pass over to the discussion of the particular problems of inner configuration of the political model, we must raise another, more original question, namely the question of the position and limits of the political sphere in the model of socialism conceived in this way. In this framework our theoretical theses are quite close to the theses as explained by professor Bibiĉ here. In short: in the bureaucratic system there exists one subject only — the subject as embodied in the union of the state and party, with one sole, global, so-called social interest, known only to the very centre of power, while carried out by others. In this bureaucratic system everything is policy, and everything is political. At a certain level of the development of socialism reconstruction means a transition from the non-instrumentalist, non-metaphysical explanation of policy to the instrumental one, means to conceive the sphere of politics as a sphere of the creation of the conditions of non-political human activity, to make possible the liberation of all the forms of non-political activities and thus to give to this sphere a humane form, since neither socialism nor the socialist political system represent the final goal of history, but are rather the means of humanization, the means of setting free society and the people. Thank you!

#### I. MITRAN, BUCHAREST:

As we saw yesterday, at the beginning of our symposium, the building of socialism is a work which is realized in various concrete social and economic circumstances, and which thus always acquires new, special forms. This process of development has revealed numerous problems, with the problem of democracy being one of the most important among them. After a relatively short historic period, socialism can, beyond doubt, show important results in the economic and social fields. When saying this I do not want to neglect the fact that in the process of the revolutionary transformation there ap-

peared several difficulties and obstructions, that several mistakes were made, even such mistakes which could easily be avoided. Speaking in general terms, we can say that socialism has not at all exhausted all the possibilities, or shown its full value, still, it has passed its maturity examination and proved its ability to overcome its shortcomings and to advance inspite of all the transitory difficulties. Today we are living in that phase of socialism which no longer represents a transition from one system to another. It has established itself and developed on the basis of its own laws, of course, in various circumstances specific to each country, and this has given rise to new problems in connection with the development of society, its structure, i. e., in connection with its political system which must correspond to the demands of life. Due to the facts that socialism won victory, that new relations were established between the classes, that the question of power — the main problem of the revolution — was solved in favour of the working people, that socialism of today is on a qualitatively higher level of development, for all these reasons we today view the existent forms of power with different eyes — in the way which is to ensure the harmony of social interests and a highly efficient evaluation of the material and spiritual resources of society in accordance with the highest interests of the national and with the obligations to internationalism. Irrespective of the existent forms of their particularities these ways are democratic in their essence. The political system of socialist democracy is possible and real only if all the forms and methods of social management as a whole are openly estimated and evaluated by the people. This means that a firm democratic life in all the fields must be secured — from the sphere of the material production to the sphere of all the institutions and organizations of the social superstructure. With us in Roumania, this concept has conditioned several decrees which make it possible today already to prevent any self-will in making decisions in various fields of social life, in economy and in politics, etc.

The organs of collective management operating today thus have not got a representative and formal nature, but rather a consultative nature. An expression of the permanent development of socialist democracy, of the improvement of the socialist productive relations, and of the co-operation of workers in discussion and solution of all the problems of interest, can be seen in the success of various economic decrees and of enterprises, where the general assemblies of workers which have come into being recently play an important role. At this assemblies the organs of management must

obligatory report about the activities of the management, about the results of work, about the general position, and about income and its distribution. The purpose of the territorial administration is to ensure a greater activity of local organs, to increase their initiative and efficiency, to improve the relations between the central organs and the fundamental units, to ensure a more efficient control over the territorial administrative units.

On the basis of the new law concerning the organization and the role of local organizations, about which my colleague spoke yesterday, the regional people's committees and also town committees and commune committees have got more independence in all activities and considerable competences in the organization and in adaptation of economic, social and cultural life.

The experiences of the development of our socialist society have shown us that a permanent concern with steady progress in the way of abolition of conservative tendencies in economic, social and political life is characteristic of our country; these tendencies as manifest some time ago gave rise to prejudice against the building of socialism. We are quite sure that the dynamic presence of the masses in the political arena, at all the levels of management and organization of social life, is a proof of permanence of the socialist system in which the masses represent a real subject of history. This is the significance of authentic socialist democracy, through which and because of which great forces of people express a qualitatively new energy and build such social relations and circumstances which they themselves desire.

The process of the building of economic, scientific and social life, accumulation of problems and tasks to be solved, objectively determine the strengthening of the role of the application of democratic principles in the entire political life of a socialist system.

#### F. VREG, LJUBLJANA:

I agree with colleague Dubska and her theses that there exist several models of socialism, several roads to socialism, and that we cannot proclaim one model only to be socialist. What is more, it seems that the etatist, great-state model of socialism contains very few socialist elements; in its extreme Stalinist version, it rather appears to be anti-socialist. The etatist model of the dictatorship of the proletariat — which considers limited sovereignty, non-autonomy



of parties, the policy of force and occupation to be socialist principles — cannot be a socialist model. For this reason I think that we can stop to speak about the theoretical crisis of socialism at the very moment when marxist-leninist thought begins to consider various models of socialism, when it begins to search for new roads to socialism. Since the etatist model of socialism gets established in this or that variant, in this or that period in all socialist countries — in some it gets established as the leading principle, while in others attempts are made to overcome it or to refuse it — I would like to illuminate some of the characteristics of this model.

Firstly, the etatist model of socialism as a closed system, forced to carry out the concentration and centralization of political power, of necessity leads to the dictatorship of a close oligarchic group and not to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Socialist and people's fronts and also the members of the party turn into mere transmissions of the centralized party staff, they lose the last remains of their autonomy and decay into an atomized mass of individuals. Thus the same process of atomization takes place as we can see it in capitalist society, and the same system of the political manipulation of isolated and devalORIZED individuals. The declared hegemonistic role of the party is misused for the creation of a power structure which is intermingled, and in some places even mastered, with a political-police agency as its vanguard part.

Secondly, political pluralism, or rather a many-party system, a system of a hegemonistic party, as named by Polish sociologist Wiatr, is only a formal facade of democracy in people's democracies. As soon as authentic pluralism tries to begin to live within the framework of people's fronts (in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and elsewhere), the conservative, etatist forces feel threatened and suppress the revival of autonomous political subjects in the name of socialist unity. All the socialist forces must show an automatic and mechanical uniformity, that ideological uniformity of opinion which is dictated by communist parties. The same system of unity and uniformity is established also at a higher level, in the sphere of inter-party and inter-state relations. Mechanical unity is forced upon socialist countries and parties. The system of a hegemonistic party is established artificially — by the hegemony of one party (the Soviet party) over all other parties, or rather by the hegemony of the Stalinist power oligarchy over the satellite power elites.

Thirdly, the etatist model brings about totalitarianism in politics, economy, culture and in mass communication. The contemporary automatized society is of necessity managed in a democratic way; man's creative forces, investments in science, and self-government become decisive. The decision-making should be brought closer and passed over to man. For this reason principles of the distribution of political power, of autonomous political subjects, and of selfgovernmental pluralism get established contrary to the stalinist dictatorship. Selfgovernmental pluralism does not tolerate the hegemony of one political subject over other subjects. Also the communist party must establish its vanguard role through its conceptual-theoretical capacity to propose the best solutions. Socialism is a system liberating man, that is also a system in which man is freed from political institutions and various systems of hegemony.

Fourthly, in most socialist countries and also in Yugoslavia the obsolete forms of political organization have been preserved, which really appertain to the etatist model of socialism. These traditional, hierarchical, military-staff structures of organization cannot be appropriate forms to the broad process of the establishment of political co-deciding of man. The existent political structures do not make it possible for the opinions, needs and interests of socialist society to become articulated and crystallized.

That is why I think that the imperative for the further development of socialism lies in the establishment of new possibilities of co-deciding of man and in the development of new forms of political organization. Yugoslav socialism sees a new way in social self-government which should make possible man's participation in political decisions. There arises the question whether the system of self-government has not, in a way, been »grafted« upon the old forms of political organization rooted in the etatist model of socialism. It seems that the system of self-government has not yielded the expected results for this reason above all. This means that there is a need to analyse anew and to criticize the forms of political organization, which have been established by the etatist model, and that these forms must be confronted with the system of self-governmental socialism. The necessity is becoming more and more apparent that self-governmental socialism create new forms of political organization from its own practice, forms which will represent a dialectical negation of the etatist forms of political organization.

## A. TANASE, BUCHAREST:

I would like to call your attention to a few thoughts on an old question.

Our Yugoslav comrades spoke about the Yugoslav concept of democracy, of the state, etc. I think that there exists also a Rumanian concept, at least as regards the question of solving various problems of democracy and of the state; I would like to emphasize that — I am speaking about the Rumanian concept of this — we have the same fundamental ideas, while there exist also differences in our conceptions.

First we are concerned with a methodological principle, namely that the economic, social and cultural policy is nothing else but an applicable thesis, conceiving the socialist society as a *donnée* in emergence, in dialectical interconnection, with an immanent tendency towards a permanent self-improvement. So we are for the division, for the separation of live structures from anachronistic structures, and for finding the most suitable forms for the given levels of development. The dynamic of thought and of political principles is determined by the intensity of introduction of innovations in all the spheres of social life. Immobility and anachronism are incompatible with socialism.

Some comrades have more or less severely put the state contrary to democracy, including the socialist state and socialist democracy. In my view the state does not give rise to anti-democratic phenomena in any circumstances. Democracy, of course, is not limited to the boundaries of a state. I agree with the idea used about the dialectic pluralism of democracy. An interesting idea. Still, I would like to say that democracy is not limited to the framework of a state, and even to a lesser degree, this can exist without democracy. Irrespective of our relation to it, the state is a fact, a live fact, and we — humanists and socialists — have to face the problem how to keep it and how to give it a more and more democratic nature. So we are for the state since it represents the necessary political factor of the socialist superstructure, but we are against the uncritical and passive attitude to various bureaucratic tendencies conditioned by the existent phenomena: exaggerated centralism, the existence of numerous unnecessary connecting links between central organs and basic units, the parallelism of the organs of management, in short, against all the phenomena conditioning subjectivism, voluntarism, and the lack of initiative and responsibility. In this connection we must also place a problem which must be faced by all democracies and which demands a careful investigation, namely the problem of the relation between

democracy and planning, or in more general terms, between the demands of democracy and the demands of the scientific method, with everything concerning the organization and management of social life.

The value and necessity of planning, which has become an obligatory condition of social and economic progress, are unanimously recognized in our time even in capitalist countries. But planning presupposes an efficient use of the main levers of power. Somebody may argue: but how can it be ensured that these levers will not cause damage to democracy? How can we ensure that the scientific criteria of power, demanding high professional competence and responsibility, are linked with the principles of democracy demanding wide participation of the masses not only to realize the best proposals regarding the equally increasing development of economy, of whole social life, but also to implement all these decisions?

The fact that the scientific organization demands professional skill and not democratic co-operation certainly cannot be proved false. On the other hand the absence of planning or its bureaucratic deformations cannot be excused in the name of democracy.

This problem is certainly more complex and I am not going to persist in it; I would like to call your attention to some other principle, which is perhaps the very opposite, the antithesis of bureaucratic phenomena and negative phenomena, which can come into being in a socialist country. This is the humanist principle according to which the improvement of a political social system as a form of the development of socialist democracy is inseparably connected with man, with the conditions of his existence, with his future and his consciousness. Democracy and humanism are two fundamental principles of any well-organized socialist society. For a really democratic system man does not represent a distant goal but rather an immediate aim, man is not only the object of democracy but above all the active subject of the democratic process. Man creates democratic circumstances and does not only enjoy them. The fundamental problem of humanism is the liberation of man, the realization and development of his human essence. The fundamental problem of democracy is that it represents the main means of the realization of these humanist demands. Socialist democracy with its humanist significance presupposes an improvement of the institutional system of organization; the institutional mechanisms must, of course, be improved; but the creative assertion of man as a personality, the realization of the human essence in the concrete existence is an even more important prerequisite.

And now let us go to the question of the models of socialism. Comrade Dubska called our attention to this question in her introductory word today — namely to the question whether there exist several models of socialism. This is a very controversial question in socialist circumstances, and especially in socialist countries.

#### R. SUPEK, ZAGREB:

I am speaking unprepared because I could not attend the previous discussion, that is why I am going to touch upon those thoughts as just expressed by some speakers.

Since some problems concerning the possible models of socialism have been touched upon, I am going first — and mainly from the sociological point of view — to speak about the problem of the model of socialism. Since the history of socialism as an epochal social change began with the October Revolution and has lasted for fifty years, and in this time other socialist revolutions have taken place and other socialist societies have got established, it is necessary that we pose the question about the *dialectic of the model of socialism*. I must immediately add that this is not a new problem, since Lenin himself spoke about it when thinking about the October Revolution, which did not emerge on the basis of the most developed capitalist society, but rather on the ruins of the backward tsarist Russia. Lenin knew very well that the new socialist state in Russia would have to pay a tribute for this backwardness, and he expressed a thought which is very important for the understanding of the dialectic of the model of socialism, namely that any better developed European country when beginning its socialist revolution would be immediately before the Soviet Union, even though this revolution might occur much later. Thus Lenin clearly expressed the idea that the level of development of socialist society, or speaking in more dynamic terms, the course of the socialist revolution itself in its internal development dimension, depended on the objective level of the development of the social-economic and political-cultural structure of society in which the socialist revolution took place. This is the first fact from which we must proceed when speaking about the different models of socialism or the problems and conflicts which have arisen in the socialist world so far, because of lack of understanding of this dialectics of development.

Today it is well known that what we call Stalinism is in essence an attempt to force the mechanistic understanding of the socialist development and to force as »the ideal model« or the ideological model Soviet socialism as an obligatory, ideal



type for all the socialist countries. Stalinism was yesterday and is still today a negation of the real dialectic of the development of socialist societies, under the label »Marxism-Leninism« making absolute a strategy and tactics, a form of power, a social order and even the very way of life as the »true socialism«. We need not emphasize how idealistic and anti-dialectic such an understanding is. It is quite clear that in countries at a different level of development the socialist revolution must get established in essentially different ways, regarding the strategy and the way in which it comes in power, and also regarding the building of socialist society itself, that is the realization of socialism as such.

How could it happen that under influence of Stalinism certain fundamental truths about the socialist revolution and about the building of socialism were forgotten?

One of the reasons can be found in the understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which went through a positivist interpretation in the so-called »Marxism-Leninism«. Stalinism namely took it in consideration exclusively only in its political function, and this in the first phase — as a take-over of the bourgeois state. Let us remember that Marx defined the true nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat in a very simple way, when in his early works he said: »The proletariat needs a political revolution with a social soul and not a social revolution with a political soul!« The political dimension of the revolution — as a take-over or an abolition of power — must serve the building of the new society, which is really a negation of the political nature of bourgeois society, and in which the classic forms of political ruling gradually disappear. Well, from the experience we know that the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union developed in the very opposite direction: and the political dimensions of the dictatorship of the proletariat — as are the state, party, bureaucratic centralism, the administrative-centralist management of all social affairs, »politization« of all forms of cultural life, etc. — succeeded in forcing themselves upon the entire society to its very most personal and private forms of life. It is understandable that the revolution must go through the political dimensions of social action at a very broad social front, and that the political avant-garde has the decisive role in this action, especially in undeveloped countries. But this *political avant-gardism*, which is a necessary phenomenon and also the main carrier of all the essential social changes in social and conceptual relations, and at the same time also the *anticipator* of future society to be built in longer social processes from the very fundamental economic-social circumstances onwards, this political avant-gardism led to an

increasing alienation of the political avant-garde — in its organization and in working style — from society, to its establishment as the »subject carrier« of the historical change; because of this view the political avant-garde of necessity had to become etatist and bureaucratic and to establish that regime which is naively called by the Soviet theorists »the cult of personality«.

Political avant-gardism and its separation from society were unavoidable in the Soviet Union of the twenties this century. This can be seen from the discussion between Lenin and the labour opposition in 1921, and especially at the Xth congress of the bolshevik party, when it was clearly demanded that the factories be managed by working collectives under the supervision of trade-unions. We know that Lenin rejected this demand saying that in the entire Soviet Union there were not even 1500 workers capable of managing anything, and thus such a decree would soon result in making the economy itself »rustic« and »bourgeois«. Only a centrally organized political avant-garde could ensure the building of socialism in the Soviet Union. This view has remained valid until today. But we must say that in the discussion with labour opposition Lenin did not deny the »social soul« of the dictatorship of the proletariat, he even tried to determine it sociologically when the circumstances would be ripe to pass the factories into workers' management. He stated that this would happen when approximately 50% of the country were urbanized, or rather when the peasants represented only a half of the population. Even though the Soviet Union fulfilled these conditions of Lenin regarding the power and education of the working class and of other social layers a long time ago, the conditions of transferring the factories to workers' management, or rather self-management, it is known that Stalin's theory on the development of the »Soviet state« completely rejected this thought, and that the Soviet theorists for this reason consider workers' self-management to be a special »revisionism«, even though the very opposite is true.

If we go back to Marx's formula, we can see that the very opposite of what he desired happened in the Soviet Union, namely that the political revolution devoured the social soul of the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is the transition to a true social revolution, which is the withering away of the state and the building of direct democracy or selfgovernmental socialism. The backwardness of the circumstances in which the socialist revolution occurred in the Soviet Union forced upon us a model of socialism which does not correspond to Marx's concept of socialism, which the bourgeois forms of power suit as poorly as a police uniform. We

must add that in all backward countries political avant-gardism is likely to result mainly in forms of political power, taken over from bourgeois state, i. e. in the state and centralized centres of power, while the more developed societies will take other ways.

If we can speak about an *inner dialectic* of the socialist revolution, or of the dictatorship of the proletariat, then it is characterized by a certain *dualism of power*: the bourgeois forms of power are intermingled with typically socialist or labour forms, as was shown in the October Revolution in the relations between the parliament (Duma) and workers' soviets. This dualism can last for a long time, even though in principle we must assume that the socialist forms will supersede the bourgeois forms. But really! Not only so that a bourgeois form is given the label »socialist«, as it has been a wide spread fashion so far. With us, for instance, we speak so much about »workers' self-management« and about »selfgovernmental socialism« that most of the people never realize that they live in a combination of representative, parliamentary democracy, i. e., a bourgeois form of power, and of workers' or social self-government, i. e., a socialist form of power!

I would like to make a short digression here regarding the question of dualism of power. It is namely not necessary that this dualism is connected exclusively with the so-called »transitory period«, or rather with the dictatorship of the proletariat, which will finally vanish with the progressive socialization of the social order. Theoretically it is an open question, whether in some future society there will exist only the decentralized forms of power in the way of various self-governmental communities which could be hierarchically projected to a common body, let us say the congress of those who execute selfgovernment, or whether it will be necessary to directly confront and politically express the views of groups regarding various questions of general social interest at a global social level. I leave this question unanswered, because it is not interesting for our present discussion.

Even though, unfortunately, we have no elaborate theory of »the dictatorship of the proletariat« or of »the transitory period«, trying to define the importance of the social-economic level of the social development for the establishment of socialist society, and on the basis of which we could come to conclusions about the possible models of socialism, we have already encountered this problem, we have even tragically confronted it in actual, concrete historical practice. Did we not see that a free development of a socialist country was prevented by force, because its model of socialism was con-

sidered to be not only »revisionist«, but also to be »threatening socialism from inside«, only because it was not in agreement with a more backward form of socialist order? We are facing an attempt to force a certain model of socialism upon another socialist country as »the only right model«. The Stalinist concept of socialism has succeeded in a considerable extent to force itself as a necessary phase upon the development of every socialist revolution. Also with us a theory has got established which tries to distinguish an etatist and a selfgovernmental phase in the development of socialism, thus the socialist revolution should of necessity develop from an etatist and centralist form to a more democratic and self-governmental form. I think that this is a very mechanistic conception which also includes dangers for labour movement in better developed countries.

The inclination to see etatist socialism as a necessary period of the socialist revolution and even as a natural expression of the dictatorship of the proletariat proceeds from the tendency which is characteristic of revolutionary movements — and this is the tendency towards a totalization of the set aims and the way of their realization. Because in the first period the political or ideological-political aims and methods predominate, because society is under the influence of the politization of the entire life, under the influence of this tendency there emerges the opinion that the political forces and organizations, or rather the forms of their activity which should be most close to the revolutionary aims, have the greatest right to act in society permanently, to be a permanent motive, a continuous source of will, that perpetual subjective factor which determines all social changes, even though in reality they act as an avant-garde over society and are getting more and more distant from social movements. When this political totalization changes into a theoretical or ideological model of thinking, it of necessity rejects all those problems and social movements which necessarily demand a de-politization of society by means of a real *collectivization* of the social management of economy, culture and all other spheres. All true problems of the transfer of social deciding from political forums to the society itself, which characterize socialist democracy, simply vanish from social consciousness under the influence of this totalization of the political-ideological thinking and acting. This is also the reason why Soviet »Marxism-Leninism« appears to us as a withered and ossified remnant of an ancient revolutionary phase which was understood in a onesided way, and why it is not capable to encounter the new questions of labour movement and of the building of socialist society.

Why is the theory of the necessary etatist phase, or of the necessity of that model of socialism which we call Stalinism, inappropriate and dangerous for labour movement in better developed countries? This theory demands a struggle strategy which excludes the struggle for the management in factories, or for the forms of selfgovernmental socialism from its immediate aims. Last year we saw that the French workers spontaneously demanded that they occupy, and not only occupy but also manage the factories. Those leaders who have been educated in a Stalinist manner think that such demands are adventurous. But those theorists who have a better idea of the structure of the contemporary working class and of the changes in productive relations, especially in technologically better developed enterprises, understand that the demand for management naturally proceeds from the inner class relations in enterprises, relations which connect the workers and the technical intelligentsia and bring closer physical and intellectual work, so that on both sides there arises the need to take over a joint responsibility for the management of the production. The theory of the two phases — the etatist and the selfgovernmental — would thus exclude these demands from the strategy of the labour movement, even though they play a direct revolutionary role today.

I would like to remind you that the demand for self-management is justified also for some other, very important reason, that is the development of tertiary activity (the growth of the paid intelligentsia) and, above all, the developed media of mass communication, which often have a monopolistic role and control the public opinion. Last year in France we also saw that the employees occupied the television and expelled the representatives of the ministry. Also German students resisted the monopoly of Springer's newspaper trust. In the sphere of the public opinion and culture the representatives of the non-parliamentary opposition made the same demands as were made by the workers in the sphere of production, even though the two were not sufficiently connected in these events. It is important that the demands for the introduction of the forms of direct democracy, or of selfgovernmental socialism are made today more and more a part of the daily struggle of the working class, and that in these demands the working class is joined by growing social layers. This is happening for a very simple reason: because the etatization and bureaucratization of power in contemporary society has grown to such an extent in the state, administrative, productive, trade-union, political-party, and in other mass organizations, that the struggle for the direct forms of social control represents the most broad basis for the mobil-



ization for the revolutionary changes in society. The terrible pressure of uncontrolled but very strong social powers, which are over man in the contemporary developed society furnishes a good explanation of all those spontaneous forms of protest in non-conformist and anarchic resistance, which should be — as every resistance — understood as a means of the polarization of social contradictions, as a means of becoming aware of the beginning of an efficient action.

We speak about the most developed society that they develop in the so-called »welfare society«, but in this consumption it is not the means of satisfying the primary needs — hunger, poverty — that play a more and more important role, but rather secondary needs by which man satisfies the higher forms of pleasure. It is natural that the production and sale of these consumers goods in capitalist society, and in socialist society also, are controlled by narrow circles, led only by their own economic interests and which accordingly exploit the human needs, or rather manipulate them. That is why it is natural that contemporary man wants to control the production of these means in the name of the authentic human needs and personal freedom.

In this framework the philosophy of freedom must be rehabilitated, since both in capitalism and in socialism the modern bureaucracy and technocracy — deriving their philosophy from bourgeois utilitarianism — promise daily »an ever better life«, »a continuous progress«, »a more and more beautiful future«, and in the name of these promises they daily take away more and more freedom from man, who feels more and more helpless and unimportant. Even the labour movement has got adjusted to this philosophy to some extent, and several trade-unions are not interested in anything else but the »movable ladders« which ensure an automatic increase of wages when the profit increases, while the increase of profit of necessity proceeds from the development of the contemporary technology. This philosophy changes the worker in a trade-union mouse patiently waiting that an automatic signal will tell it that its piece of cheese has gotten bigger while it is gnawing with pleasure, getting fatter, and becoming more and more unmovable in body and in mind.

Thus it is quite clear that opposite to the opportunist philosophy of »an ever better life«, we must rehabilitate the philosophy of freedom as understood by Hegel and Marx. What does such a philosophy of freedom mean? Freedom as the fundamental human value, and in our case the freedom as opposed to the »good life«! Well, freedom means above all the possibility of deciding and of accepting responsibility, the possibility to tell our name and to accept the responsibility

for everything what concerns our life. Freedom cannot be reserved for a social elite or for a mythical avant-garde. It is the fundamental right of every man, and that in why — when understanding the philosophy of freedom as a demand for a wider responsibility of man and for the possibility of deciding — we struggle for the dignity of each man. In this sense only socialism can be the emancipator of the whole mankind! And since over socialism, or rather over its largest part there has gathered a cloud of absence of freedom as regards the direct decision-making of the people about the essential questions of their life, since self-governmental socialism is understood as »revisionism«, then it is not an unexpected if bourgeois philosophy, that old philosophy of a »better life«, is preached! I think that in the contemporary world it is of higher importance that we revive those traditional freedom sources of Marxism, because many things are not clear in the understanding of what socialism is or is not, which form of socialism is more progressive and which more backward, unless we have the fundamental criteria of what a human community is and what the free association of people is, where »the free development of each individual is conditioned by the free development of everybody« (Marx). Such criteria are necessary for a dialectic of the model of socialism.

#### M. SPINELLA, MILAN:

I have followed most carefully the words of comrade Supek and I agree with them. What is more: I think that his speech has given a good direction to our discussion.

As a representative of a party struggling to take over power in a capitalist state I would like to underline two points in what comrade Supek has said, two points which were of fundamental importance at the XIIth congress of the Communist Party in Italy.

The first question. We must not separate man from the experience of socialist countries, if we are marxists, if the echo of marxist thought is in us. When estimating what the socialist world has achieved in all the fields — the economic, social, cultural field, etc. — we must proceed from a concrete sociological and historical analysis of the position in which these movements took place. We must take into account not only the initial circumstances of the movement, the initial level of the development of socialist countries, but also the circumstances in which this movement came into power, and which differ a great deal: for instance the position in the Soviet Union after the revolution differs considerably from

the position after such a complex phenomenon as is the second world war, when the working class took over power in socialist countries of today. This question about the historic qualities seems to me to be fundamental for the question, as posed here, concerning the various models. Perhaps we Italian communists simplify a little in this respect, still at the end of our congress one of our comrades (Berlinguer) asked about these various models: »Well, why do you think that we must have models?« This is nonsense.

We are not concerned with models. We are concerned with a struggle, with the creation of a political direction, with the action, which is to drive the class struggle in Italy to its aim, to the establishment of workers' power in Italy, and the model will naturally develop out of this movement. Of course, everybody knows that we have a culture and a marxist position, that we believe that private property is to be abolished, but this is not a model, this is a principle — and this is something quite different. As regards the model I think — as comrade Supek said — models are models for us. Models are a reality, and the reality of socialist countries should be regarded as a historical experience. This historical experience must be investigated and evaluated, its good sides should be sought and not only the bad ones, since if we only seek bad sides then this would be an empirical and not a marxist method. In our daily struggle we must work out our perspective taking in consideration the experiences of socialist countries similarly as any other historical experience of the labour movement and also the experiences from the general human history.

The second question which I found of special interest in the contribution of comrade Supek is the question of the relations between direct and representative democracy. The dimensions of this problem in the countries where the working class is in power already differ from those in countries where we are only struggling for socialist power. I think that we must carefully consider this question. If it is true that communist parties and other progressive movements in the capitalist world must perpetually learn from socialist countries, then it is also true that the socialist world as it is must perpetually learn from the experiences of the class struggle in bourgeois states.

I think that special emphasis should be laid upon this thought. The labour movement is a whole and in this world-wide a permanent exchange of experiences is taking place. We in capitalist countries can learn a lot from socialist countries but also the latter must learn from the class struggle not only in Italy but in the entire world.

Just one more thing: I agree that a situation in which representative democracy and direct democracy are intermingled represents a transitional period. I do not know what the aim will be like, similarly as comrade Supek does not know this. Nobody knows this. And I also agree with him that from the point of view of this clear consciousness the forms of representation, of indirect democracy are inherited from bourgeois democracy. Of course, I am not saying that they should be immediately abolished for this reason, when it is necessary we must use them at the same time developing in them maximum democracy, but we must be constantly aware of the marxist view of these forms, as explained by comrade Supek.

The comrade from Roumania spoke a lot about man. Of course, I agree with him, but I would like to emphasize that Marx never spoke about man. He always spoke about the people. And I would like that we consider this, since speaking about man we can easily forget the people. Thank you.

(unauthorized discussion)

#### Č. SADIKOVIĆ, SARAJEVO:

In order to understand the *essence* and the *nature* of democracy in socialist society, its *origin*, *direction of development*, *dimensions* and *social range*, we must begin with the nature of Marx's »state as the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat«, as a *complex of political and democratic institutions* with a new spirit, direction, significance and engagement. The attempts to begin with the *original marxist concept* in explanations of the essence of democracy in socialist society and in projects of the direction of its development and progress are becoming more and more rare; if this concept is eventually mentioned, then it is explained merely as the dictatorship of the proletariat, that means it is located exclusively in the social sphere, the sphere of the classes and class suppression, and thus this principle is beyond doubt made poor, distorted and devalued, especially when we are concerned with contemporary socialist movements. In the theory of state there have never been any conflicts about the fact that the state can never mean a direct government of a class, not even in bourgeois society, where the ruling class represents »minority«, since bourgeoisie has no direct *legal-political influence* upon and relation to the state; the bourgeois state is a class because with its position and its whole function it keeps those relations and structures which finally preserve the existent social order

in which bourgeoisie as the carrier of property has a privileged position. That is why the state as a revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be a simple power and domain of the working class — because it cannot exist as a class in socialist society — it can only represent the political-democratic institutions, which emerge because of the realization of the *interests of the proletariat*, which in accordance with Marx's analysis of the nature of the emancipation of proletariat mean the *true interest and freedom of man*, of each member of society.

The development of the concept of the state in socialist society shows that as regards the concept of the *state as the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat* different countries have very rich experiences, which vary a great deal, but are unfortunately often negative, and have come to existence under the influence of *profound theoretical misunderstandings*. It is obvious above all that the concepts of the most elementary political institutions in socialist society are not sufficiently elaborate and that — as we can say — the socialist revolution has *outrun* the elaboration and theoretical preparation of the new order. There is no precisely established relationship among the individual institutions which vary a great deal as regards the nature of their function, and which come into the composition of the political-democratic order in socialist society, a relationship which would make impossible *arbitrary activity or abuse* at the very beginning, and which would help everybody to function in the sense of the ideal theoretical determinants of the new power. The concept of the *state as the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat* has been used in accordance with the line, in a rude and simplified way we have thought that it is most important and enough in every respect if we form the new »state« which will, in contrast with party, automatically give the best results only.

If we know all this it follows that it is high time that the patina of the past be cleared away from this form of power, that we emancipate it, and show it in the right light; the time has come that on the one side we underline the *pathological changes*, which were often repeated when this concept of the state was created, while on the other it must become clear that this institution in its normal form is a power which can move us, surprise us, fill us with enthusiasm, which can yield considerable results; that it contains a *nucleus* of new socialist democracy, which results from the »surgical« intervention of the power in the deepest social relations in order to cut the true roots of the absence of freedom and democracy in bourgeois society. If anything is undisputable in the marx-



ist political theory, then this is certainly the persistence in the *maximum use of the state apparatus* in the process of the building of the new society, in using its possibilities, advantages, specific features of course the *appropriate uses of it* should be previously tested, since its overdone function can be a double-edged knife in the circumstances of the social ownership of the means of production. In order to have only its positive side — this makes it possible for us to exploit such a dangerous instrument — we must pay special attention to such a structuring and operating the political and democratic institutions which will make impossible all these numerous *deformations* and abuses, which have proceeded from them and which have considerably frustrated the development of socialism in the world. In order to prevent at the very root all such negative tendencies in the development of democracy and socialism — which often occur also without any bad intention — we must immediately do everything what we did already at the level of bourgeois society, we must build something that will correspond to Montesquieu's model of *distribution of power*, which came into being in order to prevent abuse of power in bourgeois society, of course, if this concept is understood in the liberal, democratic sense of this word.

The principles of the *distribution of power* cannot be included in the concept of the state in the sense as understood in socialist society; the idea that *power checks power* has a negative effect upon the function of the *assembly as a democratic organ* inside the existent state, and this has several negative consequences in the contemporary bourgeois society itself; it is still always necessary that such endeavours be adjusted to the specific demands and role of power in socialist society. This must be proportioned so that it makes possible a *maximum mobility, engagement and action* on the part of power as a whole and at the same time avoids all the bad sides of an *overstrained political organization*; it must mean a distribution of power vertically to the assembly and to executive power, at which the democratic substratum of power comes to expression, while the conservative activity of the immense, inert and parasitic organism of the executive power is prevented in contemporary socialist society.

If we try to establish the internal structure and nature of the relations in *etatism* and *stalinism*, which today represent the *most common and most dangerous* reasons of the *decadence of democracy* in socialist society, then we can see that we have always to do with inherited and considerably increased *supremacy of executive power*; because of the inauguration of social property it becomes a too big, expen-

sive and inert organism, executing pressure upon all the aspects of democracy. A closer analysis of this organ shows that this is a groupation which is dominated by a strong *particular interest* which must of necessity be in contradiction with the interest of other members of society, and which owing to its position sees everything through a lens, which is completely incapable of producing a picture of the common interest.

In order to arise democratic processes in society in order to make the democratic and political institutions take the course of true profit and interest of all the people, we must realize Marx's concept of the *unity of power* in the right way and introduce a *strict separation* and a *contradictory relation* between the assembly and the executive power, a relationship which will set *boundaries and limits* to any serious attempt to function despotically, wilfully, and undemocratically. A determined destruction of illusions and errors concerning the *unity of power*, which is most often understood literally, the abolition of illusions which will make clear the line separating the assembly and the executive power, will not help only the assembly and democracy, it will also make it possible for us to find the true role of the *party of the proletariat*, that we formally and institutionally bring it into position when it will most appropriately stand for the common interest. As that time also the possibilities and advantages of the state as the dictatorship of the proletariat will be shown in the right light; even though existing for a few decades it is at the time being still in the phase of its »childhood«, because it has not at all yielded what it could and must offer in the prospect of the development of democracy and of a truly democratic community; it will be helped to this by all these *reconstructions* and *corrections*, which must be made, in order to complete it, to put it in a better position, and to make its structure more elastic. At the global level there will be established numerous common characteristics and results, everything that is essentially democratic, what appertains to the essence of the revolutionary changing the contemporary world, beside the specific, characteristic features of the development of socialism and besides everything what must be respected and tolerated now.

#### M. STEFFEN, FRANKFURT:

I am very glad that colleague Supek mentioned a central question, which is for us — in the time of the beginning of the revolutionary movement in West Germany — of central

importance and represents the source of most of our troubles. I have in my mind the central problem of social communications in general. Comrade Supek called our attention to the fact that this form of relations has changed more than ever before, this means that we understand this as a change of the relation between economy and politics, as understood also by Marx and Lenin, that this relation has changed essentially in late-capitalist society. For us this means a transfer of the struggle for power, or perhaps the struggle against some reactionary power from the sphere of production in the classic sense, in so far as the aims of struggle have moved. As long as the beginning of the revolutionary movement in West Germany in essentially the student movement — and I think in this connection another analysis of the classes will be established, a new analysis of the classes which will be different from the historical analysis — these forms of communication will be central in two ways: as the object of the revolutionary struggle or of the possibility of organizational development of the forms of this struggle.

I shall try to formulate a thesis and give grounds for it. We can say that the central moments of exploitation in late-capitalist societies, as for instance West Germany, and this would be true also of America, are no longer produced by the material want, the classic moment of the development of the revolutionary consciousness and of the revolutionary struggle, but that these moments emerge centrally, in a similar way as comrade Supek said, from the masses in the central forms of communication, by mass manipulation through communication media. Thus the students were not in vain directed against these media of mass communication, and media of mass manipulation. In this central moment of struggle, for instance in Springer-campaign or in the struggle against the emergency laws, which represent the phase of the mobilization of students and also of other masses — partly workers, young workers, and pupils — in this struggle there come to expression the moments of the central shift in the relationship between economy and politics.

Perhaps we can give an example in this connection, namely the late-capitalist forms of communication — if conceived as the production of such moments of suppression, the central moments of suppression, against which the revolutionary consciousness could develop — no longer produce consciousness in the former sense of the word, which Marx conceived as the false consciousness, but still conceived it as consciousness, they no longer produce it in this sense. This means that they do not even produce false consciousness, they merely produce one-dimensionality, they produce final apathy,

they do not produce any forms of any ideology with the exception of the ideology of discipline and of operating a certain system without any friction. This means, if we could imagine — certainly an apocalyptic vision — that this process, which students can learn now, is a process of what we call the technocratic reform of higher schools — and at the higher schools this process is felt first, since this process is perceptible more and more for those who are privileged as regards information, that is students — well, if we imagine that this process develops further perfectly and in an improved way, then it of necessity contains also consciousness in the old sense of the word, that is ideology, and of necessity also insights, partly produced even by Fascism, that is old ideology in this old sense, and this means a certain opinion on certain situations and instrumentalization of action, so that this very production of consciousness will no longer be possible in this new form of technocracy and apathy of the masses in this system. Only with extreme difficulty we could introduce this knowledge, this analytic knowledge into the beginnings, the organizational beginnings, of a movement.

At the end I would like to show in short a few moments of this new organizational form. Well, it could be said in the expression that in the time of the Springer-campaign, or rather anti-Springer campaign, and in the time of the struggle against the law on emergency state, the student movement existed only transitory and always exactly only in these mobilizing actions themselves, that means that the student movement actually did not exist in terms of organization outside these actions, with the exception of smaller, fundamental groups which worked at higher schools. But as a mass movement the student movement existed only in these actions themselves at that time. The last winter term, which ended just now, has shown us — and I think that this statement can be generalized for all the higher schools in the Federal Republic Germany — that in this phase the student movement is experiencing for the first time an organizational separation, the first separation, so to say, between action and organization. The action in the time of Springer-mobilization and of the campaign against emergency law, and the organization now at the universities in an organized strike against these technocratic tendencies; and here there appears for the first time and in a concrete form a possible strategy, a possible analysis of the classes, which can develop on the basis of the analysis of this shift in the form of communication, since this form of communication can be the central, more and more central, moment of the revolutionary struggle in the metropolises of latecapitalist society.

At the end I would like to put a question to comrade Supek. At the end of your contribution you warned — at least I understood you so — that the alternative *liberte* or *bon vivre* was not to be decided in favour of *bon vivre*. I think that this distinction is not sharp enough, that it is too idealistic. I would like to ask you that you make it more precise — because we must struggle with this distinction, if I can make it precise in our sense as with distinction. You certainly know it that some two years ago the movement got consolidated as a movement so that its members, or rather participant individuals, developed what we call the anti-authoritative need, consciousness. This means a vague struggle against very definite moments of a political struggle, that is any decisions on the basis of which we can conclude that these individuals are ready to renounce the short-term satisfaction of such anti-authoritative needs and emancipation needs in favour of a certain discipline of a long-term political struggle for these needs. I think that this very problem, as you mentioned it, presents itself in a different way in this dimension. But I would like to ask you to make your contribution more concrete in this sense; I have asked my question for the sake of such concreteness.

#### R. SUPEK, ZAGREB:

I would like to answer to your question in a few words. When speaking about »good life« as a life ideal I thought of the philosophy of good life opposite to which I put the philosophy of freedom. I did not speak about the nature and the distribution of wealth and poverty in our society. The problem of the true wealth and poverty in the contemporary world is a very important problem, especially when we have to do with relations which are not only class relations, but rather the relations between the rich and the poor countries; this is the problem of the third world. Here we are concerned with the question of ideology emerging in developed countries, a philosophy determined by the perpetual development of science and technics, and which as such hides the problem of human freedom. We all know that this philosophy is very widespread. We can find it with various reformers, liberals, with the advocates of the »third road«, with the ideologists of the »post-industrial society«, these ideas are encountered both in capitalist and in socialist societies. Today this philosophy gets special features in socialism, since the charismatic phase of the development of the socialist revolution — when



above all the great ideas of equality, self-sacrifice, and similar were talked about — has already passed, while the technocratic concept is making steady progress, and it ensures an »automatic progress« so that the people need not think about what progress is, what freedom is, what human life is, since all these get realized themselves, thanks to some higher organization and without any effort or co-operation on their part. Man has become a little wheel in a big system managed by experts, scientists and political leaders. Other people take care of his welfare! And it is ensured. This philosophy of good life, which derives from the »automatic progress«, is very widespread today. We can find it with authors of most varied political credos. I think that you come from Berlin. A newspaper called FUTURUM is issued there (also I am a member of its editorial board); in it analyses of the future social states are made on the basis of the »scientific-technical revolution« and progress appears as sure as planning of anything else. Such studies are important, but all the authors are not aware that the future depends on man himself, on his decision whether he is going to live in accordance with the measures of humanity or not. Of course, these speculations concern the developed countries.

There remain the undeveloped countries and there remains the problem of poverty. The demographic expansion is connected with the expansion of poverty which represents a problem in the most rich countries also, so for instance in the United States. The problem of poverty and of food-supply for the people is becoming a more and more important question, which in the framework of the contemporary social relations keeps its revolutionary nature as had before, even though it is getting prominent in a new context. I did not speak about this problems. I just wanted to call your attention to a certain philosophy which daily promises us a »better life«, a higher standard of living, but a decreasing human freedom.

This thing appears to me quite simple. If we succeed in persuading all people — and this is the myth underlying the American civilization and the cause why the working class there is politically more reactionary than the most reactionary bourgeoisie, for instance as regards Viet Nam — that our civilization automatically gives birth to a better life, and that this better life also means human freedom and life worth living. In the name of this philosophy human needs are mass manipulated by advertising and by marketing, and accordingly a new type of man is produced, who is only a product of mass production, in which the people co-operate from their

own will and passively. Marcuse wrote much about this so I would not spend my time with this now. It is more important to *make man aware* that he himself is the carrier of his fate, that he himself must shape his life and not others, that he must decide about his own picture and not the automatized productive processes. Here we encounter the question of human freedom, because man is confronted with the responsibility that he decides about his life. If man is not willing to decide about his life because of a better life, then of course, he does not need freedom! If the cosmonaut in his cosmic module, bound and subject to the control of thousands of electronic computers is a »free man«, then also the man of our civilization is free the moment he becomes reconciled with the technocratic vision of the »big systems«, with their scientific management and with his human subordination. It is important for us that by means of such philosophy the existent social systems are perfectly confirmed, that is that such philosophy has a completely conservative function, that we cannot begin any revolution with it, and give rise to any resistance or protest. The very systematic narrowing down of human freedom in the sense of the possibilities of each individual to decide about things connected with his life, this fundamental democratic question must become the basis of our criticism of the bureaucratic and technocratic social order, which is more and more degrading for man.

In this connection I would like to call your attention to the old concept of pauperism as used by the labour movements in the 19th century, and which is still used today also in undeveloped countries, even though it does not suit this situation. This concept is typical of the Stalinist positivism and of the vulgar economic explanation of the crisis of capitalism (Grossman), but it is not sufficient for the realization of revolutionary movements today in Europe. Apart from the physical poverty the *state and cultural* poverty of man should be emphasized more and more today, his impotence at deciding about important social questions and about distortion of his human needs in the contemporary mass production. For this reason Marx's theory of alienation has become the most important element for the understanding of the nature of human poverty or pauperism, and as such it is the basis of the revolutionary action of the proletariat; of course, Stalinist positivists cannot understand this. Well, these are some elements how to understand the problem of poverty and wealth today. I do not know whether I have been clear enough.

M. KUSY, PRAGUE:

Before concluding our morning discussion, I would like to invite — at the initiative of comrade Bibič — everybody interested to participate in the discussion about the theme »Socialism and Political Sciences« which is to take place before the beginning of the afternoon plenary session.

Z. ROTER, LJUBLJANA:

I would just like to tell you my personal opinion regarding some positions from the discussion of yesterday and today. It is my purpose to introduce some more polemic and dialogue in our meeting, so that our discussion would not turn into a dull meeting, at which everybody states his view while people speak past each other.

*Firstly: about the significance of the theme: socialism and democracy*, I am very sorry that colleague Haug is not here. He laid emphasis on the question regarding this significance, and expressed his view that the theme socialism and democracy was rather vague, and that finally socialism and democracy were synonyms. From the theoretical point of view he is right and I agree with him. But since there exist practical reasons to make the theme formulated in this very way the topic, I endeavoured in the course of our preparations to give this very title to our discussion.

I think that we must proceed from the real state as regards democracy in socialist countries and in relations among them. We must not only establish deformations as regards democracy in many socialist countries, but can also say that there exist countries in which there is no democracy in the real sense of this word. This can be seen especially in those socialist countries in whose policy there exists one monopolist subject only, a general subject, who takes decisions about everything, who continually speaks about democracy, but who really manipulates all the social groups and man as an individual. The question about the significance of the discussion about socialism and democracy is posed even more sharply when in the light of the relations *among* socialist states.

I a private talk with a comrade from West Germany I said — and now I am going to repeat this in public — that from the point of view of democracy I cannot see any difference between the intervention of the United States in Viet Nam and the intervention of the Soviet Union in Czechoslovakia. In both cases we have to do with an imperialist deed,

undemocratic in its very essence, and that is why I am sure that this action justifies the discussion about socialism and democracy.

If we inquire about the level of democracy in our state (I have in my mind Yugoslavia), then we also cannot be satisfied. I think that the profound possibilities of a democratic life in policy have only begun to be established, and similarly the will and conscious direction towards the realization of democracy in the proper sense of this word are only being established now.

I have carefully followed the whole discussion here, and I must say that I have learned many a thing and that this discussion has enriched me personally; everything what I have experienced persuades me that the discussion about socialism and democracy is significant, and that finally also the endeavours in our country to really establish democracy in all its dimensions are significant.

*Secondly.* Yesterday and today we spoke about the apathy of the masses. I carefully listened to the colleagues from West Germany who called attention to the fact and established that apathy represented a great obstacle for a really revolutionary action. One of the reasons for this apathy of the masses has already been mentioned today: the manipulations by the means of media of mass communication. I would like to add something to this: here we have to do with a systematic indoctrination concerning the good life as the only aim of human existence, an indoctrination successfully performed by these mass media. In speaking about the apathy of the masses in capitalist countries, I see the second reason for this apathy in the belief of these masses, that there exists no other social alternative of a better life.

Now we can start our discussion of the bureaucratic model of socialism. I am sure that the affirmation of the bureaucratic model of socialism is that fact which prevents us from overcoming this apathy of the masses, which makes it impossible for the masses to see and experience the significance of some other alternative, which is and remains — in my view — the humanist model of socialism.

The problem of apathy of the masses is present in socialist countries also, with our country included. In political language we usually say that the masses are disinterested. This comes to expression for instance so that the workers in enterprises — having a formal possibility of optimum participation (that is participation in the sense of power, not in the sense of the participation as it is known in some capitalist countries), — do not want to have this power in enter-

prises, that their participation is very small or even a minimum participation. We must raise the question, why this is so. I think that here we have to do with a feeling of impotence of the masses and workers to influence global decisions, global social and economic decisions which really determine the framework and the possibilities of a working community, enterprise, in which the workers work. The problem of the relation between the possibilities of participation at a local level in the enterprise on the one side and the participation within the framework of a wider social community on the other — the problem of these relations represents a challenge for me, and that is why I am trying to answer the question which I have defined above: though having all the formal possibilities, why do the workers not participate, or rather participate in a lesser extent than would be an optimum extent? The problem of the apathy of the masses in contemporary society certainly merits much attention. I feel most obliged to everybody who has called attention to this problem.

*Thirdly.* Movements and institutions, or rather, the problem of the relation between a movement and institutions. I would like to emphasize immediately that I do not agree with those views which equalize a movement with anarchy and think that every decision for a movement and against an institution represents a decision for anarchy. I think that this is not so. According to its essence a movement is not anarchy. What is characteristic of a movement? The mass interest and co-operation are typical of a movement. A movement is also organized — in a democratic way. In connection with the relation between a movement and an institution I find of the highest importance the question how to prevent the turning of a political movement into a political institutions which is characterized by static qualities, closedness, concentration of power in the hands of smaller groups, concentration of power in elites. Hence my request — also as regards the circumstances in our country — that we must make every effort to revolutionize the existent political institutions so that they would get rid of their institutional nature and again become movements in the full sense of this word.

*Fourthly.* Yesterday a question was raised concerning the student movement with us, or rather, the question why the student movement last year — and we can say also this year — took place outside the existent institutions. I will just give you my personal opinion about the significance and reasons of this. I am quite sure that there are people among us in this hall who are familiar with these problems and I would like to invite them — without naming them — to complete



my views, or rather to inform us about their views, if they do not agree with my views. In my opinion, our student movement last year is in essence a protest against closed political institutions, and it demands that they be revolutionized and that student co-operate with equal rights in political and social decision-making. My answer to this question has been very short, I would just like to add that I explain also the strikes in our enterprises in this way, irrespective of the form these strikes have.

*Fifthly.* Yesterday it was said that various forms of direct democracy should not be fatishized in the circumstances of socialist democracy, since, for instance, a referendum also has its bad sides. Of course, I agree with this. Everything has its good and bad sides. Still I think that it is absurd to call attention to the bad sides of direct democracy in the position when these forms of direct democracy have not come in being yet. We had referendums. Typically, these referendums concerned minor issues, while we had no referendum concerning global problems, problems of general importance. Thus if we have taken this example for our discussion about the forms of direct democracy, in my view we should not speak too much about the bad sides of these forms, we should rather make every effort that this and also other forms of direct democracy get fully established. Otherwise the discussion about the bad side might be understood also as a manipulation by means of which the transition from the formal discussion about direct democracy to the realization of direct democracy should be prevented.

*Sixthly.* If I understood it correctly, it was said today that the thesis about the legitimacy of the existence and discussion about the existence of various models of socialism should not be fatishized. That it would be more appropriate, or rather better, to investigate the experiences of the first, second, third and fourth country, irrespective of the fact, whether we have to do with countries with the so-called socialist power, or countries in which there exist movements to establish power on socialist foundations. I do not agree with this proposal. I agree that individual investigation is needed, but I also agree with those who say that the discussion about various models of socialism is not only legitimate but also necessary, since this discussion in our actuality speaks about the existence of at least two models of socialism, that is the bureaucratic-etatist model with all the consequences, which were discussed today by comrade Vreg, and the endeavour to establish a theoretical and practical humanist model. That is why I insist that it is not only legitimate but also our duty to stand for democracy and socialism. Thank you.

#### D. CLAUSSEN, FRANKFURT:

Even though it may appear as a movemeent away from the discussed problems I would still like — in order to avoid misunderstandings — to speak about the paper of Mr. Tomberg from Argument, Berlin. It is my purpose to refute the wrong ideas presented in his analysis and to explain our attitude, that is the attitude of the German revolutionary students movement towards socialism and towards the existent socialist countries, and especially our insistence on the analysis of the forms of mutual relations. I must unfortunately be short, so my contribution cannot be either complete or theoretically integral.

Mr. Tomberg formulated three points which do not correspond either historically or logically to the experiences of the student movement. They are in accordance with his distorted phenomenological presentation of our practice. The origin of our movement was — similarly to the orgin of the Yugoslav revolutionary student movement — the criticism of the imperialist crimes of the United States in Viet Nam. At the beginning we linked our movement to liberalist consciousness. In the sixties it became possible in West Germany to break out of the black and white concept of friends and enemies, characteristic of the cold war, without falling under the pressure of solidarity with the revisionist post-Stalinist policy of the German Democratic Republic, or of the collaborationist, real policy of the Soviet Union. We began with anti-imperialist actions against the American aggression, against the dictatorship in Persia, etc. We learned two things from these actions; (1) the protest was not taken in consideration as long as we co-operated in the carnival of the »right to demonstrate«; (2) later, when we broke the rules of the game, as set by the police and the state, the potential of violence of capitalist society — which had been hidden since the defeat of Fascism — became manifest in the form of police reprisals.

The integrative will of the state for the reform of higher school and at the same time also at the general political level, the preparation of a direct transition to a state of emergency through laws on emergency state appeared to us relatively soon and in a clear way as a farreaching preparation for the liquidation of the revolutionary student movement and even more farreaching as an insurance against any initiative of the proletariat. Through the anti-authoritative action at the university we broke the veil of non-political sciences. With plebiscitary mass teachins at the university we succeeded to attain the establishment of our movement as minority and at the same time also a mobilization against the disciplining,

technocratic reform of higher schools which was more and more conceived of as the »laws on the emergency state at the university«. In West Germany, and especially in Berlin, the reaction called more and more openly to persecution. All our explanations about this manipulations seemed to have no effect. The attempt to kill Rudi Dutschke forced us to violent resistance action, against this manipulation, when we attacked one of their centres of Springer's trust. The participation of young workers — amounting to 30% of the participation of our great action — was a surprise for us, and brought about in us the illusion of a short-term mobilization of the proletariat. This illusion was connected with our wrong idea that through non-parliamentary pressure we could prevent the passing of the law on emergency state. Since the emergency laws were passed without friction, and since the reformist trade-unions, and the revisionist and relatively unimportant communist party refused to agitate for a general strike, we got rid of this illusion. The process of the formation of an opposition was very fast and is even faster today. Since it became more and more clear that the authoritative state was going to liquidate the student movement we organized resistance in the form of self-organization at higher schools, and this resulted in long strikes at higher schools in the course of the last term, and in the form of basic groups in which organizational help was offered to workers in preparations for direct political actions in enterprises and outside them.

On page 5 of his text Tomberg says: »This self-decision must be arrived at through nothing else but the self. It must be realized so that it be practiced here and now. Thus the problem of the revolution is reduced to the problem of the change of the rules of the game: if all the people who depend on wages refuse to live according to the rules of the game of bourgeois democracy and decide to acknowledge the rules of the game of direct democracy, then democracy is thus realized.« What Mr. Tomberg is saying gives a completely distorted picture of our practice. In our struggles at university, which were answered by sharpened reprisals, we have learned better than ever that this system can be overthrown only by means of force. But not in the sense of the military anti-strategy as in the third world, because Mr. Tomberg has not understood that selforganization which is presented in occupation of universities and factories represents the force which can give serious troubles to this system. We, however, do not entertain illusions that we can pose the question of power. Today it is of high importance that we organize resistance, that we stabilize consciousness and that we ensure points of departure for further developing strategy of clearing

up in connection with action. This will not be possible without compromises of institutional nature, that is why the reproach of utopia is ridiculous.

At the end only a few words about a reappearing reproach: sons of the bourgeois intelligentsia are trying to secure for themselves privileges also in socialist movements. Irrespective of the theoretical nonsense, which cannot be refuted in short, I would like to ask: Does Mr. Tomberg not see that the safety of the bourgeois intelligentsia was ensured by the integrity of the bourgeois forms of relations and that it was definitely broken by the break-down of bourgeois society on the basis of the capitalist way of production as preserved by the intervening state. In spite of its privileges the bourgeois intelligentsia has sunk, and these privileges are recognized by the intelligentsia itself. In this transitional phase we must use them for the struggle against the authoritative state, which can certainly end only if we can practice positive models for the establishment of the future society through the production of new forms of relations in self-organization. It is true, for our decentralized work we cannot state any modus of centralization. Tomberg's demand for centralization is technologically shortened, with Marx it was historically deduced. Mr. Tomberg gives up the component of Marx's theory of »radical and reckless criticism«; we are sure that we must break the state apparatus, which in liberalism represented a special, non-economic power, but which has become a general instrument of repression today. We cannot start the realization of this revolutionary, emancipational aim with the belief in an apparent »realistic« life insurance of a possibility of a »socialist industrial society«. I am not reproaching Mr. Tomberg that he does not know what this society should look like, but rather that he simply does not see the conditions of the possibility of a revolutionary movement.

Tomberg has written: »If the anti-authoritative APO has come to know what power is opposite to it, it can either resign to its fate or to undertake a policy conscious of its aims, which is not embarrassed if it has to make a compromise with its enemy, if this is in the interest of the circumstances, and which can make use of the existent institutions also, if only to finally abolish them and put better ones in their place.« These most general generalizations, which I have just quoted, disqualify his paper as an analysis of the experiences of APO. Apart from this he also misrepresents our relation to socialist countries, and this we shall be able to correct in the criticism of the traditional theory of the party and state as planned for tomorrow. The last paragraph of his

paper: »There exist signs that on the basis of the acquired experiences not only the minority in APO will come to a more realistic policy. The exact effect can hardly be established at the time being, since the process of clarification is still continuing.«<sup>1</sup> This last paragraph of his paper gives hope to all revisionists and sectarians. The adjustment of the arguments of SEV and the German Communist Party in Tomberg's paper is shocking, and in the last consequence it changes this paper from a non-solidary criticism into an anti-revolutionary calumny.

What gives us the right to speak about categories of revolution and contra-revolution, even though we are not in the classic crisis position? Perhaps from the answer to this question there results a communication basis of the concept of a non-established revolutionary movement — in a way a *contradictio in adjecto* — in socialist countries in Europe. I do not want to deny the specific difference between the organization of late-capitalist and socialist countries, still the ideological convergence of the ruling technocrats regarding the problems of industrial society points to an essential shift. Technocratization of society, functionalization of the forms of mutual relations, and the increased efficiency of production create an integral system on both sides, especially because this has become seemingly rational due to the flourishing technology and exploitation. The possibility of a »transcendental ideology«, as formulated by Herbert Marcuse, breaks down through the functionalization of the social superstructure by the organization of production and the entire social process of life. This functionalization of the superstructure is only a tendency, against which we can struggle by resistance, proceeding above all from the groups with privileged consciousness, especially the students. Functionalization of society at the same time makes topical the historical, ideological remnants. In West Germany we proceed from liberal consciousness, which the state is trying to liquidate, in socialist countries one could proceed from the socialist essentials which have become phrases of propaganda. The moment this criticism becomes practical in the form of actions there begin punishment decrees, because of which the authoritative state comes under legitimate compulsion, which in turn reproduces the appearance of the remnants of the inherited emancipation ideology. Self-organization of opposition outside the institutions plays an important role in this. The strong repression exercised by institutions forces upon these movements an

---

<sup>1</sup> Tomberg's Paper is published here in revised version, without this paragraph which appeared in original text. (Editors' note)



anti-institutional nature. The mobilization for representation in institutions, for taking over power on the part of party oligarchies, is a historical anachronism in European countries today, no matter whether socialist or late-capitalist. The self-organization of the movement in struggle of necessity encountering enemies and the anticipation of the future society have passed from the anti-authoritative resistance against the discipline of technocrats, which was reflected in the form of direct actions, into the process of differentiation between an organization tending towards the creation of equal, solidary forms of mutual relations among comrades and thus at the same time self-discipline for the repressive political struggle, and the strategy of action which in accordance with the needs in a pre-revolutionary position inaugurates a widening of relations. On the basis of this anti-technocratic resistance, which must become the beginning of the building a long-term socialist, revolutionary movement with us, we are greeting and explicitly expressing our solidarity with all revolutionary, anti-technocratic movements, like the independent Yugoslav student movement, which for us represents the first hopeful guarantee that socialist theory will not turn into a propaganda slogan of the ruling bureaucracy, but that in the seemingly »socialist« countries this theory will finally be realized in practice.

#### Z. MLINAR, LJUBLJANA:

I would like to link my discussion to a few problems mentioned by colleague Zdenko Roter. I would like to speak about the problem of the social-political co-operation of the masses in socialist countries. Before touching upon the essential question I would like to call your attention to a kind of a general tendency in the present world which involves very odd contradictions.

In the processes of social-economic development there appear two opposite tendencies. On the one side we encounter the tendency to increase the education of the masses, to increase the role of women and youth in social life, to shorten the working time and to increase the amount of leisure, to improve the social-economic position of the population, to better the cultural level of citizens, etc. On the other hand we encounter a simultaneous tendency, in spite of all these, to narrow down the possibility of co-operation of these masses in actual decision-making in society. At the same time we encounter a tendency towards the alienation of the political power in socialist and in capitalist countries; we can establish

a tendency trying to concentrate influence and political power, to subordinate small nations to the great political powers, we face a process of bureaucratization, professionalization, etc.

I have stated all these because I think that we often exaggerate when representing the nature of institutional changes as attained in several East European countries. We often consider these institutional changes to be fundamental, in a sense even the only factors, in transition from capitalist to a socialist society. Many disappointments — after the revolution, after taking over power, regarding the determining of the programmes of the integration of the working masses, and especially of the lower layers in a social-political system — result from a too strong emphasis upon the nature of institutional, or rather organizational changes (under which there persists the old basis). Thus the working class, or rather the »lower layer« in capitalist society was the starting-point of the revolutionary action, and still today, after several institutional changes, we can see that these same layers represent a kind of marginal groups in most of the so-called »socialist« societies.

Several reasons for this state can be found. I shall try to illustrate here only a few of them. The empirical studies in our and also several other countries show that in practice there exists a kind of polarization, or rather a tendency that on the one side we have an accumulation of »negative« criteria (negative in the sense that they prevent a real political influence, a political co-operation). We still have workers with a minimum income, with a minimum political influence, who are also the least interested in these processes, at the same time having also the smallest aspirations to influence these processes at all, etc.

On the other side we have an accumulation of what could be termed »positive« characteristics — in the sense of enabling political co-operation, that is those who have the highest income, the highest level of education, the highest aspirations, the most complete information, the highest position in the political sense and similar, which fact brings about the so-called accumulation of leading positions, accumulation of influence, accumulation of power, etc.

It seems that this picture appears on the basis of several investigations in Yugoslavia and it is also in accordance with various investigations in other countries. This situation does not appear momentarily only. Citizens belonging to the lowest layers of population, according to criteria as mentioned before, have not got these positions today only, but they also show a kind of self-complacency and do not want to exchange

their position. Those who have absolutely no influence upon the political decisions, who do not know what is taking place in their narrower or wider social community, have no leading role whatsoever, and *they also do not want, or expect, or hope* to change this state. They are satisfied with the situation as it is.

This is what is worrying me, this points to the very contradictory questions which have remained open inspite of all the institutional changes. At the same time it leads us to the conclusion that the masses of citizens will have to be led and directed.

Colleague Roter and some other speakers mentioned some reasons for this state. We have a more or less uniform model of the political system and at the same time very heterogeneous and highly differentiated social, economic basis, on which this social-political institutions are operating. As regards this I would like to pose the question: in what extent do these institutions reflect heterogeneity, and if they do not reflect it, is not one of the important reasons of the low level of participation and social co-operation with us to be sought here?

I think that in most of socialist countries after the revolution there existed a tendency to define the general interest more or less a priori. At the same time special interests were prevented from coming to the surface; there existed a kind of fear that the individual and special interests might threaten the integration of the society. The basis for this was furnished by a mechanistic interpretation of social unity; a mechanistic interpretation in the sense that only identity and uniformity furnish a firm basis for social integration. I think, however, that the very *prevention of expression of special and individual interests* is one of the reasons that also the *foundation of wide political co-operation is eliminated*. If man has only the possibility to play the role of manifesting general adherence to the political system to which he belongs, then his real role is very limited and far from what I consider to be the socialist and democratic role of a personality in a really socialist society.

That is why I think that one of the fundamental reasons for our having so poorly developed co-operation of the masses of citizens is *because in our political system we have not left room enough for very different interests*. Citizens cannot be motivated for participation only in order to confirm something what has been a priori defined, what has been defined as a general interest.

Today and yesterday we listened to several interesting problems concerning the student movement in the world. That is why we should speak about the student movement in Yugoslavia also. The first speaker at today's meeting, comrade Roter tried to answer in short to the question raised yesterday by somebody: Why is the student movement in Yugoslavia outside the institutional system? I would like to add a few views without making an attempt at a complex answer to this complicated question. In my contribution I am going to speak only about those origins of the student movement in Yugoslavia which are of wider social significance, that is about those origins which proceed from the global social relations; for this reason I am going to neglect the specific university problems, which are to some extent similar in all the European countries. This approach will be also of special interest since it reveals some open internal contradictions which are characteristic of the Yugoslav society in general.

Among the origins of the student movement in Yugoslavia we must mention the problem of equality. As you certainly know, in Yugoslavia the idea of equality developed so that in the first periods of the development of Yugoslavia after the second world war the idea of complete and instantaneous equality, that is complete and instantaneous egalitarianism became predominant. Later this idea was replaced by the ideal of equality as a long-term goal, which brought about various forms of social differentiation in practice. I think that social differentiation which is based upon work, abilities, knowledge, etc. is not bad, only those forms of differentiation which spring from deviant bases (privileges, unequal opportunity) are bad and these very forms of differentiation represent in reality one of the important origins of the student movement in Yugoslavia. As regards this I must add a specific student aspect. Students and youth in Yugoslavia had a profound experience of the social mobility or social immobility with us. As you certainly know, the school and the system of schooling are one of the important channels of vertical mobility. Different layers with us have not got equal opportunity to get into various levels of the system of schooling, and this fact makes it impossible for them to get included into the process of vertical social mobility. Finally these problems of insufficient social mobility and of insufficient care for the financially weak student resulted in a defective distribution of individual cadres in Yugoslavia. Also the second problem faced by the generation of students is connected with the problem of equality. Here we must mention the

problem of the employment of young specialists and their migration to foreign countries.

As the second origin of the student movements in Yugoslavia I would like to state political problems. Today comrade Roter called attention to the fact that the closedness of institutions was one of the reasons that the student movement was developing outside the system. I also think that we must underline the important social contrast about which professor Supek spoke today, that is the dualism of our political system, the contrast between etatism and self-government, which also represents one of the important origins of the student movement with us. The political power of those layers which are the carriers of the *etatist* structure, is still so prominent and concentrated that it blocks self-governmental pluralism, which has not been able to develop sufficiently. As regards this I would like to call your attention to the inadaptability of political institutions in the sense of making it possible for the important political subjects to get included in the existent institutions. You all know that there exist unformal groups which operate outside the existent institutions and this proves that these political institutions are not sufficiently adapted to the efficient work of various political subjects. The enumerated political problems: the closedness and inadaptability of institutions and the blocking of selfgovernment were at the same time also specific, topical problems of students. Among political problems, origins of the student movement in Yugoslavia, we can also list the problem of communications, above all the public means of communication. It is highly characteristic that in the course of the student protests an important criticism of the public means of communication was raised due to their insufficient objectivity in the reports and analyses of the student movement. Coming to the end with our outline of the political problems, origins of the student movement in Yugoslavia we must finally say that the student movement began as a rather wide movement outside institutions, as a revolt and protest, still later on a part of the student movement gradually got included in the social system as a kind of a permanent political activity.

As the third origin of the student revolt and of student movement in Yugoslavia we could mention — in a few words — the problem of generations. I think that there exists no bridge between the old generation which conducted the revolution and the youngest generation, no bridge consisting of a medium, influential generation. This state came into being because the political power was concentrated in the hands of the old generation for a long time. The various views



and interests of the younger generation are not identical with the interests of the older generation. These views and interests are not in accordance with each other, because the younger and the older generation are not sufficiently connected with each other.

Among the origins of the student movement in Yugoslavia we can mention one more problem, characteristic of Yugoslavia, namely the fact that science and specialist professional qualification have not got the appropriate position in society. It is interesting that in Slovenia — as the best developed republic — the structure of the qualification of the leading cadres at various levels is very poor.

At the end I would like to mention two more characteristics of the student movement which — in my view — are specific of Yugoslavia, which distinguish the student movement with us from other student movements in the world. First: the student movement in Yugoslavia did not launch any attack against the declared fundamental basis of our social system. These foundations are — speaking in schematic terms — the system of self-government, subordination of the political system to the interests of man, abolition of inequality, humanism, etc. The Yugoslav student movement attacked above all the considerable differences between what is declared and the actual practice. The second important characteristic of the student movement in Yugoslavia is that this student movement began in the period of social development when the different special interests gradually came to expression which fact gave rise to new conflicts; Dr. Mlinar spoke about this before; and at the same time there open possibilities of gradually solving these conflicts. These are some specific characteristics of the student movement in Yugoslavia. Thank you.

#### V. STANOVČIĆ, BELGRADE:

The relation citizen-power, that is the relation of citizen to power and of power to citizen, is one of the fundamental relations in every political system, and in a broader sense also a criterion whether a certain political system is democratic or autocratic. The existence or nonexistence of real possibilities, of institutional channels through which citizens can influence the choice and constitution of organs of power, and can exchange legally the group in power, represent one of the essential criteria of existence or absence of democracy. As regards the position of citizens before power, there exist — in my view — numerous »unsolved problems« or »imperfections«, to put it mildly, or authoritative or autocratic defor-

mations in the existent political systems of socialist countries. In order to realize the rights as formally possessed, in order to make these declared rights something in reality, the citizen must above all be freed from voluntarism and subjectivism of power. The solution of this problem, which (with small exceptions) has not got an adequate form and content in any socialist state, is — in my view — to be sought on the level of the democratic, political institutionalization of socialist societies; very little or nothing has been done in this field.

I do not understand the political institutionalization so that there exists a complex of institutions, existent in socialist and also other societies, but rather as a process of limiting various carriers of power in the execution of power, as the influence of citizens in elections, as the constitution of the organs of power, and as a way in which power is executed and carried out. We encounter various concepts and criticisms of institutionalism, but a great deal of this criticism does not see this aspect of the process of political institutionalization. The legal side of such a process of political institutionalization should be legalism, again in a deeper sense, still not in the sense of the existence of certain perpetually valid and previously known legal and political rules, binding even the carriers of power themselves, and to which they would be subordinated.

From the historical point of view, several countries which are building socialism today, or consider themselves to be building it, have really never had legalism in the true sense of this word. In these states the political relations have always been solved on the basis of the quantity of political power, as possessed by certain carriers or certain groups. In this framework, and if it is solved in this way, this represents a painful problem of all socialist countries, namely the problem of succession of the highest political functions.

If we think that the way in which political power is limited is of essential importance for the process of the democratic constituting of the political system, we must remember a few elements, which provide a relatively real guarantee to the eventually established barriers in the relation to the competence of power.

The complex of rights and liberties of citizens represents an important limitation of political power. If these rights and liberties really mean something, then they must be that barrier across which the competence of power does not reach, and when coming to this sphere, it is operating illegally. As far as I know, we can state only a very small number of rights »given« to citizens in socialist countries which cannot be removed over night, limited or abused.

The second possibility of limiting power, which must come to expression in the political system, is a dispersion of power, that is a deconcentration of power, since if power is concentrated in one centre it can be controlled and limited only with great difficulty. This dispersion of power is not real unless power is transferred, or returned to autonomous social groups. The theory of the absence of conflicts in socialist society is in reality a simple phrase of propaganda. The conflict-free society does not exist for a very simple reason: because the various positions of people coming from their different professions, with different levels of education, different ethnic origin, different geographic distribution, etc., create groups with varying interests. All these interests cannot be satisfied simultaneously because they themselves are conflicting. A democratic society is not characterized by the absence of conflicts, but rather by the way in which these conflicts are solved. It is of special importance for the process of the democratization of socialist society whether there exist possibilities of establishment of autonomous, independent centres of economic activity or not. I would even say that the possibility or impossibility of establishing independent economic existence of individuals is one of the essential economic preconditions of democracy in the political sphere. Every authoritative and autocratic power, beginning with slaveholding society and including the feudal, Stalinist type, etc., knew that the possibility of man's subordination, of making man a political subject, presupposed the impossibility of this subject to independently procure the means necessary for his existence.

The classic instrumentarium of the division of power must find an expression in the institutions of socialist society. And especially the concentration of political, economic and ideological power in identical centres represents a permanent source of totalitarian danger for socialist societies.

The change of the relation citizen-power must come to expression above all in the sphere of the electoral system and electoral process. If the carriers of power are not simple mandatories of voters in a real sense, then we cannot speak about the democratization of these political systems and about democracy. That is why a democratic electoral system and really democratic electoral processes represent one of the essential criteria, presuppositions and foundations of the conclusion whether a certain political system is democratic or not. If we have to do with a process of self-reconstruction of the political elite, of self-recruitment of elite, and if the connection with the electoral body is discontinued, or through different political combinations an illusion, a facade, created,

while there is no possibility of a real dialogue between the voters and the political top, or rather there exists no true influence of the voters on the constitution of this top, then we cannot speak about democracy in the true meaning of this word. At the end I would just like to put a question: Why do the political, representative bodies in socialist countries not have that position and role in real life which they should have in accordance with the corresponding constitutional and other legal documents, inspite of the fact that they are constituted under strict supervision, and in spite of the fact that they supervise the electoral process? Why are the representative bodies not the true centre of supreme power, as stated in several legal documents? This question is directly connected with some problems of the position and role of the communist party and of its programe, which are the theme of our discussion tomorrow.

#### V. TRČEK, LJUBLJANA:

I think that the organizers have chosen a good time for the discussion about the significance and questions of the democratic development of socialism. We are namely going through a new phase of the development of industrially developed socialist countries. In the course of recent years several events have shown us that numerous new objective and also subjective circumstances ripen irregularly, making possible and at the same time demanding a faster democratic development in the economic and the political sphere of social relations in these countries. The stronger pressure of conservative forces, new theoretical formulas and concepts, a widespread use of various forms of pressure and similar are really an answer to the recognition of new social needs and new possibilities of the realization of the democratic and human goals of socialism.

That is why the fact that we emphasize the significance of democracy for further development of socialism is fully justified and has a deeper social-political significance. But I think that we must go a step further. For our further co-operation, and especially for the co-operation of the boards of editors participating in this meeting, is would be of high importance to direct our work, our considerations and investigations to other questions also. We should above all investigate profoundly the movement of social contradictions in the present phase of the development of industrially developed socialist countries. Our knowledge in this field is still rather limited and one-sided. We should investigate also

the true historic possibilities of the realization of democratic and humanist aims, and also the subject of this struggle. Apart from this it is also necessary that we investigate on the scientific basis also the questions of the national and the international strategy of the political struggle for the realization of the new social contents of socialism.

In recent years social movements in numerous world spheres are passing into a new historic phase. The reasons, the historic aims and the characteristics of these social movements vary in different countries. But the new qualitative developmental characteristics are general, demanding new scientific endeavours to investigate all these phenomena and to help on this basis with the formulation of appropriate knowledge, necessary for a successful political and ideological struggle.

I would like to call your attention to a few questions concerning socialist countries. It is becoming more and more obvious that the industrially better developed socialist countries are coming in that phase of their historic development in which the objective possibilities of an etatist economic system are more and more limited, and in which knowledge is ripening that the present etatist system no longer enables the optimal and rational development of economy and society. In this historic moment the demands for increased democracy do not reflect only the tendency of man towards freedom, they are not only a humanist ideal, but rather represent also the condition of a faster economic development in these countries.

Still, we must not stop at this estimate of social movements. I think that we have not got to do only with a crisis of the old social institutions and traditional ideologies, but rather with the »crisis« of scientific investigations, the crisis of scientific criticism of the existent society. That is why we are often embarrassed or enjoy a short-term satisfaction that we have replaced one stereotype concept of society by another, which is similarly one-sided. For this reason I think that it is the central task of the progressive scientists and publicists to heighten the level of scientific criticism of society. In this connection I think that the investigation of the laws of social movements at the present level of development should be the most important sphere of our endeavours. I have in my mind above all the nature and the reasons of social contradictions in socialist societies. You are certainly familiar with the most recent theories of »the imperialist ideological diversion«, which should be the main reason of the social and ideological tension in communist movement and in socialist countries. That is why the problems of social



contradictions in these countries must be in the centre of our scientific efforts, and similarly also in the centre of our ideological struggle against the conservative forces in socialist movement. These are above all those contradictions which arise in the development of socialism from socialist social circumstances. The conservative forces in socialist movement like to equalize the initial forms of socialism, springing from unfavourable historic circumstances, with the very essence and perspective of socialism. Thus there arises an absurd situation, in which some political forces try to use even the authority of the international communist movement in order to defend their position that nothing needs to be changed in the political system of socialist states. Such situation is absurd also because this same forces at the same time speak about the great changes in the material basis of socialist countries after the revolution. This is, to put it in this way, an elementary mistake which certainly does not derive from the lack of knowledge of the fundamentals of the science on society, but rather from the interest that the conservative forces keep their positions in socialist society. Thus I would put as the first question: the question of more profound investigations of the contradictions in socialist countries; my thesis is that we should obstinately insist upon the assertion that these contradictions — known to everybody in socialist countries — derive above all from the lagging behind of the socialist theory, socialist practice.

The foreign ideological pressure upon socialist society can be successful only in so far and at the time when the progressive forces of socialist society are not able to express more appropriately the new social needs and the needs of the progressive social development. If they cannot do this, then a maneuver place is open to the influence of foreign anti-socialist forces. Now we are not only concerned with the question »socialism or capitalism«; the historic question »what kind of socialism« is in the centre of our attention. If this is the central theme of our time in better developed, industrial, socialist societies, then it is quite natural that the arguments of the conservative forces break down how to settle these contradictions and how all the means are justified in the interest of socialist development.

It is quite clear that we cannot accept a vision of the relations among socialist forces, which requests that all the states »keep step with« the strongest socialist state and develop in dependence of a certain »average«, which should be valid for all the states. Such tendencies are rather conservative, because they try to frustrate the progressive develop-

ment of those countries (for instance: Czechoslovakia) which have got the possibilities and sufficient force to move at a higher speed.

In such a position we must examine also numerous views regarding the relations among socialist forces and the problems of the world strategy of the struggle for socialism. I think that today in the new version a position is being established that the centre of the struggle for socialism be above all in the international field and that the military force of socialist states is the decisive factor in the development of socialism in the world. I think that experience has proved that socialism cannot exist without internal socialist forces. The aid from outside, the aid of the socialist forces of the world — according to me — can and must be limited to the creation of optimal international circumstances for a more natural development of each national socialist movement. That is why it is quite clear that the unity of the international socialist movement cannot constitute a purpose unto itself and so the question: How to create favourable conditions for a free development of the socialist movement in each individual country, is much more important. In the framework of each country we must support the development of various, autonomous, socialist forces. This means that I am against any international monopoly, and against the monopoly of any socialist force.

I think that we are facing a period of very fierce encounters, and a period of a complicated development of socialist society. I am sure that at the time being we cannot see the full complexity of these questions, which we are going to encounter in the future development of socialist society. The more prominent gets the view that the problems inside a nation as well as in international relations be settled by force, or from the point of view of a conceptual monopoly, the more complicated will the future socialist development be. Even if the position of democratic settlement of the problems in socialist society is victorious, we must not entertain any illusions that this development will take place without complications. This is true of our country and of other socialist countries also. That is why we must anticipate a longer historic period with conflict situations. I still feel that the development within recent years shows that there are no reasons for pessimism. The forces of the conceptual monopoly and of etatism have got several strong blows in many spheres, and the »successes« of the conservative forces, as for instance the pressure on Czechoslovakia, are of necessity temporary only from the historic point of view.

Now we must accelerate the process of the constitution of the progressive forces both in traditional movements and in new movements which are coming into being now (as the new left).

I think that now we must stand for as fast a constitution of these progressive forces as possible, and this above all an ideological constitution. Our first aim should be to turn the »criticism of scientists« into a »scientific criticism«. Because the criticism of scientists is unfortunately not always at the level of scientific criticism. When saying this I have in my mind everything I have read about the problems of our time.

Of course, in the days of our discussion at this Colloquium we shall not be able to find appropriate answers to the great questions of our contemporary existence. That is why I would like to suggest that the board of editors continue their co-operation also after the end of this Colloquium. I am for an international co-operation and for an international dialogue, which will make it possible for us to produce as perfect a scientific criticism and a picture of the contemporary world as possible, and to define scientifically the aims, forms and methods of our struggle.

#### B. DEBENJAK, LJUBLJANA:

We are all discussing socialism here, we all know that there is no agreement among us about what to understand by socialism. We speak about »various models of socialism«, about »various ways of building *the* socialism«, etc. We assume that in spite of this variety we have to do with one »socialism« alone.

Perhaps the very posing of this question indicates imprisonment in ideological distortion. I would like to call your attention to the classic sentence of Marx: »If I say the Roman Law and the German Law are both laws, then this is self-evident. But if I say that law, this abstract noun, *is realized* in the Roman Law and in the German Law, in these concrete laws, then this relation becomes mystical.« (This sentence comes from the first edition of *Kapital*.<sup>1</sup>) If we apply this methodological observation to socialism, then we shall consider that those interpretations which lead to the conclusion that »Socialism«, the abstract noun, is realized, becomes actual, in this or that »way of building« or »model«, etc., are mystical, that is ideologically distorted. Later — when no »way«, no »model« can be proved to be socialism simply —

<sup>1</sup> *Kleine oekonomische Schriften*, Dietz, Berlin, 1953, p. 271.

this ideological distortion leads to the bitter disappointment that »Socialism« does not exist. We come to the question: Does socialism exist at all? And the answer is: *the* socialism does not exist yet either in the West or in the East, and not at all.

At present there exists a plurality of movements and parties which call themselves »socialist«; we have anti-authoritative socialists, for example the new left, and we have SED, to give the extremes only, the Italian Neo-Fascists called themselves *Movimento sociale*, the prohibited Neo-Nazi party in West Germany called itself *sozialistische Reichspartei*, and its forerunner even *national-sozialistische deutsche Arbeiterpartei*. *Christlich-soziale Union*, which is not very left, furnishes another example for this plurality. Fifty years ago the German social-democrats repressed the German socialist revolution, etc. The *Communist Manifesto* distinguishes three kinds of socialism:

a) »reactionary« socialism (»feudal«, »petty bourgeois«, and »German or true« socialism),

b) »conservative« socialism (»Bourgeois socialism«),

c) »critical-utopian socialism and communism«. The position of the *Communist Manifesto* is outside these three kinds of socialism. Perhaps it would be our task to formulate such a typology of socialisms. Then it would become clear for which pluralism we can be ready, and which of socialisms is still acceptable to us, willing to take the authentic Marx as the point of departure.

The politicians have no difficulty here: for them pluralism means not repelling anybody who now or later may become an ally. Such pragmatic considerations are alien to a theorist. A politician can »lose« »all his illusions about the socialist nature« of this or that movement several times in his life, the illusions created by himself when in need of the support of this or that movement; a theorist is a failure as a theorist, if in his illusion he changes the potential allies into something that they are now.

Thus as a theorist I would not be willing to bring the social system of the Soviet Union in any closer connection with Marx, even though I acknowledge the full right of politicians to see in the Soviet Union a potential ally against American imperialism, but in a similar way I must acknowledge them the right to make devil's pacts with this same imperialism if they are threatened by police-socialism.

The October Revolution was a socialist revolution and no mere take-over of power. The process of its degeneration springs from that capitulation before the overpowering reality of the existent state, when limiting itself to »the building of

socialism in *one* country«, so the beginning of the real world revolution was pushed into futurity. The needs of an underdeveloped society became the canons of socialism, »the building of socialism« took the place of the world revolution. In the words »the building of socialism« lies hidden the total ideological distortion: the building to be built with planning engineers, with »soul-engineers« included, fast industrial development at any cost as the canon of socialism, etc. A system of terrorist efficient society came into being. When the politicians speak about »various ways of building«, they often have in their minds several small »buildings« which ought to be built, whose builders are no longer monopolists but who rather freely compete with one another.

But we must not forget that for Marx it was the world revolution, and not socialism, which could set free human potentialities, that Marx was not concerned with wealth; for him the realm of necessity was rather identical with the »natural« circumstance, in which the production process governs the producers, with circumstances which sprang from shortage of products, from material misery, but which no longer depend upon these circumstances but rather reproduce their own pre-conditions.

We are concerned with breaking »the power of things«, with establishing »community control« by the people over their own conditions of existence, and with accepting the permanent revolution as the only establishment. In the *German Ideology* it stands: »The existent created by communism is the very actual basis to prevent the creation of that existent which is independent of individuals, in so far as it is not yet the product of the intercourse of the individuals themselves.« In the *Jewish Problem* it is stated that historical emancipation is always concerned with adapting the existent circumstances to man »as he is«, and that the communist revolution represent the end of the world order so far, and accordingly revolutionary practice represents a self-alteration by man, as it is emphasized in the third thesis of Feuerbach.

Thus a free alternative has to be presented to late capitalism, and — among the many socialisms — also such a socialism which can be brought into connection with the name of Marx is to be created.

#### J. NETOPILIK, PRAGUE:

I think that the concept of democracy of a political system and socialism is a many-dimensional concept. It should be viewed from the political, sociological-economic aspect and



analysed accordingly. I would just like to say a few words about the problems of these dimensions. When speaking about democracy we must take in account the level of the development of society; a certain kind of direct democracy was possible in undeveloped societies, as for instance in ancient Greece or in Rome. This level of social development and of democracy corresponded to a certain political system. The development of the means of production and the emergence of the technical system of machines brought about a new type of democracy and of political order. This type made possible an efficient and rational management of things. This is bourgeois democracy and a bourgeois political system. It reached its peak in contemporary industrial society. I want to say that also socialist society to a certain extent conforms to the laws of industrial society. The picture of socialism — in my view — depends on the developmental level of the industrial system. An undeveloped industrial system to some extent influences the emergence of bureaucratic socialism, based upon the power of individual persons or individual collectives, on the power these persons exercise upon society. This is the Stalinist type of socialism. Stalinism did not destroy only all the links between the ruling political layers and society, but also all the links inside the political system itself. Thus this system could no longer meet the tasks of a rational and effective building of socialism.

Still, the fact that the industrial system was not developed did not need to result in Stalinist social relations in socialism, as the case of Yugoslavia can show; the high level of development of the industrial level could result in another type of socialism — namely the technocratic-bureaucratic socialism. I want to say that the contemporary social foundations of civilization do not furnish only the possibility of a free and humane socialism, but also the possibility of the development of a technocratic-bureaucratic socialism. The present social foundations of civilization in several dimensions make possible this very type of socialism by subordinating the people to the system of the present division of labour. From this there arises a complex dialectic between the bureaucracy of the technocratic type, which — though being very reactionary — can be very effective also, but which prevents self-activity of the people, and democracy established by such a system, namely the system making possible self-activity of the people. Today the idea of democracy is in a large extent broader and deeper than it used to be, because it has to take in account the many-sided humanization, and the many-sided development of the subject. In my view, this concept includes not only the political sphere, but also the

entire being and activity of the contemporary man. The contemporary development of civilization demands a very rich, active and responsible subject. Socialism is a conscious endeavour to master and to surpass industrialized society, still this surpassing can be realized only by the development of the socialist economy, by the scientific revolution, by a higher level of culture, etc. This is self-abolition of all the barriers of self-activity of the people.

I think that the significance of our Colloquium lies in this. Here we are making every effort for such a type of a political system which would make possible the building of socialism, which will satisfy the needs of the contemporary economic and technical revolution, at the same time making it possible for us to create new possibilities. Being a heir to past achievements of mankind, socialism cannot conform only to the tradition of a few nations. Our post-revolutionary movement must be based on our historic tradition, on our culture, etc. I want to say that the exploitation of the national tradition is no deformation of socialism, it is rather a fundamental way to prevent that socialism change into an abstract system, alienated from the people. A very complicated dialectic between the international and the national road to socialism is taking place here. From this it follows that our model of socialism cannot be used in other countries, that this model is specific of Czechoslovakia, but that it, inspite of this, conforms to the general laws of socialism and expresses the same — since it expresses the need for self-activity of the subject. If the political system in the past was modeled after foreign models, today we want such a political system in which there will be sufficient room for man as the creator of his own fate. We are concerned with such a system which links individual social structures and renovates them, and which makes it possible for man to co-operate in social life not only formally, but rather to develop his human content also. At this level a new type of democracy can be reached. This type can make it possible that we surpass man's alienation, and for this reason it is equal to free humanism. Thank you.

#### **B. MARKIČ, LJUBLJANA:**

In my contribution I would like to touch upon voters and socialist democracy. If we give a short analysis of the development of elections in socialist democracy in Yugoslavia, we could establish that elections with us had a plebiscitary-manifestative nature at the beginning, that they were primarily an expression of socialist patriotism. At the beginning

of the development of our society we above all confirmed the legitimacy of the political regime, political system by means of elections. The development of socialist selfgovernment brought about a different view of the electoral process in the circumstances of socialist democracy. After the idea of a complete monolithism of the socialist system and the ideologized concept of a full uniformity of this system have been rejected, elections can no longer be a mere political manifestation, a mere expression of a more or less abstract patriotism, but must be a part of self-governmental decision-making.

In the course of history elections have often been an object of the alienation of man from power, but they can also be an object of surpassing this alienation. I think that it is of primary importance for the essence of elections in any political system — with socialist system included — that they are not a means of political manipulation. Also the position of social-political organizations in the electoral process is of high importance. I think that we must proceed from the position that in a socialist system nobody can expect that »his party« will ensure him an electoral success in every case, since this would turn elections in a kind of bureaucratic investiture. Group loyalty as a criterion of candidating should disappear. And also a kind of paternalist relation of political organizations towards candidates should disappear. Of course, I am not trying to advocate a »neutral« position of the organized political forces in the electoral process, or a hiding of commitment and engagement. Still, the process of choosing candidates and the rest of the electoral process cannot take place under the pressure of the closer monopolistic party groups, and if the latter »determine« the candidates. I think that elections in socialist countries are becoming more and more real, at least they should be real, and that those electoral results which move around 99,9% and similar tell very little about the real value of the electoral process.

Speaking about our electoral system, I would like to emphasize that the development of the pluralist basis of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia is one of the necessary conditions of the democratization of elections, and that the forum activities of the Socialist Alliance, which we have known so far, become more and more unacceptable, a social anachronism. I think that also non-party electoral competition should be developed in our electoral system. As you certainly know, our political system is not based upon a many-party system, for this reason I think that some electoral alternatives should open in the electoral process. If we acknowledge the fundamental values of socialist system,

apart from a wider electoral programme of the Socialist Alliance of Working People of Yugoslavia there must exist also personal electoral projects of individual candidates. Also political culture should be developed in our electoral process. The very nominism in candidating (one candidate for one position) of the past limited the development of the necessary political culture. Developing pluralism (that is, several candidates for one deputy mandate) of candidates in electoral processes in the socialist world, we must develop and cultivate such a political culture which will lead to a state in which candidates will be capable of a dialogue and also capable to take their defeat in elections as something normal in democratic circumstances, while a political tolerance in the electoral process itself is fully acknowledged. Speaking about political tolerance which should always be present in socialist society, I do not mean by this that political tolerance is to be understood so as to pass over the boundaries of the generally accepted and acknowledged values. A political system proves its stability also by the fact that its carriers are tolerant of other ideas and conceptions, based on socialist positions.

#### I. KRISTAN, LJUBLJANA:

I would like to touch upon the problem of the *assembly system* since our discussion is taking this direction after leaving the general level, the level of socialism in general.

I think that we must agree with the comrade from Bucharest, who stated this morning that democracy could not be reduced to the state, that democracy could not be exhausted within the framework of the state; our theory of self-government proceeds from this very truth that democracy cannot be exhausted in the state and through the very system of self-government we are trying to develop the process of transition from power and from state to society. I also think that it is true that humanism must be one of the immanent categories in this process, since democracy cannot exist without humanism.

Yesterday the question was posed, whether there existed an alternative dilemma between *institutional, representative democracy and direct democracy*. It seems that the participants in this discussion took a negative view regarding this dilemma.

If we think that this dilemma is not possible, and I feel this is the only realistic solution, then we must seek for the solution in *the most democratic and efficient symbiosis* of the institutions of indirect and of direct democracy. The solu-

tion should be sought within the framework of the reality of a given phase and at the given level of the social development.

From this stand-point, questions can be raised in various directions, and above all about the problem what institutions of the representative democracy correspond to certain social circumstances: does the traditional assembly suffice, or should also other forms be sought? Should all the present representative institutions be questioned, as somebody stated yesterday, next, how to recruit the representatives into these representative institutions, since here we have to do with the problems of changing elites, etc., as stated yesterday — I think comrade Babić from Zagreb called our attention to this — further, the question how to make possible as close a connection as possible of the representative bodies with the basis, this is in essence a problem of the control of power, the question of lawfulness, which was emphasized today, further, which are the possible forms of direct decision-making at the global level of society, what is the role of referendum like in this sphere, and similar. Is the referendum really only a form which no longer corresponds to the present level of democracy? This view was also emphasized today and represents one of the views on referendum, etc. In this context we encounter these and other similar questions.

I think that also in this field Yugoslav practice is characterized by an intense search regarding the assembly system, and that Yugoslavia has gone an interesting way for the last twentythree years. According to the Constitution from 1946 we had a *parliament with two houses*, in which two elements were represented: the element of the population, of citizens from the federation, in the Federal Chamber, and the second element, the element of nations, or rather of the federal units, which was represented in the Chamber of Nationalities.

In 1953 an essential alteration took place as regards the assembly system. The assembly kept its two houses, but the element of nations, of the federal units, became secondary thus giving its place to a new element, that is to the Chamber of Producers. Thus instead of the former independent Chamber of Nationalities, in which the republics were represented as federal units with equal rights by equal numbers of representatives, the Chamber of Producers came into being, in which a new element — the element of the producers was represented instead of the element of nations.

With the Constitution from 1953 we got another innovation; the second chamber, The Chamber of Producers was divided in several directions, thus from one chamber we got four specialized self-governmental chambers, that is the Eco-



conomic Chamber, the Chamber of Education and Culture, the Chamber of Social Welfare and Health, and the Organizational-Political Chamber. All these chambers represent the second house to the Federal Assembly, as the first house.

Before full four years had passed from the Constitution from the year 1963 we witnessed a new interesting process which in a way took us back to the position from the year 1946, or rather 1953, namely the emphasized element of the nation, of the federal unit, while the element of the producers was only secondary. According to the new amendments from 1967 and 1968 we now have the Chamber of Nationalities, which is becoming a chamber of primary importance instead of the present Federal Assembly; in this chamber all the republics are represented by equal criteria, irrespective of the size of the republic and of the number of its inhabitants, etc. (These differences are considerable with us: from 500,000 inhabitants to 9 million inhabitants.)

As you can see from this outline we have made every effort to make it possible for all the subjects and all the interests, coming into existence on a pluralist basis, to function most adequately within the structure of the assembly. Apart from this, characteristic self-governmental units have been created, called efficient self-governmental units outside the assembly; these are mainly units in the sphere of education, culture, labour, social protection, etc.

Of course, these efforts, these schemes are only being tried now, and it was stated yesterday already that no ideal results had been attained yet; but our dilemma is not whether to have the institutions of representative democracy or nor, and whether they are to be questioned, our dilemma is connected with what we spoke yesterday, in two directions.

First, are the present forms of representation adequate, are all the spheres of social life and all the interests represented in them in a sufficient extent, not only the short-term ones but also the long-term ones, as comrade Babić stated, and in which directions the new solutions are to be sought. Do there exist any other solutions apart from the ones mentioned in our after-war development.

The second question is the question: how to attain the most efficient connection of these representative institutions with their original basis. Is it enough for this connection if the deputies of the council of working communities are recruited from working organizations, from among the members of workers' council, etc. Practice shows that this is not clear in advance, and today comrade Roter raised the question: »why the workers do not cooperate«, and comrade Mlinar spoke about their opportunity for co-operation.

For this reason this field is often discussed, the structure of the assembly and the number of chambers are discussed to represent most adequately all the interests, and all these discussions and efforts meet with the problem of the political responsibility of the representatives, with the problem of the publicity of their work, and the problem of its lawfulness, etc. I wanted to call your attention to this in connection with this system, the assembly system, which is identical with the system of political economy in general.

In the connection with the contribution of comrade Mlinar I would like to call your attention to one more problem; he touched upon the problem of inactivity, the problem of apathy of the masses and established that the decisive problem lay in the fact that there existed too many predetermined solutions and decisions and the masses did not want to cooperate for this very reason since acclamation and plebiscitary agreement with this predetermined policy were requested from them. I think that this is one thesis proved by practice, but I think that it is not the only thesis, and perhaps also not the essential one, since also other causes of inactivity of the masses of workers should be tested, especially since this problem does not appear with us only, but is apparent in the entire world. We should probably also raise the question in what extent the higher standard of living, the higher level of civilization represent the causes for this phenomenon; why do individual people close themselves in their families, etc., and in what extent does the tendency that the individuals have as much leisure as possible represent the cause. This problem can be posed from another point of view also: if the statement of comrade Mlinar is correct, or rather if the main reason for apathy lies in the predetermined solutions, what should we do, what should our action be like on the basis of this finding? But I think that this element — apathy resulting from predetermined solutions — should not be glorified, since a concrete action can also break this wall, the wall of the predetermined solutions, as it was shown in the Slovene Assembly when the constitutional amendments were discussed and when two chambers of the assembly did not agree with the predetermined solution. Thank you.

#### I. BABIĆ, ZAGREB:

I think that the theme on the relation between order and freedom, institution and spontaneity, is really the central theme of our discussion about the political system. In connection with the student movement last year — and this is

also the case with many other actions in Yugoslavia — we can establish the fact, that the spontaneous forms of political revelation are considered to be a sign that the self-governmental system has stagnated, or rather, a sign that the self-governmental system does not work. I think that at this moment we should revolt against this thesis with a practical demand, that some forms of the spontaneous political revelation be legalized and consequently built into the self-governmental order. I for my person would suggest that we first legalize announced public meetings, secondly, quiet protests and thirdly, strikes. In Yugoslavia we had 800 such strikes only in one year. It is not normal that such forms of human establishment are marked with a negative mark, indicating that the self-government system does not work. Rights to an announced meeting, to quiet protes, and to strike should be clearly acknowledged and concretely institutionalized as normal self-government rights.

This practical proposal, however, touches upon the central theoretical theme, which I am not going to discuss here, I would just like to end with it — with a question. Can a political system which says that it itself is revolutionary institutionalize its own principle, or rather, can the principle of the revolution be institutionalized at all? Does it not remain that imperative of freedom and of free human activity, as something transcending every institution, something that has been called by the natural-legal theory (the theory of self-government of its own age) the inalienable human right of individual to bring those institutions which he considers inappropriate into agreement with his original human nature, or else to replace them by new ones?

**Z. ŠT'ASTNY, BRATISLAVA:**

With your kind permission I would like to direct our discussion again to the problem of the political system in socialism and to the many-sided functioning of this system. Two concepts, two variants of discussion emerged in the discussion yesterday and today. The first possibility is direct democracy and the second possibility institutional democracy. In my view there is no contradiction between these two forms, they rather contsitute a dialectical unity. Both possibilities must work together. I shall try to give a few hypotheses on political participation by stating an example from the Czechoslovak social-political participation of the co-operative peasants. As I have said, in my view the direct political participation and institutional

democracy are dialectically connected. The functionalization of democracy comes to expression in this connection. If as a hypothesis we transfer this problem from a boundary political system of an enterprise, then we see how the political institutions in an enterprise, i. e. the party organization of an institutional political function, can essentially be analysed as systems in which, or through which, the higher political institutions realize their regulations and normative impulses, which according to these institutions are positive and functional for the political system. And vice versa, these impulses realized and modified by the political institutions in enterprises represent a source of new impulses for the institutions of a higher political rank. This process is perhaps a simplified model of the continuity and circulation of political information and political government. In order to operate well it must have a significant aim and a value for all the participants in this process. This means that the higher political institutions put through such political aims in the system, in an enterprise or in a larger group which are in principle in agreement with the aims of the enterprise, its people, its workers. On the other side, also the activity and the interpretation of these aims on the part of the political institution of the enterprise must be — with wider or more narrow possibility of taking free decisions — in agreement with the aims of the enterprise and its workers and with the principled aims of society. Universality of policy means that all the structural parts of the social structure in an enterprise are the object of the functioning of the political institutions in the enterprise. The political relations grow from many-sided social relations connecting man with the enterprise and also with the global society. The functionalization in the political institutions of an enterprise offers the possibility to man to create a specific social bond, or a specific social interconnection with the global society and also with the system of the enterprise. The political relations in the enterprise will operate correctly, firstly, if the people in the enterprise accept the values, aims and orientation given by the higher political institutions; and secondly, if they accept the interpretation of these values and aims as furnished by the direct institutions in the enterprise; thirdly, if they co-operate in the interpretation and in the realization of these political aims.

I shall try to shortly show these hypotheses in the sociological sense by an example of an agricultural enterprise. If we want to investigate the political relations empirically, then we can categorize three types of political activity and also three types of institutional political activity. We qualified these three types as: politically active, politically passive, and

politically resistant types. If we represent this classification of participation in politics by empirical data — as an example we shall take the data about the participation of the co-operative farmers in general policy, and they represent in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic a considerable part of the population, perhaps more than 40 % — then we obtain the following picture: one third of them is politically active, one third politically passive, and one third politically resistant. As regards the institutional political activity, this is the activity in the party or an anti-party orientation, the picture is different. The majority are politically neutral, i. e., non-party; only a small part of peasants belong to the party type and one third of them (30 %) is anti-party. If we connect the data from both classification, which include altogether six types in political institutional activity, we can see that the politically passive and institutionally neutral types form the majority. Generally politically resistant and neutral as regards the party, non-party types have the second place. The third place is had by the politically active types which are institutionally anti-party, that is resistant as regards the party.

This illustration proves that there exists a connection between the institutional and the direct activity. The activity and functioning of the political institutions in enterprises furnish only one example for this problem. And I feel that this example can be generalized to some extent.





### III.

# The Role of the Communist Party and Progressive Forces in the Struggle for Socialism

*The »round table« discussion was conducted by: Mario Spinnella, Rinascita, Milan, Jozef Bob, Kulturni život, Bratislava, Jan Kamaryt, Filosoficky časopis, Prague, Stane Kranjc, Teorija in praksa, Ljubljana, Ion Mitrani, Lupta de Clasa, Bucharest.*

M. SPINELLA, MILAN:

*I am commencing the third day of our Colloquium. Today we are going to discuss the role of the communist party and of other progressive forces in the development of socialism, and I am sure that some discussants would like to tell us immediately something about this very important problem.*

I. MITRAN, BUCHAREST:

The theme of today's meeting is — as generally known — the role of the communist party and of other progressive forces in the struggle for socialism. I would like to tell you a few thoughts on this theme from the point of view of our present circumstances. In my view — and obviously also on the basis of the actuality itself — the means of social management have revealed several theoretical and practical problems, among them also the problem of the relation between the communist party and socialist democracy.

I would like to advocate the opinion that in our time — when socialism is a live reality in many countries — it is possible to speak about several objective factors which determine the necessity that the development of socialist society be guided, if we recognize primary mathematics, donnée of the contemporary history and political geography. Among these factors I would like to call your attention to the following: the dialectical parallelism between the subjective and the objective, the predominance of consciousness over spontaneity, the necessity for an appropriate explanation of the actuality in political theory and implicitly in practice, the great extent of the tasks of the economic, political and cultural building in each socialist country, the development in its pure sense, the necessity of an independent development (when saying independent I am not forgetting the idea of

unlimited) which must be parallel to the increase of the international responsibility, the complexity of the international relations within the framework in which the development of socialist society is taking place today.

Perhaps (and I am quite sure about this) the above enumerated factors though not including all the factors still suffice to prove that the main problem as posed today is not whether the communist party has a leading role or not. A long time ago this role was determined by the marxist theory and the practice of socialist building itself. How the struggle for socialism will be conducted in future is a question which will be answered by this struggle itself, on the basis of marxist-leninist principles, and on the basis of the different revolutionary circumstances in individual countries. As I said yesterday: from the very fact that socialism won victory, that new relations were established between the classes, that the question of power was solved in favour of the working people, that the socialist system in all socialist countries is on a qualitatively higher level, from all these facts there proceeds a new way of looking at those factors which express power and also at those means, through which the party carries out its role in a social community. We believe that the existence of one sole party or of a many-party system in the system of socialist democracy has not got the importance of a principle, proceeding from the general laws of socialism; it rather represents a political question which can be answered by a concrete investigation of the social and political circumstances in individual countries. Special features of the development of the revolution and of socialist building in Roumania, for instance, the abolition of bourgeoisie and great land owners, the transition of the political power into the hands of the working class and its allies caused in the political arena the vanishing of the parties which defended the interests of the exploiting classes.

Today it is a historic reality acknowledged by our entire nation that the victory of the Rumanian people on their way to socialism, to material and spiritual progress, to the acquisition of significant rights and democratic liberties is a result of the creative policy of the party, its elasticity in establishing its strategy and tactics, its organizational ability, and the policy of making the masses conscious, and of its authority acquired in the time of the revolutionary struggle. The party as a leading force in the system of political and social relations prepares the programme and concept of social development on the basis of a scientific analysis, using as a point of departure the statement that both the absolutization and the undervaluation of general laws and of special conditions and

the mechanical copying of certain methods and forms of activity of individual countries and of levels of development merely introduce prejudices into the process of the building of socialism. When working out its own policy our party relies upon the investigation of the objective social laws. Practice has proved that sooner or later in the process of the building of socialism there come into being various difficulties which are manifest as anomalies and differences in the economic and social development, if these laws are neglected. That is why it is imperative that we permanently investigate the phenomena of social life, that we prepare the political line in agreement with the demands of the objective laws of the development of society. In the revolution and in the process of the building of socialism, the general and the particular represent a dialectical unity. The knowledge and application of the general truths of socialism are an obligatory condition of a correct policy, of a policy corresponding to the principles. The general beyond doubt expresses the objective social laws, but it cannot reflect many-sidedness and variety as manifest in the particular features of phenomena. For this reason the success of a political line depends to a great extent upon the knowledge and understanding of the particular, upon the investigation of the concrete circumstances of the activity of the party. Of course, it is much easier to repeat the generally known truths than to investigate the actuality, to think, to try, and to search for an appropriate answer in every concrete situation. The decisions and decrees accepted at the 9th Congress and at the National Conference of our party have grown into the process of the development of democracy, into the improvement of the system of management and planning of the national economy, into the improvement of the methods of management in all the fields; that is why they express a profound scientific nature of social management and its accordance with the demands of life. The activity of our party as concretized in original solutions which we have found in the process of the building of socialism, of the economic development, proves — we are quite sure — the correctness of the thesis that each party can and must independently produce its political line on the basis of the marxist-leninist theory, thus also contributing to the development of the same. It is well-known that the protagonists of our world view showed an explicitly creative attitude towards their own ideas. We can say that they bequeathed to the communist and labour parties a tendency to live, creative thought which can surpass spiritual torpidity, abolish rigid schemes and get free from all the old-fashioned concepts and obsolete structures. I feel that we can say that the idea of a marxist spirit has be-



come almost synonymous with the idea of a creative spirit. In this context of ideas it is impossible to use Marxism-Leninism as archives from which formulas and quotations can be taken for any purpose without taking into account the laws of logic, of time and of the actuality.

J. KRYLOVA, PRAGUE:

My name is Krylova, and I come from Prague. Dear comrades, I am going to speak about the relations among socialist states. All the socialist states certainly consider the development of these relations and the strengthening of unity to be an important task. And this also corresponds to the needs of socialism. Still, we experience that this unity is not strengthened, but on the contrary weakened. The practice of the building of socialism and the internal development of the socialist world have abolished the idea of a monolithic unity, that is of that concept which thinks that the socialist revolution has created the basis of making equal various conceptions. The actuality has proved incorrectness of this belief, since we can see that also among socialist countries there arise conflicts. The socialist states must even take different views as regards some problems.

Trying to establish the reasons for this state, we must remember the great differentness of socialist countries and the differences in the level of development of the means of production, and in general in the level of development of their ideological, political and economic development. Similar differences can be seen in the historic tradition, in the tradition of labour movement, in the mode of thinking, and in the special international, geographic position, etc. If the individual socialist states should develop successfully, these specific circumstances must not be lost sight of, since socialism can only develop within their framework. This fact does not result only in the possibility of deviations and differences in position, but also in the possibility of establishing various conceptions and thus also in the demand for new forms of unity among socialist states. First of all the demand for entirely identical positions should be given up, and the concrete circumstances of the development of socialist countries will have to be taken in account. The rich and special national interests of socialist states should not be abolished, but should rather be respected. The unity of socialist states can be preserved, or rather attained in this way only.

In the interest of unity there must exist the differences not only in theoretical conceptions, but also in practical policy



of these countries. That is why we can say that each socialist country and each communist party has the right to independently shape its domestic and foreign policy and to decide for such a road to socialism which is most appropriate to its national circumstances and to the needs of the state. On the basis of these principles as early as in 1945 the Belgrade Declaration was accepted, stating that different countries have the right to a different building of socialism, and that only such variety will strengthen socialism. This declaration emphasizes the demand for a free expression of views regarding the socialist development and the demand that the co-operation among socialist states be based upon complete freedom and equality.

We can develop socialism only, if we stand for its progress in the special, national circumstances, and not simply by defending what has already been attained. Socialism can be best defended by developing it further. In this connection I think that only the development of own, national policy, corresponding to the circumstances in a certain country, can furnish the adequate basis for the agreement about the uniformed views of socialist countries and for their joint actions; only the development of national policy creates new possibilities for international unity. The road to internationalism must begin with the definitions of national policy and not with the subordination of the interests and views of individual states to the interests of the majority of other states, and not with the endeavours to prevent processes originating from the special needs of individual countries. Today the contents of proletarian internationalism cannot be limited to the international dimensions only, but must rather include specificness also. I am convinced that this is the first condition of a future situation in which the policy of individual states would express with more vigour the common interests also. At the present level, we must — this is my opinion — emphasize above all national interests and must not speak that the special interests should be subordinated to the general interests of the socialist movement. Of course, it would be an ideal state if all the communist parties took in account above all the common interests, and if they were willing to subordinate their views to these common interests on individual, concrete occasions. Still, if at the present level communist and labour parties emphasize the need to defend their own interests, this must be understood as a fact deriving from the present circumstances and from the present level of development.

The correct understanding of this problem, that is the belief that specific circumstances cannot be separated from practical policy, is connected with the needs of each socialist

state. The complex of these problems is most important. The fact that the relation between the national and the international today cannot be understood as a subordination of the state policy to the predominant views, and also not as a subordination of the policy of several states to the views of one state only, is confirmed again and again. We are really concerned with respecting the special circumstances of each country and in this way creating a sound basis for the formation of common views, for joint action, and for the creation of new possibilities of internal unity. The necessity that national and international elements be taken in consideration in the policy of communist and labour parties has been generally acknowledged.

If the principle of equality is not respected in practical relations among socialist states, interferences with the internal affairs of one or other socialist state may occur, together with theoretical considerations of sovereignty trying to justify such an interference. We shall not be able to strengthen the unity of the international communist movement, unless we respect equality and national independence of the states, and unless we respect the principle that nobody is allowed to interfere with the internal affairs of communist parties and of socialist states. Thank you.

(unauthorized discussion)

#### O. CHETAN, BUCHAREST:

I would like to emphasize some characteristics of socialist democracy which are closely connected with the necessity of the existence of a party, whose role it is to lead the social and political life, and whose activity is based on the adherence and devotion of the masses to socialist power.

In my view, marxist axiological literature, though lying a definite emphasis on the significance of political values, has not treated this problem systematically enough. Thus it happens that the new political values, born by our time, and above all by the actuality of contemporary socialism, are still investigated by sociological means and through the prism of the theory of scientific socialism. If we disclose the axiological dimension of these social phenomena, these political principles and actions, the specific features of our contemporary social and political life become more apparent and thus more understandable; and this in turn reveals the fact, which has been too often neglected, the fact of the surprising attraction of these values for the masses, which they often drive to exceptional actions thus reminding everybody who has

forgotten that ideas, as Marx said, become a material force as soon as they reach the masses, as soon as they become political values and are accepted as such by the largest masses. Our time has confirmed the fact that political consciousness, originating from the structure of the actual political values, is a dangerous weapon resisting dramatically the crude power everywhere where peace, independence and sovereignty of nations, freedom, and human dignity are not respected.

The investigation of the social foundations of political values must be completed by an investigation of political phenomena in their axiological relations. This is the only way to learn the ideal and real nature of values of different kinds, and especially of political values. Interconnection of the ideal and the real in the structure of each value gives to this value the status of a moving force, of consciousness about social development, and this interconnection directs our present political actions to the future. Political values are determined by special, historic circumstances, by the given atmosphere of social existence, that is why the masses appropriate them and experience them as the supreme social and political phenomena, decisive for the social and political progress, and at the same time as ideals representing the measure of social and political activities and of political and moral behaviour.

Patriotism and socialist internationalism, permanent development of socialist democracy, affirmation and continuous strengthening of the national independence and sovereignty of each socialist country, development and strengthening of friendship among socialist countries — these are not only the necessary leading principles, brought about by the social development itself, but are also real political values, penetrating deeply the spirit and the hearts of working masses. These very facts have become basic political values for millions of people who build socialism, and anew prove their close connection with political and social practice, and also the irrevocable necessity of developing and strengthening them.

The improvement of socialist democracy, for instance, is of special importance at the present level of our development. In Roumania we have created such necessary circumstances which ensure that the return to capitalism is impossible for ever. The belief that socialism represents the only social and political system ensuring material and spiritual progress, good life for all the members of society, and a harmonious realization of man's personality took deep roots in the consciousness of the people in Roumania.

Parallel to the building of socialism, an improvement of social relations, of forms of co-existence and co-operation of

all the members of society in economic, political and state activities is taking place, and this improvement appears as an objective necessity, since socialism is not only a society to ensure to its members a comfortable material life, but also a society able to realize the highest human, social and political values, and the highest strivings for freedom and for happiness of men in the earth.

On the basis of the belief that socialism and democracy are inseparable, the Communist Party of Roumania has developed a far-reaching policy, tending to the deepening and improvement of socialist democracy. This policy is based upon firm belief that the building of the new socialist system is a conscious work of the masses led by the marxist and leninist party. The creation of those necessary conditions which will make it possible for workers and masses to actively co-operate in administration of public affairs, and to express their opinions about all the problems of social development, is the objective law of our development, the main guidance in socialist and communist building. The Communist Party of Roumania considers it to be one of its first tasks to organize and to lead the process of deepening and many-sided perfection of the new social system, to establish everything new and progressive in social thought and practice, so that socialist democracy would be developed continuously. Lenin wrote: »In our opinion a state is strong because of the consciousness of the masses; it is strong when the masses know everything, when they decide about everything, and when they do everything consciously.« But this co-operation of the masses is real only when the main premises of the entire state policy, as we have shown, express as appropriately as possible the main interests and will of the members of society, that is when the members of society accept and experience them as the main political values. This is the only true insurance against formalism and bureaucratism, which make possible the negative phenomena of abuse of power, and also the only defence against pragmatism and social careerism, which can be found everywhere where the norms of social and political life are neglected.

The continuous deepening of democracy has several aspects, harmoniously complementing each other regarding the typical features of a certain historic level of building of socialism. Interconnectedness of political and social democracy, continuous perfection of social relations among various social classes and layers and the relations between the individual and the community, supporting and strengthening of the co-operation of the masses in management of society, and the establishment of an institutional system, ensuring the



realization of the fundamental rights of man, and at the same time also his carrying out social obligations, are the main characteristics of our socialist development.

To separate democracy from socialism, to create between the two of them an artificial contradiction, really means to bereave the content of democracy and the concept of socialism. This means to deny the essential element: the superiority of socialism in relation to capitalism and an arbitrary »sanction«, which makes possible anti-democratic phenomena and practice, the acts of abuse, which in turn can cause immense damage to the authority and attractiveness of socialism for the people all over the world. Some authors raise the question whether socialism is democratic or not, and thus try to separate socialism and democracy. If we try to solve the question in this way, we — in our view — neglect the fundamental fact, namely that democracy is the central value, an inherent dimension of socialism, and that every process of creating the new social system is at the same time also a gradual process of development and of deepening the democratic nature of socialist society. In investigations of socialist democracy the axiological perspective reveals in a persuasive way also the theoretical and practical untenableness of those opinions which have appeared recently about this theme and which think that the development and further spreading of democracy in socialism are contrary to the principles of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the leading role of the working class, and to the fundamental interests of socialist society. But the leading principles of social and political life, as contrived by the classics of Marxism, and the present practice of building socialism unquestionably reject such fictitious fears. Socialist democracy does not in the least reduce the political power of the working class, it rather strengthens the alliance of the working class with peasants and intellectuals.

The historic role of the marxist-leninist party as the leading social force is confirmed by the concrete circumstances of a continuous development of socialist democracy. The relations among these phenomena are objective, necessary and dialectic. They are demanded by the laws regulating the new system, since they are connected with strengthening of our socialist society. Even in the time of the most fierce class struggle for power and to break down the resistance of the exploiting classes, the new system in our country struggled for giving the widest democratic rights to the working class, peasants and to the intelligentsia, in order to mark in this way the fundamental difference from the old society, based upon exploitation and suppression, and in order to stimulate

revolutionary energy. It would be beyond understanding, if in the time following the take-over of power the victorious socialism limited the free establishment of human rights, the co-operation of the masses in carrying out the state power. The fact that at the present level of the building of socialism in Roumania the process of strengthening the leading role of the party in social and political life of the country is organically connected with the process introducing the broadest masses in co-operation in the management of the state, and to the establishment of new measures to broaden the authority of mass organizations, is especially important and highly characteristic. As a political value socialist democracy involves the sense of social responsibility of each citizen, and also a sense of the necessity of acting fully in accordance with the demands and supreme postulates of society and of socialist nations. The development of socialist democracy is closely connected with the development of this profound responsibility, since socialist democracy is the very opposite of anarchy and bourgeois liberalism. Socialist democracy presupposes a high level of social consciousness, conscious discipline, and freely accepted decision to respect order and lawfulness. From this point of view, socialist lawfulness appears to be the only possible framework of a true, democratic state life. Only the strict respect for laws ensures favourable circumstances for the establishment and development of democracy, similarly as the existence of a democratic atmosphere in socialist circumstances represents the main guarantee of the execution of laws expressing the interests of society and of all citizens. The Communist Party of Roumania consequently implements the policy, founding our social whole on the basis of socialist equality, of strict respect for laws, norms and rules of social life, requested from the state organs, public organs, and from each individual citizen.

These essential phenomena of social and political life and these basic principles are accepted and experienced by the public opinion, by the masses as pure political values. Socialist unity of our people comes to a complex expression as a political, social, and ideological unity. The attempts to create antagonism between the political and moral unity of our people and the interests of socialist society are completely wrong. Such theses annihilate the global social changes from the time of the revolution and of the building of socialist society, and point to the lack of confidence to the value and the definite nature of these changes. The very opposite is true — unity of the people represents an assurance of the solidity of the socialist order, and also one of those factors which stimulate the increase of democracy in the life of the state.

The strengthening of the social role of the unity of the people in the process of social development, the emphasis on its role of the motive force in preparation and in realization of the tasks of individual stages directly depends on the state of development of socialist democracy. In recent years the leadership of our party and of our state has permanently endeavoured to increase socialist democracy in the sphere of economy, of social and political life, and in the sphere of scientific activities, etc. We try to find new forms of organization, appropriate to the present level of development, and which would encourage and strengthen the co-operation of the masses in the development of social life. In this time we are testing new decrees for the improvement of management and planning of our economy, our financial system, and of the organization of industry. The practice of our party to have consultations with the workers, with the collectives of specialists and to discuss in public all the major problems of its internal and foreign policy has been established in a wide extent.

Our measures for strengthening and perfecting socialist democracy contribute to the establishment of our socialist society and also strengthen the leading role of the working class and of its revolutionary party.

If we investigate these social données from the axiological point of view, I think, we can see more clearly that process in which the masses of people appropriate the political line of the party and of the socialist state — and this is the first prerequisite of the development of socialist democracy.

#### Z. ROTER, LJUBLJANA:

I would like to problemize the theme we are discussing today. Firstly. When beginning to speak about the theme: communist parties and progressive forces in the struggle for socialism we have to face a question. Is the way in which we have defined our theme to mean that only communist parties are — everywhere and always — the main factor in this struggle for socialism, and that other progressive forces are only their welcome ally in his struggle? I think that this is a very important question — if we think of the third world or of the position in West Germany. If we strictly kept this logic, then we should — always and everywhere when speaking of the struggle for socialism — first find the communist party and only then search for other progressive forces as its welcome allies. With these remarks I am just posing a question which I consider to be of high importance.

Secondly. From the history of communist parties in Europe we know that these parties always declared political alliance with other progressive forces before the second world war also. We must raise the question: does this policy of alliance with other progressive forces mean that these so-called allies are welcome as allies only in the phase of the struggle for socialism, in the time of the establishment of the revolutionary power, or is this alliance valid also after the revolution has come to power already? If we analyse the events and the position in various socialist countries after the second world war, then — in my view — we must establish that many things happened to these allies and that this alliance turned into a mere means in spite of the loud proclamation of its validity in the phase of the struggle for power. We encounter the question whether the policy of alliance has a tactical or a principled nature, and what are the relations between the communist party and the so-called progressive forces like in this light. I think it would be very good if in today's discussion we answer to this question and clear up this problem. I would especially like comrade Spinella to tell us about his experiences from the practice of the Communist Party of Italy, and his opinion regarding this problem.

Thirdly. All the communist parties, those which are still struggling for power and those which have already established the revolutionary power, emphasize the following principles: democracy, liberty, freedom of dialogue, equality, freedom of thought, respect for personality, the need of the co-operation of the masses in power, etc. We must pose the question: does not the proclamation of these principles demand that these principles be introduced in an optimum extent into the practice of communist parties. If a party stands for a dialogue, does this fact not make it obligatory for it to realize the principle of dialogue in its own party practice? If a party proclaims the dialogue as a way of its relation toward others, then nobody will believe its real readiness for this dialogue, unless it itself realizes it inside the party.

It is known that communist parties also stand for pluralism; does this not mean that they must realize pluralism also in the party itself?

Fourthly. On the whole the communist parties which are in power in socialist countries, that is which have established the revolutionary power, have all passed the phase of their revolutionary struggle of a movement, which had — as I said yesterday — all the characteristics of revolutionary movements: mass participation, democracy, minimum organization, some broadness, openness and similar. On the other side we know that later, when these parties came in power, some

changes took place; we know that these parties got institutionalized in the bad meaning of this word. We must raise the question: Why did this negative institutionalization take place? Why did these communist movements as movements in the authentic sense of this word not remain movements with mass participation, democracy, with freedom of thought, and without the hierarchic principle as the fundamental organizational principle, and so on?

At the end just one more question — the question about the relation between the party and power. If we investigate the present situation, we can establish at least two models of the relations between the party and power. The first model can be termed a bureaucratic model. In this model the party is fully identified with power; practically this is manifest in the fact that the party forums first discuss economic decrees, while the organs of power, for instance the government and assembly only realize these decrees. Thus the organs of power are only an instrument, an obedient means, to realize decisions which have been determined in every detail before. This is one model of the relation between the party and power. The second model, which we are trying to realize in our political practice, is based on the separation of the party from power, and on the party operating as an ideological-political factor, trying to influence the political, social and economic development by the methods of persuasion and of arguments. I am for the second model, for the model of the separation of the party from power. This model gives rise to numerous dangers, dilemmas and problems, still I am quite sure that it represents the more humane alternative, which should be seriously investigated if we want that communist parties based on Marxism remain really marxist parties, I am namely saying that there can exist also communist parties which are called so, but which are not marxist parties, while on the other hand there can exist parties which are not called communist parties, but are nevertheless marxist parties. — Thank you.

Z. ŠT'ASTNY, BRATISLAVA:

I would like to add a short remark to the discussion contribution of comrade Roter, to the problem of party and power, or the separation of these two problems. If we take the interpretation of Mr. Wright Mills, I feel that we can distinguish the influential elite and the power elite. In my view, the communist party and its institutions can be characterized as the influential elite. In our country, where the democratic prin-



ciples were well-developed in the past already, we can certainly say this about our communist party also. This is perhaps my hypothesis. I shall try to illustrate this hypothesis by an example from my sociological research in an enterprise. When interpreting the functionalization of political institutions in an enterprise, we can say that the representatives of the policy of the party in each layer of the structure of the enterprise represent the influential elite which realize the general political orientation of the party. The influence which these political institutions have in the enterprise and which separates the members of the party from other workers in the enterprise must be realized in an adequate field and must lead to a social, positive, functional aim.

In my research I tried to find an answer to the question whether the members of the party had influence, whether they differed from other workers through the intensity of their influence, further, whether the intensity of their influence was stronger or lesser than the influence of other democratic power-organizations, i. e., of the management of the enterprise, etc.

I further tried to establish in which direction this influence was realized. It was shown that — in the view of the workers — the political institutions of the enterprise did not represent the elite of influence, but rather had no influence. They had a rather scarce influence in individual relations and even less influence in the sphere of power. And what is more, when they exercise a certain influence then this influence is adequate in the sphere of power, but inadequate in the sphere of individual, where it does not express the interest of the party or of the state, where individual private problems are concerned — a better position in the enterprise, a higher income, etc. This is an important question since our investigation shows the position in a typical agrarian enterprise in Slovakia. If the things are really such as this investigation shows them, if the results of this investigation are generalized, then we can see that this inadequate orientation of the political institutions in enterprises and their generally only small influence represent a serious danger for policy, since the cooperative peasants and peasants in general are an important political factor in our country.

P. KLINAR, LJUBLJANA:

We began to speak about the interesting problem of the relations between the party and power. Comrade Roter and comrade Št'astný explained some ideas concerning this problem and I would like to add something to what they have said.

The complicated position begins right when the political party — I have in my mind the labour party — takes over the power. The processes of the transformation of the party into an ideological, social, political organization and a similar transformation of the classic political power into a selfgovernmental political power — even though the social-political organizations and the selfgovernmental political power do not represent the final phase of this transformation — are very complicated. I think that the principle of dualism, that is the interconnection of self-government and hierarchical elements in power, and the establishment of dualism in the party in which the elements of the classic party are intermingled with self-governmental elements, about this we spoke yesterday, speak for this position. Our investigations of participation and influence of citizens and of individual layers in making important decisions in selfgovernment organs and in organs of power show that participation and influence are distributed very unequally; similarly investigations of the participation of the members of the party (League of the Communist) inside the organizations of the party and outside them have established that participation and influence are distributed rather unequally also among the members of the League of Communists, and among individual layers inside it. This means that both in power and in the party there exist pretty strong classic elements of these phenomena. Selfgovernment has encouraged processes of deconcentration and demonopolization of political power, that is also of the change of the relations of the party to the organs of power and other political subjects. This makes it possible for other political subjects to acquire greater autonomy, and in short, that the development of selfgovernmental pluralism begins. In this connection two problems are of special interest: first the problem of the leading role of the party in such circumstances, and the second, central problem is the relationship of the party to power.

In the model termed by comrade Roter the bureaucratic model, the leading role of the party is very simple, since in this model party organs and state organs are closely connected, that is the leading role of the party is based on the monopoly of the state power. The problem of the leading role of the party becomes much more complicated in a model in which the party is separated from power, or rather, when an attempt is made at the separation of the party from the power. In this second situation — in my view — the leading role of the party cannot mean some static category, acquired by the party because of its historic services, because it was the initiator

and realizer of the revolution; this leading role must rather mean for us a dynamic category in the sense that the party — with us the League of Communists — must only fight it out in a continuous and intense struggle with other political subjects, and in connection with concrete problems. According to me, wider general views and general interests, which can represent general principles for the programme of the policy of the party and which result from the integrative role of the party, can be attained in this way by the generalization of progressive views, which emerged from the struggle regarding concrete problems. I think it of high importance that, when speaking about the leading role of the party, we always emphasize that inside the party itself the activity and influence of its members be always present. If only the party leadership is active and influential, a monopolization of the political power may come into being, while the development of autonomy of other political subjects is prevented. This conclusion supports the demand for an intense, democratic breadth inside the party, that is for the development of internal pluralism in the party. If we have a look at this principle in our practice, then — I think — we come to the same or similar conclusions as explained before by colleague Št'astny; we must establish that the participation of the party in the framework of this organization is not sufficient, and that both the participation and influence of the party members are insufficient in all the spheres of political life also. All this proves that the problem of the realization of the leading role of the party in this sense (as I have explained it) is very complicated and realized only slowly in a long-term process. We can establish that the party does influence the process of the emergence of the organs of power (selfgovernmental power) and the work of the organs of selfgovernmental power. This means that the party has not reached yet that level of its development to function exclusively in ideological positions. Today the party operates also from political positions and this will remain its perspective for quite some time. In connection with the problem of the relation between the party and power, I would finally like to add a few words about the trend of the development of this relation and about the consequences which are likely to be brought about by this trend. Intense acceleration of the transformation of classic elements of the party in selfgovernmental ones influences also the process of the transformation of classical power into selfgovernmental political power. It is necessary that the mutual active relations be based on relative autonomy of the party and of power, and that the principle of personal union of the leading party bodies and the organs

of power be abolished. What are the consequences of this trend of the transformation of the classic functions of the party? Firstly, I think that when the party is freed from its struggle for power — which is one of the dominant functions of classic parties — there open to it large possibilities of intensifying one of its rather neglected functions, that is of intensifying the process of politization of citizens. In short, this means a connection of the centres of decision-making with citizens and the strengthening of direct democracy.

Secondly: I think that the outlined trend of the relations between the party and power also influences the fact that the party is no longer the mediator between power and citizens, that it no longer transfers the decisions of the authorities to citizens, but rather makes it possible for citizens to be included in political processes, and above all — and this is very important — for their influence on global political decisions to grow; this influence is namely very weak now. Thus the party does not merely mediate between the general and the special interests, but also speeds the development of selfgovernmental pluralism and of various special interests.

Thirdly. When this trend of the relation between the party and power is realized, the integrative function, so important in classic political parties, ceases to be a function established by the activity of the leading party organs by means of a »party filter«, but gradually becomes part of actual integrative processes.

Fourthly. The outlined trend of the relations between the party and power — in my view — also makes greater autonomy possible for the party (the League of Communists), and thus also a wider and more efficient control over the work of selfgovernmental organs or the organs of selfgovernmental power.

Fifthly. Also the influence of the party on the public opinion is different, if we take into account the outlined trend of the development of the relations between the party and power. I think that the party no longer influences the public opinion by means of propaganda and of programmes, which are never realized, which are not in accordance with the real policy of the party, which try to attract the interests of various and rather heterogeneous social layers and to persuade them for the policy of the party, thus making it possible for the party to come in power. Now it has become possible that the party becomes one of the factors which struggle for an objective shaping of the public opinion, one of the factors which struggle against manipulating of the public opinion.

At the end I would like to add the following: everything mentioned as the possible consequences of the outlined trend

of the development of the relation between the party and power opens a wide platform for party policy and for its positive influence on the development of interest associations. Thank you.

#### A. TANASE, BUCHAREST:

My colleague called attention to a question which could be termed the axiological significance of the problem we are discussing today. I have applied for the word only for two minutes to disclose some of my thoughts, as a non-specialist in political sciences, as a philosopher, if you want.

Speaking in general terms we say that the leading role of the party is a general principle, a generally valid law of the socialist revolution and of the building of the new society. In my view this is a fundamental truth which cannot be denied by any marxist-leninist. Still, it must be understood in its historic function. So it is impossible to reduce this principle to an objective law. We think that a certain party cannot efficiently carry out its leading role merely because of the objective laws which have been automatically strengthened in this place by an infallible justness. Not at all. From the very spirit of Marxism-Leninism and from practice which has confirmed it, it follows that each party must merit its role and must establish it by appropriate methods, containing the democratic and humanist principles of the new society. Thus I suggest that we consider the present value of this principle which reveals a necessary, but not sufficiently objective, justification; *the social and political value*, that is its ability to create the policy of social development appropriate to the structures and specific features of each country; *the moral value* deriving from its ability to be equal to humanism of a marxist concept, and to make humanism its own *raison d'etre* and aim in its activity towards a new society, towards the most humane society in our history; *the national value* deriving from its ability to be identical with the progressive consciousness of a nation and to be responsible to the nation, to its country, and to develop its own policy and to defend its sovereignty, independence, national dignity, and to determine correctly its decrees, changes and the models of building of socialism which are most suitable to the tradition and to the specific features of the country. And finally: *the international value* showing the responsibility to the labour and communist movement of the entire world. In the spirit of mutual respect it must get to learn the positive experiences of other parties, it must choose the right things and accept everything what



may be useful for its own activity, still always remaining itself and preserving its originality. These are only some of the values. Other can be added to them, thus giving us a more perfect and rich picture of what is and what should be the principle of the leading role of the communist party, at the same time being a subjective and an objective principle of the transition from socialism to communism.

M. SPINELLA, MILAN:

Today in the afternoon comrade Krylova referred to the words of comrade Togliatti speaking about unity in diversity. This expression derives from Hegel, and when using it Togliatti emphasized above all two of its polemical dimensions. He first wanted to emphasize that the development of Marxism could be linked only to the history of great thought and dialectic, and that all the reductions trying to limit Marxism to positivism or to an usurping dialectic materialism, still being established in some places, were insufficient.

Secondly, comrade Togliatti wanted to polemicize against the theory of monolithism, which is contrary to unity in diversity. And also this theory is still always influential in labour and socialist movement. The Italian Communist party has been advocating the principle of unity in diversity for a longer time. In this connection we do not see only a principle to be respected in the relations among communist parties and progressive movements, but also a principle to be respected in the sphere which we are discussing today, namely in the struggle for socialism.

At the last congress of the Italian Communist Party comrades Longo (in his paper) and Berlinguer (in his concluding speech) emphasized that the Italian communists by no means thought that they were the only carriers of truth, and also did not think that their analysis of society was correct in everything. That means we are only one of the forces struggling for the socialist revolution in Italy. We are making every effort to be the strongest revolutionary force, at the same time being aware of the fact that our eyes are like the eyes of all the people, and that like the eyes of all movements they have their limitations. That is why it is important that we know that there exists pluralism of progressive forces, movements and actions, pluralism of masses, organizations and parties, and that this pluralism constitutes a moment of the revolutionary dialectic, which can drive not only the development of doctrine but also of practice. Comrade Berlinguer said: »The question how to build more progressive de-

mocracy and socialism in Italy is not a question of one party only. Even though we have to do with such a strong party as is our communist party, this is still a question to be solved by all the forces of the democratic and progressive left, by all the live forces in our society.« Of course, this principled position depends on our estimate of what mass movements are, and on the theoretical proposals offered to us by the other part of society. Comrade Berlinguer laid special emphasis upon the existence of forces which go even further than the Italian communist party. Also I would like to underline this fact. And this is a very favourable fact for us, since these forces have not emerge in an empty space, but rather come into being in the struggle itself and in the very crisis of Italian society. These are vanguard movements of our society, acknowledged their avant-gardism by the Communist Party, and used by it not only to learn better the general position in the state, but also to enrich and to better formulate its own political direction.

Speaking about these forces, I have in my mind above all youth. I think that the question concerning youth was in the very centre of the congress of our party. The Italian communists have shown their will to understand and to consider the fresh ideas of Italian youth, struggling in factories and in schools with new anti-capitalist enthusiasm, which can be compared only to resistance against Fascism.

Under the influence of these youth movements, student movements and the most progressive part of labour movement, we have come to learn the necessity to investigate more closely the problems of direct democracy. The problem of the direct expression of the will of the masses, and above all the forms of organization and self-organization of the masses in this struggle.

We are a communist party and we have our special forms of organization. These forms correspond to the needs of a large, mass party with more than a million and a half of members. Of course, we improve these forms continually, still we remain true to the leninist organization. But we cannot force our model upon all the masses, because we think that each group must develop its own forms of organization in class struggle.

In this way we also put the question of pluralism at the level of internal, Italian questions. Pluralism must ensure a true autonomy of movements, it must create unity, which is unity in diversity, that is dialectic unity.

The relation among parties and progressive movements is becoming a permanent tension, and this tension tends not towards a creation of a special organization, but rather

towards a creation of what after Gramsci we call a historic bloc — that is a whole of powers based upon the social and economic position of the state and trying to surpass it.

In this historic bloc the theoretical and cultural power of Marxism and socialism has a special position, but this cannot mean a rule over the movements coming directly from the social basis. At the same time we must know that all these positions of students, of leftists, of the Catholic left, etc., are intermingled with Marxism, no matter whether understood in a better or worse way, Marxism is still always the starting-point for the analysis of the struggle against contemporary society; of the struggle which in Italy is not merely a struggle at the economic, social and political level, but rather goes even further, as Comrade Berlinguer said, already raising the question about the relations between private life and society in general. This struggle raises the question on the relations among the people, but not among abstract people, but rather between me and you, between me and others.

Thus vanguard movements and youth are more and more aware that the socialist revolution is no mere change in productive relations, but rather a revolution of the whole life.

In this spirit we have also formed our views regarding the international policy and the relations among communist parties. As you know, the Italian Communist Party condemned very much the intervention of the forces of the Warsaw Pact in Czechoslovakia. This intervention was condemned from the general point of view. At the congress we underlined that we did not think this was a simple mistake, committed by Soviet comrades. This was even more. We emphasized that this act could be understood only in the light of the entire history of socialist power in the Soviet Union. Only a critical analysis of this history could explain the deep reasons of this act, which — in our view — is contrary to the interests of proletarian internationalism. And above all we cannot understand the theory of limited sovereignty, which is contrary to the theory of unity in diversity. There can be no unity between the ruler and the ruled, between the one who gives orders and the one who obeys them. Only partners with equal rights can be uniform, and for this reason limitation of sovereignty is contrary to the true dialectic unity.

In this way we also look at the role of the progressive movements and liberation movements, which are not communist movements. We invited to our congress all the movements of this kind and thus continued our policy from the preparatory meeting in Budapest, where we officially demanded that all such movements be invited to the congress in Moscow. I am convinced that those struggling against

imperialism should not be distinguished by their names and labels. The socialist movement must not be closed and it must know that in class struggle that time has come when it must gather around itself all the forces not only in order to defend itself, but also to attack its enemy.

At the end I would just like to speak about one more question. In our discussions we clearly took a position as regards one thing: namely that we do not accept models. This not only in the simple sense, that we do not accept the Soviet model, or for instance, the Yugoslav model. But also in a deeper sense: we are not seeking models in accordance with which to build socialism in our country — we do not proceed from an abstract formulation, because we think that this would not be dialectic. The following is our view: we are fighting on the basis of pluralism of power, we are struggling against the censure, and for all the democratic liberties, which are to explode in the heart of capitalist society so to become weapons against capitalism itself. We associate with most various forces — with the utmost left, with catholics, and with those who are even more to the right... And we think that the model will emerge from the struggle itself. If we start from the position of the struggle in maximum pluralism, from the position of what comrade Supek called very appropriately the tradition of freedom, then it is clear that due to historic necessity, we shall have to go further also after we have taken over power. This may not persuade those who like to conceive history in terms of mathematic formulas; we think, however, that this historic quality, fidelity to the historic conception of Marxism, will make it possible for us to go further and to build in Italy our own socialism, — rich, profound and radical socialism.

(unauthorized discussion)

#### D. ROZEHNAL, PRAGUE:

If we project the relationship between socialism and democracy in the sphere of international relations, we can notice at once almost the same problems as we have encountered so far — while investigating this relationship mainly in the light of interior political relations. The international socialist movement has to struggle against difficulties both in the developed world and in the underdeveloped countries, so many communist in the West say that socialism is experiencing a profound crisis.

They say that we have to do with a crisis of aims and a crisis of methods, as well as a crisis of strategy and tactics.

First of all, we must not be satisfied with a demand for a simple struggle against imperialism. But we cannot secure the prerequisites of this struggle unless we are aware of the fundamental characteristics of the contemporary phase of transition from capitalism to socialism. This is at the same time a civilizational turning-point.

When speaking about the scientific-technical revolution we have not got in our mind a picture of a certain perfect civilization, a certain determined and qualitatively different state of civilization, but rather a challenge, an explicit tendency bringing new problems, new possibilities, and new dangers, but also a new view of the satisfaction of the basic human needs. Even though this scientific-technical revolution is a matter of perspective, of future, it still induces us to the knowledge of today that the fast development of the means of production demands also new interhuman relations.

Thus a way to a very important increase in production opens and that production itself will break the logic of private appropriation. Of course, this does not mean that illogical phenomena are automatically excluded from history. This can be attained only by means of a revolutionary activation of the masses. The technocratic improvements of the model of industrial socialism, or rather, the administrative and rigid model of industrialization — which is often a more appropriate name for this model — are not enough here.

We must assume that in a considerable part of the world the scientific-technical revolution will take place even before the socialist revolution, even though the very socialist revolution was considered to be the first condition of the development of the qualitatively new forces of production some time ago. In the present circumstances the best brains and the best hearts of youth can be attracted only by intellectual courage and principled politics. If we want to respond to the new reality, we shall have to undergo similar difficulties as Lenin did.

I am quite sure that also the organizational forms of the parties and of the entire movement should be adjusted to these hard tasks. The remains of Stalinist transmissions and levers and the reproaches of independent thought cannot succeed. The Action Programme and the Resolution of the session of the Central Committee of our party in November spoke a clear word about this. The relations of democratic movements towards communist parties are very often a spontaneous criticism of our policy of sects as regards this. The unity of all the constituent elements of a movement must come into being from the bottom, without enforcement of the leading role of the party, and also without the so-called



etatization of the struggle against imperialism, which has been criticized by some communists in the West, among them by the Italian communist. Here we have to do with a reduction of a movement to some spheres in which only socialist countries can work, as for instance, the economic and scientific-technical competition, the military and the diplomatic field, while this reduction limits the movement itself to the role of a statist watching the functioning of the powers with sympathy even where all the means, including the ideological means, and all the parts of the movement and its allies should be used.

Even though this may sound paradoxical such tendencies derive from an overestimation of the power of imperialism. On the basis of this belief we must say that those assertions according to which time works for class-enemies are pessimistic, assertions according to which in the last half of the century socialism did not acquire sufficient adherents and did not succeed in converting its former enemies. In a similar way the processes in Czechoslovakia were estimated, thus people's movement for humanism was considered to be a consequence of the influence of a few refined plotters, journalists or writers, etc. Such a judgement would be a mere offence against the twenty years of the activity of our party, it would be an offence if we believed that these twenty years of work could be destroyed by a small group of irresponsible people within a few month's time.

Dealing with the problem of the masses, allies and collaborators, we must always take into account the extremes and other possible negative sides, accompanying a mass movement. If we have to choose between a formalist unity, seemingly without problems but connected with a real lethargy, and mass initiative and political activity, which brings risks and extremes, then we must choose the second alternative, even though it is hard to be realized. In my view this is a Leninist decision. The same is true of the international relations: if we pretend that there are no problems the problems will not be cleared away in this way, and the expulsion of those who rise these problems cannot have any good consequences. These methods, characteristic of all the inferior social formations, originate from subjective and political idealism which cannot understand the real reasons for the emergence and development of political views.

For this reason a certain kind of pluralism must be taken in account also in the international movement — and here I would like to express my deep agreement with professor Zdenko Roter — and this pluralism also corresponds to the plurality of the factors of the international development and

of the progressive forces. The class position is of necessity bipolar, due to the historic circumstances corresponding to the bipolar system of the military equilibrium of the two superpowers. Still, this is only the starting-point which should in practical policy use pluralistic methods of the dialogue including the full variety of progressive movements, a variety which corresponds to the objectively given levels of the development of the revolutionary struggle. Only various elements, with their independence fully respected, can result in a real organic unity of action.

At the end I would like to say a few words in connection with the discussion of the former speaker, comrade Mario Spinella, who discussed the problem of sovereignty in connection with the problems of the political development, especially in Czechoslovakia. I think that what I have said about the question of the cultural, scientific-technical revolution can be applied also to the formation of its political antithesis: it is the task of the Marxist theory to work out also the political extrapolation of the problems concerning the turning-point of the civilization, of this challenge of the scientific-technical revolution. Since the tendency towards universalism, towards integration, towards widening of regional markets is getting more and more prominent we need in these circumstances an investigation of sovereignty which is not casuistic — such investigations we encounter very often — but rather really scientific.

## Ž. RAKOČEVIĆ, BELGRADE:

The social functions of communist party are the central material of this, third »round table«. I am going to approach this problem, which has been illuminated from several sides already, from an unusual side — unusual for this meeting. Being a political economist — the political economy is my specialized field — I am going to proceed from this point of view in my discussion also. I am going to emphasize above all the economic dimensions of this problem. Since time is very limited, I shall only propose a few theses and questions.

The fundamental problem is how a communist party — and I have in my mind above all Yugoslav experiences — is to »detach« itself from power; how it is to begin to criticize the power. How is it to negate its own role in the creation of a »model« of socialism in a real way? How is it to surpass the role which it has played so far as — if I put it in this way a spiritual essence of the state, a backbone of the state? In other words, how can it practically begin to criticize the state

with which it has been identical, with which it has been one in the development so far?

We are facing two very important questions here. The first question is: Why does this process occur at all? Why should the party detach itself from power? Why should the party begin as we Yugoslav communists say — a different political strategy, or rather, why must it begin the so-called ideological-political directing of social processes, of the working class, and of other social layers which tend towards socialism? How is it possible at all that the party does this, when it has been, so to say, mechanically identified with the state? All this presupposes the possibility of a magic way — the way of Münchhausen — that the party can extract itself from the position which differs a great deal from the position which it would like to have. This reminds me of a picture of a sinking man pulling his hair in order to come to the surface of the water.

I would also like to touch upon the position which has been previously emphasized, namely that there exists no uniform »model« of socialism. On the contrary, recent practice of communist countries shows that these »models« of socialism part in some extent, there even occurs — as our Italian comrade said — a kind of refusing, repulsing among the concepts of socialism which are relevant now. Further our discussion tried to prove that also political life itself should get differentiated, that is, that socialist political forms should develop first towards political pluralism, that the socialist political forms be revolutionized. I completely agree with this view on political relations. Still, I would like to put a question: What is that final, real social cause which »produces« such phenomena? If we ask his question, we must — whether we like it or not — answer it in the way as has been introduced in our discussion by some people. We must namely speak more critically about the *determining productive relations*. These relations have been touched upon already in this discussion; but I think they have not been treated critically enough; we have not tried to critically penetrate deeper in what *Capital* calls »the most internal secret, the essence of a given social structure« and of a historic period. We must direct our analysis to this road. We must establish if anything has changed in the real productive relations, in the very principle of appropriation, that is in the relations of division. In other words: has anything changed in the ownership relations; what is the present position of the direct producer to the material circumstances of his production, to his productive labour; or rather, viewed from another side: what are the forms like through which his surplus labour is alienated

from him? Marx absolutely emphasized this dimension in all of his works.

The second thing to which I would like to call your attention is the historic universality of the process of uniting labour and the internal lawful connection of this social relation with commodity production, that is with »production of value«. The contemporary crisis of etatism is connected with this — the crisis of state capitalism in the West and of ultra-etatism in the East. This crisis can be seen in numerous manifestations. I think that something is confirmed here about what Marx spoke when discussing the practice in France after the revolution, in the middle of the last century. I have just mentioned this problem by the way.

When we say that something is changing in the utmost inner secret of social structure, then we really encounter the problem of the various forms of uniting labour, manifest in this or that way, and whose political reflection is the so-called student movement of the world. Of course, these forms of uniting labour vary a great deal in different countries. In our society we have to do with various economic forms of uniting labour through which the worker appropriates his labour more and more. With us this process is taking a different course, as a development and strengthening of the functions of the enterprise, or rather of the working collectives as the fundamental producers of commodities. In my view, this actual logic of uniting labour brings about these changes in the political sphere. And the other way round: the revolutionizing of this political sphere, the differentiation of the political forms of socialism in the direction of a specific political pluralism, that is the abolition of transmissions the detachment of the communist party from the monopoly of power, and the transition of the party to the conceptual-political direction (even though this process is not taking place without friction and sometimes we »return« to the »old«) all these represent that strongest lever, by means of which we can deepen, accelerate and revolutionize this economic process. That is why I think that the discussed problem is of extreme importance.

In connection with this new nature of the relations in production, I would like to say something else. A profound critical analysis, which would also try to revalorize Marx's doctrine, and would be based on practical facts, would certainly establish that the structure of the contemporary relations in production is essentially different from the structure investigated by Marx. I discuss this problem in my paper also, that is why I shall not go into details here. I would just like to call your attention to one dimension. In classic capi-

talism, investigated and scientifically explained by Marx, the contemporary forms of state protectionism of the so-called neo-capitalism, simply could not be imagined. Even a relatively unimportant thing, as for instance the state supervision over the sources of raw materials, was absolutely incompatible with the inner logic of the capitalist productive relations in that time. Today there exist phenomenal forms of this interventionism and supervision. In various ways the state penetrates deeply into the secret inner sphere, in the very physiology of bourgeois society. Thus there exists above all an allinclusive control over profit; further such interventions are: the policy of cheap money, the world function of dollar, pound sterling, and of other convertible currencies (this last thing has been characteristic of the recent years), super-national unions of states, as for instance EEC, EFTA, Eastern European Mutual Assistance Treaty and others; all these movements shorten considerably the industrial cycles. On the other side we can see interventions which mitigate falls, »recessions«, crises. The state regulates the relations among the fundamental social forces in a very interesting way; it namely »permits« that that tendency is established which Marx anticipated, that the total working time gradually changes into the necessary working day; or rather the tendency that the narrow limits of wages are broken in a way, that this dependent changable nature of wages is surpassed, that is its complete dependence on the degree of accumulation. Thus the contemporary state has made possible a historic change. Our comrades from western states certainly know these phenomena better than we do, because they live this practice; still also we know many things about this, because also we investigate this practice and study the pertinent books illuminating this problem critically and explaining it.

I am calling your attention to these problems because we have to take into account the fact that the solution of the last crisis of the franc in France (and also in some other countries) is sought in an attempt to rise the »price of labour«, the national wages, to a higher level and in a considerable increase of the »degree of increase«, what inevitably brings about inflation, the rise of the »costs of production«, etc. Still, these are actual ways in which — though only in an embryonal form — there are manifest the processes of uniting labour, that is the historic processes of the development of socialism. But this is so only, and above all, in a *negative*, distorted form, as was also the case with the former companies limited by shares. In recent decades changes have taken place in negative and in positive sense, this is also in the sense of a positive negation of this private capitalist appropria-



tion. I give to this assertion an extremely conditional value. Such a process has been taking place in an accelerated way for some ten years. In my opinion this is that very inner logic, actual dialectic which demands also this differentiation in the political sphere, the so-called political pluralism, the abolition of the power monopoly of the communist party.

At the end of my discussion I would like to call your attention to one more thing. Even though I think that the problem of humanism, the development of individual liberties, etc., is of exceptional importance for socialism, we still have to do with a derived problem and derived relation, with a problem and a relation which are derived from these changes in the internal social structure. I personally find it very disturbing that on the one side we insist on certain — we call them classic forms of the communist party — or — in spite of the changes of organizational-political nature — on its old social function; that they insist rigidly on planning as an absolute function of the state, that they insist on the policy of full, even though only fictitious, employment, that they insist — and here I think of some East-European countries — on the policy of rigid directing the entire economic life, a negation of the logic of commodity production (with which uniting of labour is of necessity connected), while on the other side, they try to establish political pluralism, human liberties, etc., in the fullest sense of the word in the political sphere. I personally think that these two things are incompatible for a longer time. Political pluralism, liberties, humanism, etc., are in a close correlative connection with those more profound changes, with true changes in productive relations — the way of uniting labour, the development of the economic forms of uniting labour, the development and strengthening of the process of the contemporary market economy. This is so even though — as I have said — revolutionizing in the political sphere — which has been discussed very critically, with much commitment, profoundly and with much imagination by some comrades before — is a decisive reactive moment which speeds these inner changes. The one is closely connected with the other, and both are in a mutual, causal relation creating one uniform theoretical concept. This is all I have wanted to say now.

**B. MAGAS, LONDON:**

I am going to be very short. I am going to discuss the question of the party. The party is the basis of every revolutionary movement. I need not call your attention to the fact that the

Soviet working class came in power under the leadership of the bolshevik party, that the Chinese class of workers and peasants took over power with the help and under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, and that this was the case in Yugoslavia also. There has been only one exception to this rule so far, that is Cuba where the role of the revolution won victory without the help of the Cuban Communist Party. After the revolution there arises the question: what should the communist party be like? At this Colloquium we have heard new contributions which want to degrade the party to an unimportant position in social-political development. In my opinion this sad view proceeds from the fact that communist parties in East Europe have lost even the slightest pretension of criticizing society from the point of view of the working class. I am no great philosopher; I will give as an illustration a very concrete example from the Yugoslav Communist Party, and concrete examples of problems concerning this party. I think that Communist Party of Yugoslavia is facing the following concrete problems. As far as I can see they are six. But comrades can correct me and add new problems. I am going to enumerate them in order:

1. considerable differences in income and in the standard of living;

2. considerable differences in the economic development of the North and of the South of Yugoslavia;

3. increasing unemployment; a part of the working class must go to work in foreign countries;

4. the existence of privileges, both political and social of a part of bureaucracy, as for instance, the directors of factories, presidents of communes, etc.;

5. growth of private sector in production, representing a danger for the social control over the means of production;

6. abdication of the solidarity with other revolutionary movements in the world, while the government has friendly relations with the reactionary governments of India and of Indonesia. I need not call your attention to the fact that the government of Indonesia daily shoots workers and peasants struggling against it, and that this same government is directly responsible for the death and destruction of five hundred thousand Indonesian communists. In their protest last year, the students from the University of Belgrade touched upon these questions.

If a labour party does not discuss these questions in public, that is in factories, at faculties and everywhere else, then this party is no longer a labour party but rather a bureaucratic institution, automatically losing its influence and the confidence of workers and peasants. Then the question

of the party and its role in society is treated in a different manner — it is no longer treated as a problem of a party struggling for the political power of the working class, but rather as a problem of an institution which has ceased to play its class role in society.

I would like to underline that all these questions are not problems of humanism, of a certain philosophical idea of humanism, but are rather concrete problems of economic policy.

Thank you for your attention.

#### V. SABIK, BRATISLAVA:

I would like to tell you a few thoughts on the theme »socialism and the human factor«. I proceed from the thesis that the socialist revolution has not yet realized the hopes and the needs of an unlimited horizon of new humanism. Many things obscure our view — the fate of socialism in last decades has become a victim of a wrong account, of false philosophy of man, which has determined the conception of humane actuality in practice. The well known deformations of socialism and of socialist democracy of humanism, the strait-jacket of bureaucratic dogmatism, demagogic hypocrisy, terrorist despotism, urge for power, and concentration of power, anti-intellectualism, fetishization of the apparatus, abolition of the individual and of personality, all these are proofs that socialism in general has not succeeded yet to finally solve the problem of power and spirit. It seems that the traditional structure of the institutions of socialist society creates especially favourable circumstances for abuse of political power, this means that its mechanisms of social control over power have been absolutely insufficient. This has brought about a break in the development of socialism, that break because of which a humanist beginning ended in antihumanism. This is great inconsistency, a mistake and a move away from the original ideal, a danger latently threatening socialist democracy. Can socialism bear its humanist addition? This question is urgent, because we have already experienced the opposite of this. The experience that socialism united with dictatorship, not with the dictatorship of the proletariat but with the dictatorship of secretariat, with the kingdom of silence, is disturbing. Then we encounter the question of the true content of history, and this is human activity. Today the view is accepted that in building socialism we have to do with a very complicated organism, in which several forces are active, with an organism which cannot be made by means of an elaborate recipe from

today till tomorrow. I proceed from the thesis that among these forces those which can be defined as the human factor are of highest importance. It must be clear to us that also in socialism it is the people who rule and decide about people. From this it is clear that the bad deformations of socialism and democracy are to be explained as a consequence of a wrong marxist anthropology. These deformations mean a definite failure of the old, out-of-date picture of the world in Marxism. The problem of the picture of man is thus in the very centre. In the sense of this old anthropology man was explained above all as a product of economic laws, as an object to the economic-social circumstances, and degraded to a transitory point of this process, and thus killed. The social position actually shapes also man's consciousness, his decisions, still this fact should not be made absolute in a primitive and dogmatic way, as a principle for the explanation of very complicated ways of human activities and behaviour. Man is not a mere exponent of the political, economic and social situation. The ownership of the means of production did not set man free, and did not change him into a good being. His life struggle does not end with this. Man does not finally leave the kingdom of animals, does not come out of animal circumstances in actual human conditions. The socialization has not overcome the source of evil in man, his immense power, all inhumanity. And evil is the true reason of the deformation of man. Evil — whose tracks are well known — originates in the instinctive structure of human nature, and shows the need for prestige, aggressive instinct, fear, etc. Man, unfortunately also man in socialist social order, is no harmonious unit, but rather a battlefield of fierce contradictions and historic elements. In my opinion, this is one of the most important statements not only for the interpretation of human existence, the unreduced human actuality, but also for any binding, scientifically founded conception of socialism. The thought on evil in the human world, this ancient thought, must be considered as an anthropological statement about the essence of man one of the conditions of the socialist revolution. The idea of socialist liberation of man, of socialist democracy, must — if it is to make sense — take in account the dangers which are connected with the existence of evil in man, and defend itself against the expression of them. Scientific socialism cannot exclude humaneness, the human side of humanization. Serious study must be one of the fundamental conditions of socialism. Without study, and without an efficient application of its results, socialism is a utopia without history, a dream image and an untrue phantom. The fundamental anthropological questions have their actual sig-

nificance in the very connection with the problems of socialist democracy. Socialist democracy must raise anew the question about the essence of man. It is not possible to speak about socialism unless we measure it by the norm of what man really is, what he needs, how he feels, what is his attitude to the world in actuality, what forces are active in him. Subjective and objective forces of human behaviour in politics must be controlled. Anomymous forces in man must be given names, instead of being blindly faced, we must survey the mass of psychological factors of super-individual behaviour, we must master the laws of human personality, of human initiative, function complexes in personal happenings, etc. All this opens a new possibility to socialism. This process, such evolution and adjustment in the concept of socialism is still taking place. It is not possible to permanently give reasons on the basis of categories and theory and to go further. We must accept the challenge of our time. In this connection I would like to mention that prescientific positions still predominate in our political thought. This can be seen in politics, in the strategy of the socialist revolution, science as a method is included in it in a very small extent. I wonder why. A reasonable connection of scientific methods should be made possible, a complex scientific conception of socialism in the time of the second industrial revolution created.

Here I would like to state a few aspects of the new model in Czechoslovakia, of course from my personal point of view. Persuasiveness of the ideas of socialism will always depend on whether it succeeds in a solid and permanent way to realize the concrete ideas of the present state and economic order and to connect these with the ideals representing the psychological, material and institutional données and needs of our time. In the present period of the scientific-technical revolution there are active processes, whose consequence is a profound change of the traditional structure of society, of the material basis of life, nature, labour. Man himself is beginning to gradually liberate the essence of his human existence. The structural and functional breaks in relations in production, the abolition of class antagonism, the realization of the relations in the process of collective co-operation and humanization have become an essential constituent element of socialist changes as an accompanying phenomenon of the technical revolution. The developmental stages in the structure of the modern means of production of society (science being one of the most important among them) are much more radical in their social and general human consequences than it is acknowledged by the traditional theory of socialist industrialization. Relaxation and further development of economic,



sociological and anthropologic conditions are a part of the most elementary significance of the socialist age. We must ensure the progressive means of production which are a condition of revolutionizing the civilizational basis of human life. Intervention of science into social life has become one of the most important factors of this new development. Socialism could not win victory if it did not establish the advantage of a social structure without class antagonism with its openness and sensibility to this new dimension of the civilizational process. The study of the social and human complex of the technical revolution leads us to knowledge that an increasing line of the necessity of freedom and of democratization of life comes to expression in the modern, socialist basis of civilization. The process of unconditioned democratization has become the fatal question of modern socialism. In the time of a rationally organized society polarity of freedom and order is accelerated and annihilated not by too much freedom, but rather by too many state and social links. Merely functional ideologies must be replaced by a new critical philosophy of man, belonging to the main theme of socialist problems, and to which Marx contributed important beginnings with his explanation of man as the highest essence of man. This is the cardinal question of modern socialism. Only in this way it can develop the victorious prototype of man, so much needed in our time. Thank you.

W. HAUG, BERLIN:

I would like to return once more to the »picture of man«, and I want to call my contribution »Reflections on pluralism within the framework of the communist and socialist world movement«. I hope that also comrade Roter will give his attention to me, because it is my purpose to answer his remarks. It seems to me that while this discussion is moving to its end we should try to add a kind of definition of the situation; we should try at least to sketch the situation in which we are speaking (not discussing) here. This situation may perhaps be covered by the title pluralism and plurality. First of all the style of this conference has a pluralistic character. It is taking place as a succession of monologues mechanically following in time, which are only exceptionally and marginally connected with each other. Thus a state of numerical plurality is attained. This could continue for ever without ever resulting in a discussion. Boundless tolerance is limited only quantitatively: one must stop after 15 minutes. This »discussion« must be characterized also by a kind of a definition

of the atmosphere. Paradoxically this discussion is taking place without interests or passions. Somebody spoke about boredom, and this is probably the atmosphere of such congresses in general. I think that boredom felt here is in a kind of connection with the absence of internationalism. This could be the opposite concept of pluralism. Obviously discussions no longer take place, we are obviously many, only mechanically following an invitation, next to each other in a room and in a certain time, applying for the word as monologists. We are speaking about socialism and democracy; we are speaking about socialism, we are intellectuals, the majority from socialist countries and a small number from capitalist imperialist countries and nobody from the third world. What does it mean if intellectuals speak about socialism? Above all the intellectuals are suspected of speaking about the socialism of intellectuals, that is about ourselves; of not formulating the interests of generality, of the common, but rather our own interests, the interests of a clearly defined social layer. When our Czechoslovak comrade, who spoke before me, spoke about the picture of man I could at best see the picture of one of us, namely the picture of an intellectual spending his life in production and elaboration of ideas. In economic terms, we are eaters of surplus, we eat a part of the surplus produced by the working classes. The state grants us this with a double purpose: partly — and its is probably the smaller part — with the purpose that we produce something of use for the community, and partly with the purpose which was described by Brecht in his last unfinished play *Turandot oder der Kongress der Weisswäscher* — when this play was produced in Zurich the stage had an inscription: »You act and we supply arguments«. The task, because of which intellectuals are entertained, is to produce justification of what has been happening anyway. When we intellectuals speak about socialism we must also speak about the intellectual in socialism, to prevent what Brecht said about certain intellectuals: »Their industry worries me«, since »they are not related to the revolution as heads but rather as stomachs«. This means that, when speaking about socialism, we are requested to jump over our own shadow as a social layer. It is part of this that we do not speak about people in general, but rather discuss the concrete problems of the historical and social progress. If they speak that the picture of man be betrayed in socialist countries; of if they say that we are concerned with remembering again the humanist content, with renewing a real tolerance and saving the picture of man and humanizing society — then in these arguments we miss at least a reference to the social-economic processes, with the development of

which humanity or inhumanity is connected for a considerable majority of members of society. I would like to answer comrade Roter — with all the possible friendship — that a mere separation of the state and the party does not humanize society. Even more, it does not humanize it equally for everybody: it humanizes it definitely for our layer. At such a separation of the party and the state we have the possibility to devote ourselves without control to our production of ideas and to behave as producers of commodities. For workers and for peasant this separation does not necessarily mean humanization. If they are unemployed, or if they have work but do not participate in the process of decision-making and not in distribution as we do, then this does not mean humanization. We can think — and not only think, it is so — that humanization for those who are down in any case, for the underprivileged and poor classes of society is inseparably connected with the historic work, under the leadership of the party, which seems to have »inhumane features« for us intellectuals because it deprives us of our privileges. Of course, I do not want to plead that somebody take our privileges from us intellectuals — the privilege of a free access to information or to communication. Still, I would like to suggest that we have not the attitude of »stomachs but rather of heads« towards these facts.

I would like to return to the phenomenon of pluralism or plurality. There exists first of all an external pluralism; we need not speak much about this, the antagonism among communist countries finally led to armed encounters, if we do not speak about the underground conflicts of secret services. The practical and theoretical conflicts among parties finally go so far that we can hardly speak about internationalism. To the obvious state of external pluralism comes also the second perspective — introduced into our debate above all by comrade Roter, and also by other comrades from *Teorija in praksa* — the perspective of inner plurality as a counter-conception to the clear leadership of the party. I would like to say a few words about these two phenomena and to discuss the given arguments. This is not at all easy, that is why it will not be smooth. Several Yugoslav comrades connected the separation of the state and the party with the conception of internal plurality, with a series of separations. Comrade Debenjak separated in an interesting way politics and theory; he assigned pragmatism with the criterion of ability to be disappointed to politics, to theory he allotted the demand to be principled with the criterion of falsifiability. He formulated the concept of alliance as an adequate concept for politics. But he rejected this for theory, that is for Marxism

as theory. — Many things could be said about this separation. I would just like to call your attention to the following consequence: all this was sharpened in a fiercely formulated refusal addressed to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. From the theoretical point of view this has nothing in common with Marxism or socialism. I am going to return to this argument later. Comrade Supek brilliantly divided and separated two orientations: if with comrade Debenjak these were theory and policy, then with Supek they were freedom and consumption. — The argumentation of comrades from SDS, from West Germany, showed similar separations, only they mobilized the nature of movement, and everything characteristic of the movement in contrast to all institutions, in contrast to everything that could be realized, to the category of actual and the category of the actually possible, and they fetishized the mere dynamic as such, the mere excitement as excitement, connected with the devaluation of all the concrete attempts, occurring anywhere in the world and in history also to realize anything. I would like to warn you against a logic which I can well understand, but which I consider to be erroneous. It has been above all said: there exist several roads to socialism (and I, naturally, agree with this statement). But this sentence is stated only to be followed by another sentence: so our own road is justified. This is a questionable deduction. This is namely an attempt to withdraw ones own road from criticism. If this deduction is only questionable, the next deduction is ceratinly rong. This deduction states as the third conclusion: thus other roads to socialism, or some other roads to socialism are not at all roads to socialism. Here we have to do with an excommunication which has been directed unanimously against the states of the Warsaw Pact.

The inner and external plurality are connected with — so to say — an appearance of the truth in a dismembered state. Actually there exists no fraction, no party in the world which — at the time being — would possess an unqbestionable, revolutionary truth. Parties, countries and institutions which come closest to it are those in struggle, so for instance comrades in Viet Nam. The truth comes in little pieces and it is kind of late revenge of bourgeois thought: man's ideas and technological, material, economic efficiency obviously appear entirely separated. Tolerance seems to be to the privilege of the poor and dictatorship the curse of efficiency. In this situation we must not keep silent about poverty in the name of tolerance and excommunicate efficiency. At least we as intellectuals should try to keep together the dismembered pieces in the discussion in an internal socialist public. I think that the last two years and the forthcoming years will be char-

acterized by a world-wide separation inside the progressive movements: on the one side we have what Kant considered to be the criterion of correctness and legitimacy of the French Revolution, the revolutionary enthusiasm, and on the other the technical rationality. If this separation really takes place, it will have fatal consequences. Irrational enthusiasm makes stupid; rationalism or technicism, technocratism, which has excluded revolutionary enthusiasm, turns into a dull apparatus, which will probably break into pieces some day. — This has been said in rather metaphorical terms, in a longer discussion much more should be said about this. I really just wanted to summon people like me, that is socialist intellectuals, to resist the temptation of this separation. I wanted to suggest that we — as socialist intellectuals — try to rescue what can be rescued in the medium of the relative impotence which is characteristic of us, by means of a discussion about internationalism. If pluralism is to exist, then also those socialist countries, parties and models which have emphasized efficiency must inevitably belong to this pluralism, so for instance the German Democratic Republic and SED, which have carried out excellent technological and economic work; which have perfectly solved the problems of work, education, health security and other questions of social policy; which — as we all know — have realized more questionable things in the field which concerns us as socialist intellectuals, in the field of the so-called cultural policy, than in any other field. Still, this should not induce us to take to this state an attitude of stomachs — as Brecht would say that is of the interests specific of our social layer. We must see that an inevitably necessary part of socialist policy is being created there, namely the solutions of material-economic problems. In spite of this we can insist that there is still not enough of that on which we must equally insist, if our attitude to socialism is the attitude of the head. This means that I do not want to advocate an uncritical apology. The purpose of my remarks has been criticism and self-criticism of our discussion.

The world-wide separation of revolutionary enthusiasm and technical rationality has come to expression also in this discussion. In several contributions — and also in the best contributions by comrades from socialist countries and above all from the hostess state — we have heard language which has been familiar to us from bourgeois political science and sociology. I think that in this we have perceived a reflection of the one-sided orientation of technocratic thought. In the contributions of our West German comrades from SDS we heard the speechlessness of the decision for dynamic at any cost, even at the cost of the reflection on contents, possibili-



ties of alliance, and possibilities of realization. In the anti-authoritative movement in the West — and we have heard that similar phenomena appear in Ljubljana also — we can notice that there exists an enormous fascination of the abstract-negative, and that a certain negation with which — if I understand this correctly — Marxism stands or falls finds lesser and lesser words, is less and less »persuasive«. We can see this fascination of the abstract negation from narcotics to the club of suicides, to the attempts of assassination at various levels: destruction of machines, return to poetry — in this way I understood also the contribution of SDS-comrade, who has unfortunately left this room. I had a feeling that this was pure poetry, neither Marxism nor policy. We should understand that this fascination of abstract negation, which is spreading as a fire in woods, is something which could no longer represent the avant-garde of our movement — as comrade Spinella formulated it — but could rather destroy this movement. We must be aware that also we are responsible for this; in this matter socialist intellectuals and writers from all countries have a considerable part of guilt . . . I am not excluding myself.

Let us try — as intellectuals — to unite the dismembered elements, in which socialism is appearing now in this world, at least in theory and in discussion, so that the broken pieces of the ruins will not kill us tomorrow.

#### Ć. SADIKOVIĆ, SARAJEVO:

It has been regularly emphasized that etatist or stalinist deformation of power and of democracy in socialist society is characterized by *merging* or *close connection of the party and power* what inevitably causes several harmful consequences and above all makes impossible and obscure the true democratic social function of the *proletarian party*, and its position in the existent system of democratic and political institutions, and its function in directing social development. But we must doubt the assertion, which often appears in our literature, that in this connection party represented that factor which determined the entire policy, the actions of power and of the state, and that in these circumstances party influenced directly the state apparatus making of it an obedient tool; if we say this, we cannot understand the true significance, perspective and democratic content of the eventual *separation of the party and power, distancing* of the party from the existent state apparatus. The analysis of the development of the state in socialist society proves

persuasively that the development of etatism and Stalinism has created an immense state machinery, which has protected its own interest under the cover of the interests of the working class, and that this apparatus has gradually assimilated the party making it a *facade, a means, for making legitimate* its essentially undemocratic social functions. Already Lenin noticed this course of the development of the state when requesting the communist party to fight against the state apparatus more intensely and to influence its activity so as to prevent several deformations and »accidents« which had already occurred because of the uncontrolled growth, inappropriate structure and function of the existent state apparatus.

If the party has been really *absorbed* and *neutralized* by the influence of an *omnipotent* and *everywhere present* organization of the state, then the process of *separation from power*, which is basically an effort for greater democracy, cannot be only separation for separation's sake; with it the party in rather taking such a position from which it will be able to carry out its function of »directing« or of »subjective intervention« more appropriately, from which it will be able to *control, direct, evaluate and democratically stimulate* the state apparatus itself to stand for a *democratic evolution and decentralization* which is justified democratically, in one word, to do everything what it could not do as long as *suppressed* by the state, and especially by the executive power. This process of the separation from power is justified only when we undertake it in order to establish such a relation between power and party which will make it possible that, on the one side, the party keeps its *independence*, which is a very hard task in the circumstances in which there exist a strong and expanded state mechanism, and on the other, it *influences* all social spheres, and especially the state apparatus, trying to make it *rational, cheap and democratic* and to engage it in the realization of the social revolution. Thus the party should only in the process of *distancing* come into position to decidedly, democratically influence its activities, especially if it transfers the main point of its influence to the *assembly* as a democratic organ, instead of being based on the executive power, as it has usually been the case so far, out of which there resulted some shortcomings in democracy in general.

In the history of the state and party so far we can see that the party has kept mainly that relation to the state apparatus as was established in the first days following the take-over of power, and this means that the party is present in all the structures and fissures of the state apparatus and that it is very hard to determine where the activity of the

party practically begins, in what direction it is acting, and what are the social effects of this activity. The relation of the party to the state apparatus has remained in a large extent *unsystematized, undetermined, diffuse* and is responsible for the most frequent infringements against democracy in the development of socialist society. The democratically inspired separation of the party from power is necessary in order to reveal the *perspective of the development of democracy* and of the new society in general, in order that we can estimate the *activities* of all the existent democratic and political institutions, in order that we can successfully survey and sum up the results of the realization of the common interest, that we can all permanently be aware and also refresh this consciousness of community, which is being built, and in order to ensure the necessary *ethic-social content and direction* in all the social and political institutions. In this way the party could perform that role which is necessary, because of the nature of the existent social basis, from which the above mentioned political and democratic institutions proceed and grow; this is still always more or less bourgeois society and if the process of *creation and recreation* of power in electoral democracy took place entirely *spontaneously and without control*, this society would inevitably get established at the political level, and this means that we would always get as a result what this society can abolish, that it, *classic political power*, and this, of course, is entirely incapable of realizing the demands for the revolutionary transformation of the existent society and for the building of socialist community, because of its characteristics which we have established and emphasized so far. Only if the party becomes *independent*, and successfully emancipates itself from the state apparatus, it will be able to perform those acts which are necessary to abolish the *negative effects and impulses* of social circumstances, which are still always not sufficiently revolutionary, to preserve, support, and develop the democratic institutions with revolutionary direction, ability and content, because also limitation of liberal democracy wants only to prevent the *reflection of the existent society* in the vital sphere of the political in the new circumstances, to ensure everything necessary that the newly established institutions function in accordance with their ideal programme determinations, that they be really democratic, creative, progressive, and thoroughly engaged in the creation of the new society.

If we have decided for such a form of power and democracy which demands the existence of the *proletarian party* — which is actually »a party in the great historic sense of this word« — then we have really decided for the *highest possible*

*form of democracy*, in so far as this organization stands in its own way for the abolition of those social roots which necessarily give birth to the relations of absence of freedom, inequality and disintegration in society, which of necessity create a *split* between declared democracy and its true social nature.

#### A. BIBIČ, LJUBLJANA:

I would like to speak about the nature of our present meeting as I understand it. In this Colloquium I see one of the forms of that process which we called »socialism and democracy«. If we speak about the position of the communist party as the leading force in society, if we speak about the relations among communist parties, if we speak about internationalism, then there arises the question what forms must be used by these parties and movements and socialist societies in general and progressive forces in order to learn what the other people think, how they live, what problems have they encountered and what perspectives are open to socialist society. Of course, this meeting is not supposed to be a meeting of parties, it is rather a meeting of some newspapers and individuals trying to consider the typical problems of socialist theory and practice and of contemporary society in general. When as a member of the preparatory council I stood for this Colloquium I understood it to be a possibility of a meeting of the people really concerned with these problems in a time when the progressive forces with us and the world have to face very serious questions. We never thought that this Colloquium should be directed against anybody, or that it would be a platform from which to teach what socialism or democracy should be like. We conceived this meeting as an exchange of experiences and of views regarding the problem which we felt represented the fundamental question of socialism. The problem of democracy and socialism, the problem of the party in socialism, is not a question which could be solved by rhetoric; it is rather a real, live problem of the position of the people in the socialist political system and of the position of the working man, not man as a man, but the position of the working class and of the working man. The position and the possibility and actuality of the working class and of other social layers to act themselves as subjects in the economic sphere, in the sphere of culture and policy depend upon the concept of the party, on its position in society and on the position and role of the state in society. If I have understood correctly the theoretical

concept advocated by the Yugoslav political theory, then I think that it is essential of it that it wants to create such a system in which the subjectivity of the subjects of socialist society is established, and not differences which exist merely as differences against the old society, as an abstract negation of the old society.

It is clear that in the socialist transformation — if viewed from the point of view of our experiences — we cannot say that there exist no problems, no contradictions, no difficulties, and no phenomena — to put it in this way — which are dangerous for our society, as I told you yesterday in a more general form. For instance: the problem of the privileges in society, the problem of unemployment, and of inequality. Still, we must know that we have not heard of these problems for the first time today; these are problems which have been emphasized in our discussion by several participants and which represent official recognitions of our policy, and which are in the very centre of discussion before the 9th congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. This means that we are aware of these problems; these problems have come into our concrete theory and especially in our practical action.

That party which proclaims itself to be progressive but really lives alienated in the sphere of political monopoly is not a progressive party; that party which becomes and remains leading by encouraging the working class and all the working people and socialist social layers to really come to power and to influence the decision-making and the movement of society itself is the progressive party. I think that this is fundamental to the understanding of the leading role of the revolutionary avant-garde.

The second question is whether the experiences of one country, to put it in this way, are universal. I cannot answer this question a priori. It should be ascertained in practice what is my universal and what my particular and personal experience.

When preparing this Colloquium we desired, let me repeat this once more, to see above all what problems are faced by the people who think about socialism and democracy. We invited also other newspaper and publicists to participate in this discussion and we are sorry that we have received no answer from some of them, while others could not come. The basic tone of our Colloquium as I have grasped it — and I think this is true also of the comrades from Czechoslovakia and from Roumania, and of every body who has determined the tone of this Colloquium — has been characterized by the fact that everybody has spoken about the problems of socialism and democracy from his own perspective, trying to ans-



wer these questions from our own particular experiences. That is why this Colloquium is valuable for me personally. It has not been a dead monologue, it has been a live dialogue with problems facing the political theory of socialism. This Colloquium is itself — I hope that you agree — a platform expressing one of the forms of democracy, of socialist democracy and of democracy in socialism. Thank you.

#### V. STANOVIĆ, BELGRADE:

I think that from the point of view of theory and of practice of democracy, the fundamental problem in those countries in which the communist party is in power is how to surpass the monopoly of social powers possessed by this party, and which it executes authoritatively through institutional power. We all know that democracy according to its definition presupposes the co-operation of majority. Since the communist party has not got the majority in any society, then that party which tends to democracy must establish some channels, through which also other social forces, other social layers, which are broader than the party itself, can co-operate, express their opinion and influence decisions of social importance. If this is not the case, it is hard to speak about democracy and democratization. It seems to me that it is a question of principled nature, that socialist democracy has something what I would term the programme limitation. Both individuals and social groups who want to become politically active and who are politically active are officially permitted to do this only in that extent in which these groups and individual citizens co-operate in a certain determined programme. I have not got in my mind a programme as a document accepted at this or that congress, I rather think of a programme in the sense of a long term ideological conception of the movement of society. As soon as man moves out of the framework of this ideological conception, which differs a great deal in individual states, he encounters certain pressures or repressive measures, which can be very drastic also. The co-operation of wider layers, of citizens in making conceptions for a new programme is very limited; since often even the leaders, the political leaders of a state do not create the fundamental components, elements of this programme, but rather take these elements from literature, from older and more recent theories and, of course, interpret them in this or that way, and sometimes these conceptions are forced upon parties (weaker parties) by the party of one state (a stronger one). Apart from this programmatic limitation there exists also a

»personal limitation«, if we call it so for now. Some people namely think that that power which according to the definition (given by itself and about itself) represents the political avant-garde is the only, or almost only, power capable of leading society in accordance with the »line« of social development determined by itself. For this reason publically or silently, there prevails the opinion that only as long as certain personalities execute the highest state and political functions, they can ensure the desired direction of development. A danger arises from this that this social power, this political avant-garde, political elite actually gets constituted organizationally so, takes such a position in the relation to power, and renews itself so that it is really hard to speak about democracy.

Because of all these problems I have enumerated and because of several other problems, today in socialist countries we encounter the following situation. A general question has been raised concerning the significance of a series of institutions organized by communists after they have come in power. Why to have the government, assembly and various other political social and trade-union organizations, if the monopoly of decision-making remains within the framework of the narrow forums of the party, and if others have the role of simple transmissions. In this case we are always in the state of going a few steps forwards and of returning back again. Since all these institutions and bodies are formally not party bodies, they must engage wider social layers, they must engage citizens because they are citizens. Thus a possibility is created that these bodies — under the pressure of a relative majority, which even though it co-operates in a minimal extent in their creation still exercises a pressure as the public opinion, and through various forms of organized pressure upon these bodies — decide in such a way which is not in full agreement with the decisions of party bodies. For this reason we are in a permanent situation in which the party really wants to »affirm« these bodies, wants to »affirm« assemblies, the parliament, and the government as autonomous agents in social life, still if this »goes too far«, if somebody feels that this is so, then a new withdrawal begins, or rather the return of social power to the centres of the party. If the process of decision-making on social matters is viewed from the purely technical point of view, then we see that if the life of a certain society is better developed, then the bodies of party are less and less competent to decide on those things which are necessary for normal life and work of society. In connection with several questions we need specialized knowledge and analyses, long-term study, and extensive discussions. With

party bodies on the other hand — irrespective of whether we have to do with congresses, central committees or any other bodies — we can still always see that these bodies meet *ad hoc*, speak about various social problems for two or three days and without sufficient argumentation, analyses, polemics, and when these bodies end with their work and decide about something global, which will for years or decades direct society, then the rest of the institutional — let us say — mechanism is only left the realization of these decisions. These decisions are — regarding the way in which they were taken — not sufficiently considered and are based upon insufficient arguments, they can have better alternatives and solutions which were not proposed because of the general atmosphere which is characteristic of such meetings. Thus in reality decisions are taken which are proposed as »the only possibility« by the party administration, or rather by groups which influence this administration. I think that this is an important question of political life in all socialist states, and it is in direct connection with the problems of democracy and with the role of the party. Of course, it is not hard to outline a few general solutions — we are mainly concerned with a distancing of the party from direct ruling, with stimulating and making possible other socialist political bodies and institutions to take independent decisions and also to accept the responsibility for these decisions. But in the concrete, everyday relations and circumstances we encounter various kinds of resistance, motivated by personal interest and by dogmatism, and also by various other ethnic, professional, etc. elements and factors. For this reason these processes of democratization are developing only very slowly.

#### Z. ROTER, LJUBLJANA:

I am going to respect the decision of the Presidency concerning the time of discussion. I would just like to make a short remark; I am also discussing in order to contribute to the realization of this meeting as a dialogue. Speaking about the dialogue and about our meeting I must emphasize that a certain precondition is of special importance for this dialogue for which we have decided. I understand the dialogue as my readiness to penetrate the thoughts of my co-speaker, to grasp his way of thinking, and as a readiness to accept his position, or rather elements of his view, if I find out that they contribute to the truth. This is how I understand the basis of our dialogue and I think this should be the case with everybody.

*The first question:* the question of legitimacy of the principles in the international socialist and communist, or rather labour movement. I am sure that the principle of pluralism proceeds from the reality of the contemporary communist, labour and socialist movement. At the same time the principle of pluralism in theory represents a thesis which resists the thesis of monolithism. I am going first to speak about this »external« pluralism, as named by comrade Haug in his discussion. It was said that a possible logic of this conception of external pluralism which should liquidate also internationalism could be the following: pluralism means several roads to socialism, thus our road to socialism is correct while other roads are wrong. I think this is not the logic of pluralism but rather its antilogic. Pluralism and its logic — the logic of external pluralism is following: in reality there exist several roads to socialism. Our road is the road possible under our conditions. This road of ours includes also the duty to investigate the experiences of other ways. This differentness of our road is also the readiness to learn from other and to create unity in diversity in this way. If we do not accept the principle of external pluralism, then we are left over only one concept, the concept that there is only one road to socialism — and since there exists the first socialist state its road is the most appropriate road historically. These final conclusions follow: anybody who thinks differently destroys unity and thus threatens internationalism and the international interests of the international communist, labour and socialist movement. So it should be prevented that anybody take any other road, those taking the wrong road should be attracted to the right road, all the means are permitted for the process of bringing back everybody to the right road. This logic takes us to the well-known resolution of the Informbureau in 1948 when the Yugoslav communists were expelled, and also to August 1968 and to the intervention of the Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia. So much regarding the external pluralism.

*Secondly:* the second form, or rather expression of pluralism is »internal« pluralism. It has been said that the principle of internal pluralism in the party would be contrary to the leading role of the party. What is internal pluralism? The principle of internal pluralism means the opposition to such a concept, such an understanding of the party according to which only the chosen men think for others, and monolithism exists in the form of an unconditioned subordination to the will of one group or even one sole person. I think that the consequences of this concept of the party are fully clear. The following is the right conclusion regarding the principle

of internal pluralism: internal pluralism is pluralism of views along with a respect for the fundamental values and aims of the movement. This concept of internal pluralism strengthens unity by creating unity in diversity.

*Thirdly.* I agree that the principle of the separation of the party from power does not make society as a whole humane, but I think that this separation of the party from power represents an important step towards the humanization of society. I think that the principle of the separation of the party from power, as explained by the speakers before me, creates considerable possibilities for the real humanization of society, since it contains several elements of humanization and is really a basic precondition of the real participation in the sense of a full engagement of the masses of working people in all the spheres of social life, from economy to politics. Socialism is not only in the interest of the members of the communist party, it rather represents the interest of wide social layers — and if this were not so, socialism would have no sense.

Five minutes have passed — so just one more thing. I would like to say something in connection with the discussion of Branka Magaš this morning. I think that in her discussion she proceeded from completely wrong assumptions. I am not going to state all these assumptions, I would just like to call your attention to one of them. This assumption is that the actuality in Yugoslavia be like her idea of this actuality, and that it can be reduced to the six alarming points about which she spoke. The logic of this assumption is this: if the position is really such, then we should find all the healthy forces inside and outside the country, so that these healthy forces would do everything to rescue socialism in Yugoslavia, since in Yugoslavia a restoration of capitalism should supposedly be taking place. I think I need not explain what this logic involves. Thank you.

## I. DUBSKA, PRAGUE:

With your kind permission I would like to express my view regarding a few theses of comrade Haug from West Berlin, briefly because our time is very limited and because an exchange of opinions can only with difficulty turn into a dialogue.

1. The overall accusation that here we have developed only an intellectualized picture of socialism, not taking in consideration the material basis and the daily existence of the masses, is — in my opinion — at least exaggerated. In



several contributions, including my own contribution, a concept of socialism has been sketched as a positive alternative of the materially, civilizationally and culturally highly developed late capitalism, with an explicit argumentation that only in this way the daily existence of »common man« can be ended and any basis of possible bureaucracy destroyed. Our problem is not the alternative: socialist democracy or a rich, socialist consumer's society; our problem is the internal structure of these aspects, and how and where to begin with this process. Both theoretical analyses and our practice prove that this process should begin in the political sphere.

2. The argument that the separation of the state and party does not guarantee a higher participation is true, but it is true only as a triviality, this means, it is methodologically mistaken. It belongs to the fundamental questions of every social science, and even more so of the marxist social science, that every institution get its content and significance in the framework of the total social structure. To raise such polemic outside this concrete historical analysis is a nonsense according to me.

3. I have been sitting here for two days and nobody has tried to expel the German Democratic Republic from the socialist camp. This is simply a lie, and it is not fair play. On some other occasion I would like to discuss with our colleague the problems of efficiency, especially the economic efficiency of the system in the German Democratic Republic. This is a very instructive field. Still this analysis should be conducted in close contact with the specific conditions of this state.

4. Our colleague expressed his agreement with the thesis that there exist several types of socialism. And he criticized that this thesis is used as an argument for the deduction of any possible, concretely given socialism as the true socialism. I must agree in this point with him. Still, nobody here presented the so-called Yugoslav model or the Czechoslovak project as the universally true model. In my contribution I explicitly argued against any such interpretation and against the liberalistic interpretation of our project. Of course, the question how to evaluate all the possible and all the given types of socialism remains open. Here we are concerned with a subtle theoretical problem and now we have not got the possibility to continue this important discussion. But in any case this evaluation must be in the hands and heads of concrete individuals, concrete social groups, concrete parties. Our colleague was very careful as regards the bourgeois remains in the concept of sociology and political science in the contributions of our Yugoslav colleagues. I would like to call

your attention to the fact that in the human sphere any estimate from outside from outside the concrete individuals, outside the concrete groups, is not only bourgeois but even a feudal remnant. And finally: I am absolutely sure that it is not only colleague Haug, but rather all of us here want above all to rescue the last remains of internationalism. Still, this is not possible as long as attempts are made to prove by an a priori suspicion that others are wrong, that they move in the sphere of bourgeois ideology, and that they are only intellectuals and not communist intellectuals.

## B. DEBENJAK, LJUBLJANA:

Comrade Haug spoke here about the tasks, I would even say duties of »socialist intellectuals«. He spoke about the conditions of a privileged position of ideologists, who produce ideas and ideologemes for mass consumption in class society. He spoke about the imperialist and the socialist world, to which he added the so-called »third world«. In the name of internationalism he requested that the so-called socialist world be first acknowledged this character so as to make possible the criticism of the order in these countries.

He spoke about efficient society, about parties which profess efficiency, and in this connection he mentioned the German Democratic Republic and other countries members of the Warsaw Pact. The socialist content of these societies should not — in his opinion — be lost for theory.

There arises the question what are the socialist achievements of these efficient societies? Our attention was called to the abolishment of unemployment, to the efficiency of the German Democratic Republic, etc. Well, since national-socialist Germany showed the same advantages this would accordingly prove the socialist nature of Hitler's Germany; of course, comrade Haug does not say or believe this.

Efficiency taken per se, without its real content saying efficiency of what it is, is nothing. There exist two efficient systems of repressive society — the late capitalist, essentially persuasive efficient society, whose excellent literary portrait can be seen in Huxley's *Brave New World*, and the so-called socialist, essentially terrorist-repressive efficient society, whose picture is given in Orwell's *Nineteen-eightyfour*. In both models the means of production (in literary abstraction) are nationalized, that is the nationalized means of production are subject to management of power elite. In both efficient societies — if we are permitted to speak together with Brecht — the division of society in two, in the »under-

takers« (Unternehmer) and the »undertaken« (Unternommene), is fully carried out, even though in two different ways: one of them is efficient through persuasion and the other through terror.

As regards the producers of ideas, alias intellectuals — since the intellectuals were equalized with ideologists here — comrade Haug assumed a fixed division of labour. There used to exist socialisms — and they still exist — which theoretically permit that the division of labour continues to exist. *The abolition of the division of labour* is one of the best known demands of Marx and Engels. This demand, which could not be realized technologically in the last century but is today within the range of (technological) possibility, meant that *all* labour had the privilege of free creation, which was present — even though only rudimentary — in intellectual work. The privilege of free creation is to be preserved in the so-called transitory societies, only the privilege-nature of free creation is to be abolished, so that the realivly free creators are not opposed as a »class against other classes,« to use Marx's words, but rather that this could become the »class of all the people«. Functionally taken, we intellectuals are really »superfluous stomachs« — still it is not our »stomach nature« but rather our »head nature« which drives us to rebel against functionality. We intellectuals must protest and mobilize against the persuasive and the brutal-repressive society not in order to protect our privilege, but rather in order to defend the freedom of all the people as the freedom of creation.

It would mean to despair over man if from the plebiscit decision for the »Egyptian meat-pots« in authoritative society we concluded that these »Egyptian meat-pots« were a value in general. Also millions of the readers of Springer's *Bild-Zeitung*, all the people content with their position of the »undertaken«, and the Saharows wanting to become co-undertakers are all men »as they are«. There exists only one revolutionary position — the position of the revolutionary self-change, the position of the world revolution. The events and achievements must be measured only *sub specie* of the world revolution — and this not as »socialist achievements« but rather as the preconditions of a future trans-capitalist society. If every technical discovery represents a precondition of this kind, it must not be forgotten that this precondition in the given moment represents also a precondition of the present domination.

In this extent our situation is so to say pre-revolutionary; our consciousness is unhappy; our »idea« »commits a blunder« since the nature of »man as he is« excludes the revolu-

tionary interests, even though both so-called efficient societies have got stuck, and under the influence of the historic downpour the beautiful ideological polish is coming off thus revealing the repressive frame. Criticism is not yet able to appeal internally to the individual, each individual, to reveal his interests and to formulate them, in short, criticism still cannot be really fundamental. And for this very reason the claim of any movement that it represent »socialism in general« — in this I agree with comrade Haug — is thoroughly inappropriate.

**W. HAUG, BERLIN:**

Just a short remark — it does not pay to speak about insults. I find something very unusual: I described as a danger the separation of technocracy and revolutionary enthusiasm, and now I am understood to be a technocrat. How this could happen is an absolute puzzle for me. I wanted to call your attention to this danger in order to preserve the possibility to protest against the development of technocracy. This namely cannot be done in the name of humanist ideas, we should really agree in this; this can be done only in the name of a model which is both efficient and humanist.

**M. SPINELLA, MILAN:**

In my frequent, perhaps even too frequent interventions in our discussion I have always emphasized diversity and pluralism. Now I must answer to some questions and remarks and tell you in short how we Italian communist imagine proletarian internationalism. I hope that I have given you the impression that I am not dogmatic so far; but now I am going to be so. I am going to proceed from what comrade Longo said about this problem at the last congress of the Communist Party of Italy.

Comrade Longo said that we were internationalists and that we thought of the whole and of the future of the movement. That is why we are trying to create — beyond diversity — the unity of all the labour, people's and progressive forces and to begin a great movement for the revolutionary reconstruction in the world. We are aware that the boundaries of socialism are not identical with the boundaries of socialist states, but are rather much wider. The socialist movement includes all the forces struggling against capitalism and imperialism in our world. We are aware of the historic role of

the working class in capitalist countries, not only for the development of socialism but also in the introduction of new forms and in the development of marxist thought and the fundamental principles of Leninism.

We cannot hide the fact that today the progressive movements are developing in circumstances which vary from the objective and from the subjective point of view. We can expect that these differences will even increase with time.

We do not think that the international communist movement, a part of which we are, is the whole revolutionary movement. We are not exclusive. For this reason we also demand that communist movements be open to all revolutionary, progressive and democratic forces. In 1961 comrade Togliatti wrote that Marxism was a smithy where an exceptional historic fact was emerging: various cultures, ideologies, traditions, ways of life and societies were assimilated here to come closer and be united on some later, common basis, forming the foundation of future society. We must confirm the ability of Marxism to be a universal doctrine by our acts. We Italian communists are making every effort that this merging take place in Marxism and by means of Marxism. That is why we emphasize the principle of unity in diversity. We are quite sure that the communist movement must not be only a national but also an international unit. This unity — as comrade Longo says — is experiencing a crisis today, and it can be built anew only in struggle.

I would just like to add that I am personally convinced that the fundamental question here is not a problem of words, but rather a problem of a marxist method, which is a dialectic method, a method which must not ossify. The struggle of the communist movement will bring us a new international unity.

(unauthorized discussion)



## Concluding Words

*Dear colleagues, friends, comrades. Our Colloquium is coming to its end after three days of live, interesting and rich discussion. In this discussion there were a few slower currents, successive monologues, and also a few sparks of true dialogue and live polemic. It would be superfluous, and it would also not suit the nature of our meeting, if we tried to make an official account of our work and to estimate and order views, which we have heard, or to form conclusions. I think that it will suffice to state that this Colloquium has made it possible for the editors and collaborators of twenty marxist newspapers from six European countries to come together and to exchange their opinions in an atmosphere which stimulates strong and permanent links among our newspapers.*

*Socialism and democracy, one of the greatest themes of our age, has been illuminated in these discussions from different sides and from positions of various experiences and different situations, in which individual movements and countries struggle for their socialist transformation. We have discussed questions which are in the very centre of the interest of the forces engaged in the struggle for socialism in the world, the questions of the nature and social stability of democracy in socialism, the different models of the socialist organization of power and society, which should make possible a maximal exploitation of already created objective possibilities of the development of socialism in each individual state, monolithism and pluralism in socialist society, the role of the party, the democratic mobilization of the masses in the struggle with the class forms of autocratic, bureaucratic power, and similar. Of course, we have not had time enough to investigate all these questions profoundly and in details. Naturally, several views have come to expression, some of which have been contradictory. Our round tables, naturally, also had their corners. In spite of this I think that we can establish a common characteristic of the dialogue throughout*

the three days. I think that this is a general effort to understand socialism in its inseparable connection with democracy and with the realization of the true freedom of man's personality.

There were also a few performances which were sharply distinct from the level and nature of our meeting. Still, I think that they did not change the nature of his meeting and also did not disturb our successful work.

In our discussions we were not concerned only with declarative statements for democracy and freedom. On the contrary, there has come to expression a clear critical consciousness of the great difficulties, through which the development of socialism must go in individual countries, or in the world in general, of strong bureaucratic tendencies which threaten the fundamental values of socialism in individual countries and in the international sphere. In spite of this, this Colloquium is certainly a moderate but persuasive indicator showing how the will and the desire for an open, free and democratic dialogue concerning often very delicate and controversial questions are growing more and more strong. The fundamental tone of this meeting was not furnished by a manifestation of our formal unity and uniformity of views as regards all the problems and by confrontation of various official ideological views and by recommendation of some recipes as generally applicable. On the contrary, the effort to critically investigate one's own and also foreign experiences and to direct our view further to solutions which will open roads to further and faster development of socialism was the fundamental characteristic of our meeting. This positive experience will certainly give rise to new initiative for the organization of such and similar meetings, for future contacts among us and for strengthening of mutual friendly relations.

On behalf of the organizer of this meeting — reviews *TEORIJA IN PRAKSA* and *SOCIJALIZAM* — I would like to express most cordial thanks to all the foreign and domestic participants of this Colloquium for their co-operation and particularly for their personal contribution to our common effort that this meeting, this discussion attain its aim.

On behalf of all the participants I thank the service of simultaneous interpreters, who so successfully broke the language barriers among us, making of us a multi-linguistic community for these three days.

I would similarly like to express thanks on behalf of you and myself to those comrades who have been engaged in technical and in organizational matters, and who have taken a competent, cordial and good care of them.





## Information about the Review *Teorija in praksa*

*Teorija in praksa* began to be published in January 1964 so last December it concluded its fifth year. This review was established at the initiative of the leadership of socio-political organizations and the leadership of the Higher School for Sociology, Political Sciences and Journalism at Ljubljana.

The review has always aimed at helping our public workers with taking decisions more easily and freely in their daily work by means of publishing profound treatises, critical discussions and by means of other forms of publicist activities. The programme of the review is realized by the theoretical, analytic and publicist treatment of our social practice, thus on the basis of practical experience, helping to perfect and to shape theoretical views as regards the building of socialism in a transitory age and in our circumstances. Critical social discrimination and an active attitude to the social processes in our country are essential constituent elements of the review; in a similar way, it also analyses and represents the problems of the international labour movement, socialist and progressive movement and of the international relations; it also follows and analyses the conceptual trends, socio-political, and above all, socialist-directed thought and social practice in the contemporary world.

During the time of the five years fifty numbers (with eight double numbers) of *Teorija in praksa* have been issued with a total of 9456 pages. These figures, as well as all other information in text and in statistical tables are based on the five years of the review; they do not include the issues of the sixth year as published in 1969. In these fifty numbers 1005 authors have published 1310 articles. Also the structural composition of its authors points to the programme directiveness and openness of the review; thus its authors can be divided in the following groups:



— specialist and scientific collaborators of the Higher School for Sociology, Politics and Journalism, with 52 articles in the year 1968, and the members of other university faculties and scientific institutes and institutions;

— socio-political workers from various communes and the republic;

— collaborators from various enterprises, institutions, communities and other units of our society; like economists, sociologists, psychologists, culturists, medical doctors, journalists, employees etc.;

— students and younger collaborators, who still pursue their education or who are already taking their places in our social life;

— collaborators from foreign countries, mostly writing especially for the review, or contributing their previously published articles. *Teorija in praksa* is currently exchanged with 99 foreign reviews and newspapers;

— special emphasis should be laid on the cooperation of authors from other Yugoslav republics, especially from Belgrade and Zagreb.

*Teorija in praksa* cooperates with numerous Yugoslav reviews by exchange of materials and reviews (it is sent for exchange to 63 Yugoslav reviews and newspapers).

Meetings with editorial boards of other Yugoslav sociological reviews are of great importance also. In 1968 the review began with preparations for the international Colloquium called »Socialism and Democracy« to which it has invited 50 reviews participants from 23 countries and the editors of some Yugoslav reviews.

*Teorija in praksa* performs also an important educational function. Some of its articles are used by the students of the Higher School for Sociology, Politics and Journalism as materials for their study or supplementary aids. The Bibliography of Books and Articles from Yugoslavia and foreign countries as published in the review, is of much help in this respect.

Last year also the response of its readers was examined on the basis of a special questionnaire. The results of this questionnaire were published in *Teorija in praksa*, Volume IV, number 5.

In order to provide a better picture of the above stated facts a statistical survey of authors and their articles, as published in 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967 and 1968, has been made.

A. Articles divided according to the discussed topic	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	Total
Editorial	11	11	10	10	13	55
Articles, Essays	42	33	31	26	26	158
Views, Glosses, Comments	64	59	42	39	35	240
Topical Interview	5	37	5	8	4	49
The Communists and Our Time	—	—	18	21	8	47
Problems of Political System	—	—	3	6	3	12
Echoes	7	18	8	2	8	43
Polemic	—	4	6	2	—	12
Opinions	12	12	6	4	6	40
Science and Society	—	3	5	6	8	22
Youth and our Time	—	—	9	—	—	9
Students and Politics	—	—	—	—	9	9
A Round Table Discussion	—	—	—	—	1	1
Socialism and Religion	—	3	—	—	—	3
Religion in the Contemporary World	—	—	—	—	2	2
Society and Religion	—	—	—	1	—	1
Socialism and the Nation	—	—	—	4	—	4
Socialism and Democracy	—	—	—	—	1	1
Sociological Conversation	—	—	3	—	—	3
Selfmanagement and Responsibility	—	—	—	1	—	1
Problems of Economic System	—	—	—	4	—	4
Straight Away	—	—	4	40	61	105
Yugoslavia in the Eyes of Other People	—	—	—	1	—	1
Document of the Time	4	—	—	—	3	7
Socialist Thought in the World	19	6	13	9	3	50
International Labour Movement	9	6	3	4	1	23
International Relations	4	4	6	7	5	26
Socialist Countries	5	4	3	2	6	20
Countries in Development	3	—	1	—	—	4
Reviews, Notes	29	27	24	21	23	124
Notes on Foreign Reviews	—	71	50	33	32	186
Bibliography of Books and Articles	11	11	10	10	10	52
<b>Total number</b>						<b>1310</b>

B. Authors according to their profession	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	Total
Socio-political workers	37	41	46	37	52	213
Scientific and educational workers	50	68	74	111	115	418
Journalists - publicists	15	13	14	21	37	100
Lawyers	1	5	6	13	17	42
Economists	12	11	24	30	22	99
Culturists	—	13	12	10	27	62
Students	12	12	8	3	7	42
Others	1	4	4	9	12	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>1005</b>

C. Foreign authors from:	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	Total
Poland	3	4	2	2	1	12
Czechoslovakia	3	3	1	2	5	14
Hungary	2	1	—	—	1	4
The Soviet Union	3	—	1	—	1	5
The German Democratic Rep.	—	2	1	1	—	4
The Federal Republic Germany	—	1	—	—	—	1
France	3	2	3	—	1	9
Italy	4	1	4	2	4	15
Great Britain	—	2	1	1	—	4
Austria	1	—	—	1	—	2
The United States of America	—	2	1	—	—	3
Argentina	1	—	—	—	—	1
Mali	1	—	—	—	—	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>75</b>

## n

*This Colloquium met with a response bot in Yugoslavia and outside it. Also silence on the part of those socialist countries and a part of the communist movement in the West, from where editors of reviews did not come though they were invited to, constitutes a part of this response. Thus if the list of participating editors and collaborators shows a certain one-sidedness, the organizers feel sorry but not responsible for this; they rather feel that this is the fault of those editors who did not come at their invitation.*

*Being quite sure that you are interested in the echoes to this Colloquium, we are publishing the translations of two commentaries, published in **Rinascita**, the review of the Italian Communist Party, and in **Nova Mysl**, the review of the Czechoslovak Communist Party.*

## ON THE COLLOQUIUM »SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY« IN LJUBLJANA

In the capital of the best developed Yugoslav republic, in Ljubljana in Slovenia, a meeting of editors and collaborators of scientific-theoretical and political reviews from seven European countries took place in the last days of the month of February. They were invited by the boards of editors of the Slovene review *Teorija in praksa* and of the federal party review *Socijalizam* to the international colloquium with the theme »Socialism and Democracy«. Three days the participants exchanged their views regarding the topical problems of socialist democracy trying to make a step forward in this field. Each of the three days had a limited complex of problems; on the first day the discussion concerned the questions of direct democracy in socialism, the political system in a socialist state was the theme of the second day, and the discussion of the third day concentrated upon the role of the communist party and other progressive forces in the struggle for socialism.

The first two themes of Colloquium (and partly also the third one) overlapped to a considerable extent. Apart from the nature itself — the relationship of these problems from the point of view of the content — there appeared also various interests of the representatives of progressive forces from capitalist countries and of the present representatives of marxist reviews from socialist states. On the one side it was possible to see an effort to speak about the possibilities and means of the revolutionary movement directed towards an overthrow of power, while on the other there appeared a tendency towards self-reflection and search for optimal variants in the development of socialism in the concrete circumstances of individual countries. This was also a result of an otherwise pleasant tendency to reach immediately to every initiative and thus to overcome the danger of breaking through monologues.

The paper and the introductory word of the main editor of the review *Soci-*

*jalizam*, Belgrade, profesor Pašić furnished the introduction to the discussion of the first two themes. As a point of departure he emphasized the necessity of the marxist approach to the investigation of the problems of socialist democracy. He sees it in the scientific criticism of a bourgeois, political, representative democracy and its ideological postulates. This marxist criticism does not deny the developmental nature and instrumental value of democratical, political institutions, which came into being on the historic basis of the capitalist social system and in the time of the class domination of bourgeoisie. At the same time it emphasizes two fundamental aspects:

Firstly, the institutions of political representative democracy have their value as a means of constituting and defending the democratic relations in insuring a wider influence of »the people« upon management and the content of the policy of the state; secondly, the actual value of democratic institutions — from the point of view of the creation of democratic liberties and democratic forms of political deciding — always depends on whether, and in what extent, the real, social, class forces are able and interested to use the democratic institutions as a form of their political activity and of realization of their interests and aspirations.

The discussion about whether the struggle for democracy represents a means or an aim to the working class is sterile — we usually speak about democracy in general and have in our mind the concrete democratic institutions, which we wrongly identify with democracy in general. Here then concrete historical context is always necessary, within the framework of which the working class fulfils its historic mission of freeing itself and at the same time also the entire society from the class pressure and exploitation. The acquisition of political power is only the first step to the inevitable and profound democratic process in the course of which the working class creates new democratic organizations of state power and political system.

Their concrete forms and problems, coming into being gradually or in a sudden revolutionary change, depend

on the entire social situation of those forces which are the carriers of socialist changes. The concrete, historic forms of class conflicts and the ways in which power was attained, the attained level of economic and cultural development, the social structure and the entire disposition of social forces, the extent and the forms of the union of the masses of workers around the working class and its political party, the existence or absence of democratic political tradition and the international position of the state, etc., belong to these. Any attempt to ignore the specific position of socialist forces in various countries, or to canonize and prescribe certain generally valid forms of socialist democracy and roads of its development can be harmful only.

Apart from the Yugoslav participants above all also comrades from Roumania, from reviews *Lupta de clasa* and *Revista de filozofia*, and M. Spinella from *Rinascita* participated in the discussion about direct democracy; also the contribution of the Czechoslovak participants, and above all of I. Dubska, J. Netopilik, J. Kamaryt, Z. St'astny, was of essential importance. The views can be condensed — with a certain simplification — to the following three theses:

Increasing participation of workers in deciding is a global tendency of the world. In socialist circumstances it has not got only the function of control but rather represents also a means of dispersion of power thus creating a possibility, which — of course — is not a reliable guarantee, of defence against the disfunctional bureaucratization of social life. Concentration of power in the hands of a small number of people is justified only when we have to do with a sharp, revolutionary change of social circumstances. Then the spreading of direct democracy is inevitable as a historic form which surpasses the old division, based on the principle of power, that is the division of society to the rulers and the ruled. In so far as we have to do with concrete forms of direct democracy, pluralism is appropriate only when we have to do with international measures (specific features of individual countries) and also when we have to do with internal affairs of individual states in the



sense of overcoming the bureaucratic system of »conductive levers«.

I. Dubska furnished a profound, principled explanation of the problems of direct democracy with the example of the crisis development in Czechoslovakia. She showed why with us (that is in Czechoslovakia, note of the translator) that conception of socialism which in the states without the material, social and cultural basis for the socialist development tried to unite the revolutionary negation of the forms of bourgeois society with an actuality making impossible the realization of this negation with a positive socialist content, simply could not be functional. That is why the significance of our efforts was not a mere correction of the mistakes of bureaucratic centralism, or a liberalist deviation from socialism, but rather a many-sided creative rehabilitation of socialism as a means of liberation, humanization and satisfaction of the needs of a highly civilized man.

If we speak about the views of majority we must also mention the views of minority. Q. Hoare from the *New Left Review* from London expressed his doubts as regards the thesis that the tendency towards greater participation was a world trend and expressed his reservations as regards the concept of participation in general (even though in this case it seems that this was a terminological misunderstanding). The West German editors of the review *Neue Kritik* expressed their all round condemnation of any institution. In polemic with these views J. Hysek, a participant from Czechoslovakia, expressed his views.

The fact that no wider confrontation with the views of the adherents of centralist models of the development of socialism took place was a shortcoming of this Colloquium. These views only had a secondary echo in the views of W. Haug from the West German review *Das Argument*. From the five states which military interfered in Czechoslovakia nobody came to this Colloquium. This is a pity, since similar meetings could become an important field for a real exchange of opinions.

Also the third theme of the Colloquium concerning the role of communist parties and progressive forces

in the struggle for socialism resulted in several excellent contributions.

Thus for instance A. Bibič, a political scientist from Ljubljana, stated that socialist self-government by setting free the dialectic between the state and society in the direction of spreading its possibilities brought about a great variety of forms and contents in socialist thought and practice, which could not be reduced to any of the existent models of socialist political systems so far. This variety, essentially brought about by different levels of social development and by political and cultural tradition of various nations, makes socialism more rich. At the same time it demands a free and equal communication among the subjects of contemporary socialist societies, and also in general among the subjects of the contemporary world, so that all the members of socialist and social progress could profit from the experience whose value lies in its originality. The relationship between the state and society in the socialist political system is essential for such exchange of experiences.

Some participants of the Colloquium saw the crisis difficulties of socialism above all in the inability to overcome the rigid dogmas, in the closed nature of the system separated from the socialist and democratic aspirations of the people in many parts of the world.

Contrary to the »mechanic and automatic unity« in socialist society and among communist parties, F. Vreg puts the demand, resulting from the modern industrial process together with an exchange of experiences and a search for optimal solutions: this decentralization, division of power and of responsibility, social self-government, common political decision-making, pluralism of political subjects, a public process of deciding, and a free system of communications. The freedom of speech and the actual critical function of the public opinion can get established in such atmosphere. Pluralism of political subjects, based on autonomy and equality, is a form of political self-government and does not at all mean a negation of the vanguard role of the communist party; the party must continually persuade other people through its ideological-theoretical ability to always propose the best solutions.

Also professor Supek from Zagreb discussed the problem of pluralism, he recognized it in the very problem of taking-over power, which is topical for communist parties in capitalist states. This was confirmed by M. Spinella.

Other Yugoslav participants spoke against the view that uniformity be the only basis of social integration in socialist states. Opposite to this view Z. Mlinar put the synthesis of individual and general interests. Professor Roter from Ljubljana investigated the dialectic of the relations between a movement and institutions; the problem is how to prevent that a movement, characterized by a mass interest and activity, turn into a static, passive and ossified institution.

Similarly some discussants tried to prove untenableness of the ideas according to which in socialist countries no changes occur in superstructure because of the fast change of their material basis. Actually we have to do with a complicated inner development for which the military forces are not decisive; the latter have this role only at the beginning at ensurance of an independent socialist performance.

Director of the Higher School for Sociology, Political Sciences and Journalism at Ljubljana, V. Benko contributed his views regarding the topical problems of socialist internationalism. The problems of the relations among socialist states can be solved efficiently only on the basis of respecting independence, equal rights, and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, and not by isolation or by short-term pragmatism. Independent action is necessary for communist parties also. Each communist party is responsible for its policy to the working class of its state first of all, since it knows best the concrete complex of actuality, possibilities an circumstances in which it is operating. For this reason no other communist party or centre can have the same knowledge and also cannot replace it. Socialist internationalism can be developed only on the basis of such an autonomy of communist parties.

Also the Czechoslovak contribution of J. Krylova is devoted to the relations among socialist countries. In the interest of its informal unity they must

show as much understanding as possible for the differences which come to expression not only in the theoretical conceptions but also in practical policy of individual states. For this reason only the development of own national policy, appropriate to the specific conditions of this or that country, creates the basic of common views and actions and ensures new possibilities of international unity. In our time the thought of unity and the content of proletarian internationalism can be realized only by the aid of the national, of the specific. For this reason it would be correct if at the given level we did not speak about the necessity of subordination, but rather about the necessity of an agreement between the national and international interests.

D. Rozehnal, another Czechoslovak participant, characterized the present phase of the transition from capitalism to socialism as a coincidence with a civilizational break. In this we have not got to do with a ripe state, but rather with a challenge, an explicit tendency, which accelerates our knowledge that the fast development of the means of production demands also new interhuman relations. A road is opening to such a surplus in production that it will break the very logic of private ownership. This naturally does not mean that illogic is automatically excluded from historic development. In order to attain this the revolutionary activity of the masses is necessary. Still, they should not be offered a technocratic correction, but rather a surpassing of the industrial, or often industrializational, administrative, centralist state of socialism.

It must be taken in account that in a considerable part of the world a scientific-technical change will occur even before the socialist revolution, even though the latter was sometime considered to be an inevitable precondition of the qualitatively new development of the means of production. In these circumstances it will be possible to persuade the masses of workers, youth and intelligentsia only by the courage of thought and political adherence to principles, worth of Lenin's model. The organizational forms of communist parties and of the entire movement should correspond to these

great tasks. In confrontation with imperialism its fundamental class position is of necessity bipolar, and is covered by a bipolar system of military equilibrium of the two superpowers due to the historic circumstances. This is only the starting-point which in practical policy should mean recognition of plurality of the factors of international development, that is such a vivid differentness of progressive movements which corresponds to the objectively given various levels of development of the revolutionary, anti-imperialist struggle in the world.

Also the West European left and student movement was represented at this Colloquium. F. Tomberg furnished a critical analysis of the West German and especially West-Berlin student non-parliamentary opposition, characterizing it as the new »social« liberalism. He characterized its effort for self-decision, which is to abolish the dependence on collective, as socialist, since the contact of the privileged bourgeois intelligentsia with socialism made possible a certain liberation from the capitalist system and an attempt of a contra-position of a special kind of liberalism to the monopolistic level of social development. The non-parliamentary and in general anti-institutional position of these groups originates from this position.

D. Claussen expressed his disagreement on behalf of the editorial board of *Neue Kritik*, from Frankfurt, with the above constructions and explanation of the activities of non-parliamentary opposition; he founded his discussion above all on the facts from the struggles against emergency laws. He declared that the tendency towards the functionalization of society and the effort for a greater efficiency of production lead to a technocratic degeneration.

The second polemic performance of W. Haug, trying to give a self-willed explanation to the entire conference, was factually rejected by several contributions of many other delegations. This factual approach was one of the main features of the whole Colloquium. The ability to furnish an objective analysis of the economic, social and political system of their own state on the part of the Yugoslav participants

should be especially valued. This attractive lack of apologetics was especially manifest in the discussions of J. Jerovšek and Z. Mlinar.

This conference about the relationship between socialism and democracy brought several interesting initiatives from the study of topical political problems which should not be avoided by any communist, communist party, or movement, if they want to be able to come to terms with the new tasks of the socialist transformation of society. It showed every effort to reach an agreement among marxists, and among them and the adherents of the progressive leftist movements, as regards the views on the basic demands of the revolutionary change of the world, by means of discussion and exchange of opinions, and without any attempt to force any views upon others. For this reason we should give every acknowledgement to its organizers.

JAN HYSEK,  
JAROSLAVA KRYLOVA,  
DUSAN ROZEHNAL

RINASCITA  
Number II, March 1969

#### DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM — INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM AT LJUBLJANA

The Slovene theoretical review *Teorija in praksa* organized a discussion about the theme »Socialism and Democracy« at Ljubljana in the last days of the month of February. Apart from the representatives of numerous Yugoslav reviews, there were present also the members of the editorial boards of six Czechoslovak reviews (three from Prague, and three from Bratislava), of two Rumanian reviews, of the review *Das Argument* from West Berlin, the review *Neue Kritik* from Frankfurt, and of *New Left Review* from London. *Rinascita* was represented by the author of this report.

At this meeting three themes were given special emphasis: »Socialism and Direct Democracy«, »The Political System in Socialist Countries«, and »The

Role of the Communist Party and Other Progressive Forces in the Struggle for Socialism». One day was devoted to each of these themes.

The very composition of participants and the discussed themes point to the topical nature of the meeting in Ljubljana. We must add that the direct interest of this meeting originates from the fact that Yugoslavia is just about to have a congress of the League of Communists; that the Czech and Slovak participants were particularly numerous, that an echo of the great mass movements from 1968 was felt — of the student movement in the Federal Republic Germany, and of the student and labour movements in France and in Italy, and finally that the XIIth Congress of the Communist Party of Italy and its formulations and discussions attracted an exceptionally vivid attention.

The first assertion — emphasized above all by the participants from Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and from West Europe — was the statement about the more and more intimate connection between the development of socialism in countries where the working class is in power already and the anti-capitalist struggle in countries still ruled by bourgeoisie; not only in the sense of analogy, often a profound analogy between some, also decisive, organizational forms and political practice. The connection between democracy and socialism has the first place with its specific component of the relation between »representative« and »direct« democracy, which is important both for the construction and development of socialism after the take-over of power and for the acquisition of power by the working class.

It must be noted that there appeared vivid contrasts as regards these themes in two directions: on the one side in the emphasis on the polemic between socialism seeing the key to progress in productive socialism (in the absence of representatives of numerous socialist countries this thesis was advocated by the group of *Das Argument*, and in a lesser extent by some Rumanian and Yugoslav participants) and humanist socialism which gives priority to the development of the personality of citizens (this position was decidedly ad-

vocated by Yugoslav minority and among others also by the representatives of the German review *Neue Kritik*); and on the other side, because of the split between the advocates of the democratic development caused in its contents by the socialist state and those who consider above all the »social« forms of direct democracy and of self-government to be the essence of the democratic development (this opposition appeared above all in various views of the Roumanians and of the Yugoslav majority).

As it is usual in polemic, the polarization between the differentiated positions was sometimes too emphasized and sometimes too extreme; still, it is also clear that this Colloquium has shown, that we really have not got to do with an actual, radical opposition in practice, but rather with a different illumination of the dialectic tension between the »production and freedom«, »centralization and decentralization«, »state and society«, »institutional and direct democracy«. Even though this dialectic was always present in the discussion, some discussants did not pay sufficient attention to it in their views. So for instance, it was completely alien to the »productivist« eagerness of the young representatives of *Das Argument* who advocated the thesis according to which the problems of »freedom« were only a specific deformation of intellectuals, and of very little or no interest to the working class, whose interests were correctly directed — in the opinion of the representatives of *Das Argument* — towards the development of economy and of better working circumstances.

On the contrary, the dialectic came to clear expression in the discussion which seemed best to us, that is in the discussion of Rudi Supek, the main editor of *Praxis*, a theoretical review from Zagreb, when he discussed motives which he had discussed several times already, and above all in his study »Marx and Revolution«, recently published in the review *L'Homme et La soviète*; Mr. Supek stated that »etatism« of socialist countries was a practical and theoretical reflection of the circumstances of productive backwardness, characteristic of many socialist countries, and first of all of the Soviet Union

after the revolution. This is proved by the fact that in these countries »the political revolution« has crystallized as such without permitting the deeper process to define the »social revolution«, which by its very nature involves the whole society by means of the methods of self-government and thus direct democracy. In developed capitalist societies, Mr. Supek adds, the ripening of the means of production and the consequences of the scientific-technical progress open other perspective: the problems of self-government and of direct democracy are put side by side with the anti-capitalist struggle and are even considered to be more important than the struggle for power. The tendencies in this direction, as shown by the French May, and some progressive movements in Italy and elsewhere, prove this. For this reason (I am quoting from the article from *L'Homme et la société*) »the perspective of workers' management in developed countries is not limited to a vision of a far future, but rather is becoming an important movement of the strategy of workers in their tendency to get hold of power and to establish structural changes, supporting such a take-over of power«.

In this framework also the XIIth Congress of the Communist Party of Italy was naturally referred to. Especially the discussion of Zdenko Roter, from *Teorija in praksa* was very explicit in this. The vivid interest for this Congress, knowledge of its statements and

references to the same, proved anew that the discussions and assertions of the Communist Party of Italy are getting an increasing importance in the international opinion. In this framework we had to explain especially the »pluralist« positions of the Communist Party of Italy, and the tension resulting from the solutions of the relation between »autonomy« and »unity« regarding the class struggle inside the country, and also the relations in the international labour movement.

The dialect knot of »unity in diversity«, characterized by Togliatti to be of essential importance, was the second strogly emphasized element at the meeting in Ljubljana. Around it there moved the problems of the relation between self-government and planning, the problems of the relations between the direct forms of democracy and the inevitable representative form, which must of necessity appear at a wider-range level, and also the present urgent problems of the unity of communist parties and of progressive movements in the framework of the general anti-imperialist struggle.

Let us conclude: a relaxed and exceptionally frank discussion encouraging critical, self-critical and constructive confrontation of opinions. We can perhaps say that several directions of further theoretical work and of practical action will depend on the development of such positions.

MARIO SPINELLA





## b

(from the documentation of the Institute for Sociology and Philosophy in Ljubljana)

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES AND BOOKS OF YUGOSLAV AUTHORS ON THE THEME SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY, FOR THE PERIOD BETWEEN 1953 AND 1968 (WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THE PERIOD 1964—1968)

This general theme is additionally specified by the following sub-themes:

1. Socialism and direct democracy.
2. The political system in socialist countries.
3. The role of the communist party and other progressive forces in the struggle for socialism.

## 1953—1963

DJORDJEVIĆ, Jovan. »On Socialist Democracy«. *Medjunarodna politika*, 1 (1953), 17—19.

KUSEJ, Gorazd. »Theory of Socialist Democracy«. *Naši razgledi*, 5 (1954), p. 10.

KARDELJ, Edvard. »Socialist Democracy in Yugoslav Practice«. A lecture in Oslo, October 8th, 1954. In: Edvard Kardelj, *Problems of our Socialist Policy* IV. DZS, Ljubljana, 1960. Pp. 198—243.

DJORDJEVIĆ, Jovan. »A Contribution to the Problem of the Relation between Social Classes and Political parties.« *Medjunarodna politika*, 122 (1955), 15—17.

DJORDJEVIĆ, Jovan. »Public Opinion and Socialist Democracy«. *Arhiv za pravne in društvene nauke*, 4 (1955), 339—365.

TADIĆ, Ljubomir. »To the Question of the Relation between Society and State.« *Pregled*, 10 (1955), 197—209.

SNUDERL, Maks. »On the System of Organization of Society in Yugoslavia.« *Arhiv za pravne in društvene nauke*, 3 (1956), 277—288.

DJORDJEVIĆ, Jovan. »Politics and Social Technique in Socialist Democracy.« *Arhiv za pravne in društvene nauke*, 1 (1957), 23—42.

DJORDJEVIĆ, Jovan. »Self-government and Political Order in Yugoslavia.« *Arhiv za pravne in društvene nauke*, 2—3 (1957), 182—192.

DJORDJEVIĆ, Jovan. »On Socialist Democracy.« *Istorijski zapisi*, 1—2 (1957), 1—16.

GJANKOVIĆ, Dan. »Foundations of Socialist Democracy.« *Narodno Sveučilište*, 5—6 (1957), 254—363.

GJANKOVIĆ, Dan. »Our Electoral System.« *Naše teme*, 6 (1957), 765.

KARDELJ, Edvard. »On the Programme of The League of Communists of Yugoslavia.« (April 25th, 1958.) In: Edvard Kardelj, *Problems of our Socialist Policy* V. DZS, Ljubljana, 1963. Pp. 231—271.

PROGRAMME of the League of Communist of Yugoslavia (accepted at the 7th Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, April 22 to 26, 1958). In: *The Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia*. Cankarjeva založba, Ljubljana, 1958, Pp. 287—485.

PASIĆ, Najdan. »Bureaucracy and Contemporary Society.« *Naša stvarnost*, 7—8 (1958), 22—45.

DISCUSSION: On State and Socialism. *Arhiv za pravne in društvene nauke*, 2—3 (1959), 358—370.

DJORDJEVIĆ, Jovan. »The Scientific Investigation and the Concept of the State.« *Naša stvarnost*, 10 (1959), 339—362.

LUKIĆ, Radomir. »Socialism and State.« *Anali Pravnog fakulteta u Beogradu*, 3—4 (1959), 345—357.

PASIĆ, Najdan. »On the Functions of Contemporary State and on Actual and Formal Democracy.« *Naša stvarnost*, 10 (1959), 370—380.

- DJORDJEVIĆ, Jovan. »Theories of Bureaucracy and Bureaucratism.« *Arhiv za pravne i društvene nauke*, 3—4 (1960), 207—238.
- DJORDJEVIĆ, Jovan. »The Role of Specialists, Technocracy and Socialist Democracy.« *Arhiv za pravne i društvene nauke*, 102 (1961), 170—182.
- FIAMENGO, Ante. »Sociology of Social and Worker's Self-government.« *Naše teme*, 5 (1962), 666—681.
- KARDELJ, Edvard. »The New Constitution of Socialist Yugoslavia.« (September 20th, 1962.) In: Edvard Kardelj, *Problems of Socialist Policy VI*, DZS, Ljubljana, 1964, Pp. 32—166.
- PASIĆ, Najdan. *Parallel Political Systems*. Published by the Higher School for Political Sciences, Belgrade, 1962. 221 pages.
- TADIĆ, Ljubomir. »Socialism and Constitutionalism.« *Socijalizam*, 6 (1962), 70—105.
- BOŠKOVIĆ, Mirko. *Socio-political System of Yugoslavia*. Naprijed, Zagreb, 1963, 364 pages.
- HADŽISTEVIĆ, Vojin. »Changes of the Socio-political Position of the Working Class in Yugoslavia.« *Sozializam*, 5—6 (1963), 44—73.
- JOVANOVIĆ, Aleksandar. »Socio-political Order and the Constitutional System of Yugoslavia.« *Rad*, Belgrade, 1963, 408, 8.
- KUSEJ, Gorazd. *The Political System of Yugoslavia*. Cankarjeva založba, Ljubljana, 1963. 129 pages.
- POLITICAL SYSTEM in Socialist Countries. (Conceptual project.) By the Institute for the Investigation of Labour Movement, Belgrade, 1963. 55 pages.
- 1964
- CRVENKOVSKI, Krste. »The Leading Role of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.« *Socijalizam*, 7—8 (1964), 945.
- CVJETICANIN, Veljko. »Some Problems of the Communist Avant-garde in the Contemporary World.« *Naše teme*, 7 (1964), 993—1012.
- CEPO, Zlatko. »Lenin and Labour Movement.« *Naše teme*, 9 (1964), 1267 to 1389.
- DISCUSSION: Misunderstandings about Democracy. *Socijalizam*, 1 (1964), 103.
- DISCUSSION: On the Theory of Party with Marx, Marxist Theorists and our Experiences in the Sphere of Theory and Practice of the Party. *Pregled*, 6 (1964), 557—566.
- DJORDJEVIĆ, Jovan. *The New Constitutional System*. Savremena administracija, Belgrade, 1964. 1046 pages.
- DJORDJEVIĆ, Jovan. »Some Problems of the Realization and Development of Socialist Democracy.« *Politička misao*, 2 (1964), 153—184.
- DJURETIĆ, Jagoš. »The Social Status of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in the Process of Democratization and Self-government.« *Gledišta*, 10 (1964), 1307—1321.
- DUIJĆ, Andrija. »Some Views of the International Labour Movement as regards the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Soviet Political System, on the occasion of October.« *Mogućnosti* 8 (1964), 792—809.
- HADŽI VASILJEV, Mito. »Direct Democracy and the League of Communists.« *Socijalizam*, 11—12 (1964), 1445.
- JANKOVIĆ, Mirjana. »The Creative Thought of Togliatti.« *Socijalizam*, 9 (1964), 1121.
- KREŠIĆ, Andrija. »Lenin on Soviet Bureaucratism.« *Gledišta*, 11 (1964), 1527.
- LUKIĆ, Radomir. »The Subjective Factor and Direct Democracy in Yugoslavia.« *Anali Pravnog fakulteta u Beogradu*, 2—3 (1964), 152—163.
- MARKOVIĆ, Mihajlo. »Socialism and government.« *Praxis*, 2 (1964), 172 to 188.
- MILOSAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »Democracy in the Policy of Party in the Working Class, in the Light of Lenin's Conceptions.« *Sovremenost*, 6 (1964), 590—592.
- MILOSAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »Unity of Views and Struggle of Opinions within the Framework of a Revolutionary Movement.« *Teorija in praksa*, 9 (1964), 1195—1206.
- PASIĆ, Najdan. »Interest Groups and their Position in our Political System.« *Gledišta*, 10 (1964), 1297.
- PERKOVIĆ, Božidar. »On One Form of the Theory of a People's State with Us.« *Gledišta*, 3 (1964), 453.

- POPOVIC, Milentije. »Conceptual Movements in the Conditions of the Struggle for Direct Democracy.« *Socijalizam*, 7—8 (1964), 889.
- RUS, Vojan. »The Problem of Avant-Garde in the Contemporary Development of Socialism.« *Teorija in praksa*, 7—8 (1964), 984—999.
- SADIKOVIC, Cazim. »The Problem of the Integration of Individual in Community.« *Pregled*, 11—12 (1964), 451.
- SRNIC, Ivanka. *On Investigation of Political System of Socialist Countries*. Published by The Institute for Investigation for Labour Movement, Belgrade, 1964. 29 pages.
- STANKOVIC, B. Miodrag. »The Soviet Theory of People' State.« *Pregled*, 1—2 (1964), 51.
- STOJANOVIC, Svetozar. »Freedom and Democracy in Socialism.« *Praxis*, 2 (1964), 203—213.
- STOJANOVIC, Svetozar. »Socialist Democracy and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.« *Pregled*, 6 (1964), 579—590.
- STROBL, Majda. *The Political System of Yugoslavia. II. part. The Organization of Socio-political Community*. Ljubljana University Press, Ljubljana, 1964. 261 pages.
- SNUDERL, Makso. *The Political System of Yugoslavia. I. part. Socio-economic and Political System in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia*. Ljubljana University Press, Ljubljana, 1964. 311 pages.
- TADIC, Ljubomir. »Public Opinion in Contemporary Society.« *Politička misao*, 1 (1964), 11—22.
- TADIC, Ljubomir. »Outlines of Lenin's Theory of the Party.« *Naše teme*, 1—2 (1964), 23.
- TADIC, Ljubomir. »Topical Problems of the Theory on Communist Party.« *Pregled*, 6 (1964), 557—566.
- 1965
- BILANDZIC, Dušan. »Problems of the Creation of Worker's Self-management.« *Naše teme*, 11 (1965), 1583.
- CALDAREVIC, Mladen. »Dissolutive Processes in Self-government.« *Praxis*, 1 (1965), 75.
- DAJIC, Putnik. *Recent Soviet Conceptions of Political System*. Božidar Adžija, Zagreb, 1965. 47 pages.
- DISCUSSION: Socialist Democracy and the Economic Reform. *Gledišta*, 12 (1965), 1615—1650.
- DJORDJEVIC, Jovan. »Anatomy of Political Institution in Contemporary, and especially in Socialist Society.« *Politička misao*, 2 (1965), 180—199.
- FIAMENGO, Ante. »Self-government and Socialism.« *Socijalizam*, 2 (1965), 91—113.
- FIAMINGO, Ante. »The League of Communists, Bureaucratism, and the Struggle against Bureaucratism.« *Socijalizam*, 6 (1965), 806.
- FILIPOVIC, Muhamed. »Lenin and Leninism.« *Pregled*, (1965), 31—60.
- FILIPOVIC, Nikola. »Contradictions of Contemporary Socialism.« *Pregled*, 9 (1965), 199.
- HUDOLETNJAK, Boris. »The Contradiction between Production and the Political Function of the Working Class.« *Naše teme*, 7 (1965), 1026.
- HUDOLETNJAK, Boris. »Has the Theory of Party no Purpose?« *Naše teme*, 2 (1965), 226.
- MILOSAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »The League of Communists and the Directing of the Development of Yugoslav Society.« *Gledišta*, 5 (1965), 683.
- MUHIC, Fuad. »The Relation of Ancient Democracy to Bourgeois and Socialist Democracy.« *Pregled*, 5—6 (1965), 417—446.
- OZBOLT, Branko. »On the Relation between Marxism and Democracy.« *Naše teme*, 12 (1965), 1826.
- PASIC, Najdan. »On the Nature of Bureaucratism in the Conditions of Self-government.« *Gledišta*, 5 (1965), 109.
- PERKOVIC, Božidar. »Attitude to Bureaucratism in the Circumstances of Self-government.« *Gledišta*, 2 (1965), 249.
- PUSIC, Eugen. »Development of Self-government.« *Naše teme*, 4 (1965), 536.
- SADIKOVIC, Cazim. »Withering-away or Democratization of Policy.« *Naše teme*, 5 (1965), 724.
- SADIKOVIC, Cazim. »The Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Democracy.« *Pregled*, 3 (1965), 167—183.
- SMILAGIC, Nerkez. »Marx's Summary of State and Anarchy by Bakunin.« *Pregled*, 3 (1965), 185.
- STANOVCIC, Vojislav. »Social Property, its Character Function and Forms.« *Socijalizam*, 4 (1965), 523.

- TADIĆ, Ljubomir. »The Significance of Social Property in the Light of its Historic Preconditions.« *Pregled*, 10 (1965), 293.
- ZUPANOV, Josip. »Three Approaches of a Self-management Organization.« *Gledišta*, 2 (1965), 165.
- 1966
- BAKARIĆ, Vladimir. »The League of Communists Today.« *Naše teme*, 8 (1966), 1393—1420.
- BILANDŽIĆ, Dušan. »Preconditions of the Development of Self-government.« *Naše teme*, 3 (1966), 519—525.
- BRKLJACIĆ, Ivo. »The Economic Preconditions of the Realization of the Leading Role of the Working Class and Its Party.« *Naše teme*, 12 (1966), 2059—2079.
- CARATAN, Branko. »Socialism and Politics.« *Naše teme*, 6 (1966), 1075 to 1105.
- CVJETIČANIN, Veljko. »Withering-away of the State as a Process of the Development of Self-government in Yugoslavia.« *Praxis*, 4—6 (1966), 743 to 756.
- CVJETIČANIN, Veljko. »The Role and the Structure of the League of Communists in the System of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.« *Naše teme*, 11 (1966), 1885.
- DISCUSSION: The Essence of Power and the Character of Authority in Socialism. *Gledišta*, 6—7 (1966), 893 to 938.
- DJORDJEVIĆ, Jovan. »Self-government Democracy and Electoral System.« *Arhiv za pravne i društvene nauke*, 3—4 (1966), 253—273.
- DJORDJEVIĆ, Jovan. »Power and Authority.« *Gledišta*, 9—9 (1966), 1051—1061.
- DRAGICEVIĆ, Adolf. »Self-government of the Working Class.« *Naše teme*, 3 (1966), 526.
- DUJIC, Andrija. »Topical Qualities of Lenin's Theory and Practice of the Party.« *Naše teme*, 11 (1966), 1924 to 1929.
- DŽINIĆ, Firdus. »Problems of Electoral System in Self-government.« *Socijalizam*, 11 (1966), 1467.
- FIAMENGO, Ante. »The Role of the League of Communists in Overcoming Bureaucratism.« *Naše teme*, 12 (1966), 2054.
- FIAMENGO, Ante. »Self-government and the Process of Overcoming Bureaucratic-oligarchic Tendencies.« *Socijalizam*, 1 (1966), 43.
- FIAMENGO, Ante. »Self-government and Surpassing the Class Structure.« *Socijalizam*, 3 (1966), 351—355.
- FIAMENGO, Ante. »Politics and Socialism.« *Politička misao*, 1—2 (1966), 6—19.
- HADŽISTEVIĆ, Vojin. »Emancipation of the United Producers and the League of Communists.« *Socijalizam*, 10 (1966), 1350.
- GLOBEVNIK, Josip. »Electoral System and Social Self-government.« *Teorija in praksa*, 11 (1966), 1613—1626.
- KARDELJ, Edvard. »Considerations on the Electoral System in Contemporary Conditions.« *Arhiv za prave in društvene nauke*, 3—4 (1966), 245—253.
- KILIBARDA, Krsto. *Self-government and the League of Communists*. Published by The Sociological Institute, Belgrade, 1966. 264 pages.
- KNEŽEVIĆ, Radule. »The Historical Significance of Lenin's Conception of a Political Party.« *Politička misao*, 4 (1966), 42—54.
- KOZUH, Franjo. »Bureaucracy — Government 'Without Property'«. *Naše teme*, 10 (1966), 1770—1780.
- KRESIĆ, Andrija. »Political Absolutism, Anarchy and Authority.« *Gledišta*, 4 (1966), 472—483.
- KUŠEJ, Gorazd. »The Evolution of the Electoral System.« *Arhiv za pravne in društvene nauke*, 3—4 (1966), 285—290.
- LUKIĆ, Radomir. *Political Parties*. Naučna knjiga, Belgrade, 1966. 308 pages.
- LUKIĆ, Radomir. »Power in Socialism of Today.« *Gledišta*, 6—7 (1966), 893—903.
- LUKIĆ, Radomir. »Some Problems of Self-government.« *Teorija in praksa*, 10 (1966), 1335—1350.
- MARINKOVIĆ, Josip. »Self-government and Authority.« *Gledišta*, 8—9 (1966), 1074.
- MARKOVIĆ, Ljubislav. »Worker's Income and Socialist Democracy.« *Socijalizam*, 1 (1966), 71.
- MILOŠAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »Democratic Relations in Political Action.« *Socijalizam*, 7—8 (1966), 891.
- MILOŠAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »Socio-political Organizations with Us.« *Gledišta*, 10—11 (1966), 1327—1333.



- MILOSAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »Problems of Electoral System and Socio-political Organization with Us.« *Gledišta*, 10-11 (1966), 1217.
- ORSOLIĆ, Lovro. »An Attempt of Sociological Analysis of Oligarchic Tendencies in Labour Political Parties.« *Pregled*, 9 (1966), 241—255.
- OSOLNIK, Bogdan. »The Public Opinion in the System of Direct Democracy.« *Socijalizam*, 1 (1966), 73.
- PECULJIC, Miroslav. »Surpassing Some Tendencies of Formal Democracy.« *Socijalizam*, 1 (1966), 33.
- PERIC, Ivan. »Theory of the Party of the Working Class and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.« *Naše teme*, 12 (1966), 2044.
- PETRINOVIC, Ivo. »Gramsci's Idea of Political Party of the Working Class as Machiavelli's 'Ruler'.« *Politička misao*, 4 (1966), 34—41.
- PETRINOVIC, Ivo. »Democratization of the League of Communists.« *Naše teme*, 12 (1966), 2080.
- PODMENIK, Slavko. »Theory, Practice and Personality in the new Role of the League of Communist of Yugoslavia.« *Naše teme*, 11 (1966), 1935.
- POPOVIC, Milentije. *Direct Socialist Democracy*. Kultura, Belgrade, 1966. 388 pages.
- POPOVIC, Milentije. »The Changes in the relations of the Forces of Direct Socialist Democracy and Bureaucratism.« *Socijalizam*, 10 (1966), 1239-1250.
- PRPIC, Ivan. »Politics, Political Sciences, and Socialism.« *Praxis*, 4—6 (1966), 757—773.
- PUPIC, Borivoje. »Theory on People's State.« *Politička misao*, 3(1966), 33-52.
- RAICEVIC, Jovan. »The Changes in the Vanguard Role of the League of Communists.« *Socijalizam*, 12 (1966), 1519.
- SEMIZ-EFENDIC, Dženana. »Marx's Concept of a Proletarian Party.« *Naše teme*, 8 (1966), 1522.
- SMAILAGIC, Nerkez. »Marx and Bakunin on the Paris Commune.« *Pregled*, 1—2 (1966), 3 (1966), 31, 193.
- STROBL, Majda. »Elections and Sociopolitical Organizations.« *Teorija in praksa*, 12 (1966), 1816—1822.
- TRBOVIC, Uroš. »Political Power and Self-government.« *Pregled*, 1—2 (1966), 1.
- TRBOVIC, Uroš. »Socialist Democracy.« *Politička misao*, 4 (1966), 97—105.
- VASOVIC, Vučina. »Politics and Power.« *Gledišta*, 8—9 (1966), 1062—1073.
- VIDOJEVIC, Zoran. »Avant-gardism of the League of Communists today.« *Socijalizam*, 10 (1966), 1336—1349.
- VRACAR, Stevan. »Pluralism in Socialist Democracy.« *Pregled*, 3 (1966), 211—234.
- VRATUSA, Anton. »Topical Questions of our Electoral System.« *Arhiv za pravne i društvene nauke*, 3—4 (1966), 380—389.
- ZUN, Anton. »Theory of Elite and Democracy.« *Teorija in praksa*, 8—9 (1966), 1163—1170.

1967

- BILANZIC, Dušan. »Our Social Development and the Role of the League of Communists.« *Naše teme*, 1 (1966), 1—38.
- CRVENKOVSKI, Krste. »Democratization of Society and the League of Communists.« *Praksa*, 3 (1967), 3.
- CRVENKOVSKI, Krste. »Transformation of the League of Communist and Society.« *Gledišta*, 8—9 (1967), 1081 do 1088.
- COKREVSKI, Tomislav. »Democracy in Proletarian Party and Working Class.« *Pogledi*, 4 (1967), 35.
- COKREVSKI, Tomislav. The Form of Organization Depending on Historical and Social Function.« *Socijalizam*, 10 (1967), 1240.
- COKREVSKI, Tomislav. »Dialectics or Metaphysics in Organizational Principles of Proletarian Party.« *Pogledi*, 1 (1967), 50.
- DISCUSSION: Democracy and Directing Elections. *Socijalizam*, 2 (1967), 174.
- DJORDJEVIC, Jovan. *Political System*. Published by the Association of Lawyers of Yugoslavia, Belgrade, 1967, 1050 pages.
- DJORDJEVIC, Jovan. *Democracy and Elections*. Informator, Zagreb, 1967, 101 pages.
- DJORDJEVIC, Života. »The Political Role of the League of Communists without Mediation and Monopoly.« *Gledišta*, 5 (1967), 759—770.
- DOLANC, Stane. »Democratic Centralism in Theory and Practice of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.« *Teorija in praksa*, 3 (1967), 401—414.

- DRASKOVIC, Dragomir. »Authority in the League of Communists.« *Socijalizam*, 3 (1967), 379.
- DRASKOVIC, Dragomir. »On the Possibility of a Two-party System in Socialism.« *Gledišta*, 11 (1967), 1557-1566.
- DUJIC, Andrija. *Lenin's Conception of the Party and its Influence on the Creation of the Soviet Political System*. Matica Hrvatska, Split, 1967. 318 pages.
- DUJIC, Andrija. »Some Elements of Lenin's Conception of the Party.« *Međunarodni radnički pokret*, 5 (1967), 43-52.
- FIAMENGO, Ante. »The League of Communist and the Process of Transformation of Etatist-Bureaucratic Socialism into Selfgovernmental Socialism.« *Politička misao*, 1 (1967), 7-25.
- FIAMENGO, Ante. »The Problems of the Contemporary Theory of Labour Party.« *Socijalizam*, 3 (1967), 405-422.
- FIRA, Aleksandar. »In a Normative and Actual Way through the Evolution of Democratic Centralism.« *Socijalizam*, 10 (1967), 1272-1276.
- HADŽI VASILJEV, Mito. »Self-government and Political Compulsion of the Working Class.« *Socijalizam*, 3 (1967), 287-301.
- HORVAT, Branko. »Individual and Social Ownership in Socialism.« *Gledišta*, 3 (1967), 335.
- IBRAHIMPESIC, Besim. »The Problems and Investigations in the Sphere of the Theory of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.« *Filozofija*, 4 (1967), 185.
- JANICIJEVIC, Miloslav. »Socialism and the Idea of Social Equality.« *Sociologija*, 3-4 (1967), 45-54.
- KALE, Eduard. »The Historical Role of the Communist Party.« *Pregled*, 5 (1967), 453.
- KANGRGA, Milan. »Political and Social Revolution.« *Filozofija*, 3 (1967), 63.
- KATIC, Duje. »Democratic Centralism as a Principle of Political Organization.« *Socijalizam*, 10 (1967), 1303 do 1327.
- KRAJNOVIC, Antun. »The Ideological Role of the League of Communists.« *Naše teme*, 1 (1967), 56-68.
- KRESIC, Andrija. »Principles of Leadership in League of Communists.« *Gledišta*, 1 (1967), 33-42.
- KRESIC, Andrija. »Political Society and Political Mythology.« *Encyclopaedia moderna*, 5-6 (1967), 8.
- KRISTAN, Ivan. »Direct Democracy — Myth or Actuality.« *Teorija in praksa*, 8-9 (1967), 1107-1118.
- KRIVIC, Vladimir. »Self-government and Constitutionalism.« *Teorija in praksa*, 3 (1967), 355-360.
- LUKIC, Radomir, TADIC, Ljubomir, and KRESIC, Andrija. »Democracy Today and Here.« *Encyclopaedia moderna*, 2 (1967).
- LUKIC, Radomir. »The Question of People's State.« *Međunarodni radnički pokret*, 5 (1967), 115-123.
- MARJANOVIC, R. Jovan. »Communists and Political Decisions of Self-governing People.« *Socijalizam*, 1 (1967), 42.
- MARKOVIC, Mihajlo. »Direct Democracy as a Myth and as a Real Tendency of a Historic Process.« *Encyclopaedia moderna*, 2 (1967), 16-21.
- MILOSAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »Reform or Evolution of Electoral System.« *Socijalizam*, 9 (1967), 1071, *Pogledi*, 2 (1967), 53.
- MILOSAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »Representative Bodies in the System of Socialist Democracy.« *Gledišta*, 1 (1967), 57-66.
- MILOSAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »Electoral System and Democracy.« *Pogledi*, 1 (1967), 31, *Gledišta*, 6-7 (1967), 883.
- MILOSAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »The League of Communists in Self-government.« *Socijalizam*, 1 (1967), 34.
- NAJDEVSKI, Dimče. »Limits of Democracy.« *Socijalizam*, 6 (1967), 770.
- NIKOLIC, Miloš. »Self-governmental Organization of Society.« *Gledišta* 10 (1967), 1261.
- PASIC, Najdan. »From the Dictatorship of the Proletariat to Social Hegemony of the Working Class.« *Socijalizam*, 1 (1967), 23.
- PASIC, Najdan. »Social and Class Conditions of Democracy and Autocracy.« *Sociologija*, 3-4 (1967), 23-44.
- PECULJIC, Miroslav, and NICIC, Dušan. »From Etatist Society to Self-government Society.« *Gledišta*, 1 (1967), 5-32.
- PERIC, Ivan. »Self-government as a Social Relation or as a System of Institutions.« *Socijalizam*, 4 (1967), 431.

- PETRINOVIĆ, Ivo. *The Party of the Working Class according to the Conception of Antony Gramsci.* Matica hrvatska, Split, 1967. 219 + IV pages.
- POPOVIĆ, Mihajlo. »Influence, Power and Authority in Socialism.« *Gledišta*, 5 (1967), 733—748.
- POPOVIĆ, V. Mihajlo. »Property and Power in Socialism.« *Politička misao*, 4 (1967), 624—635.
- PUPIC, Borivoje. »Federalism under the Conditions of Social Self-government.« *Gledišta*, 12 (1967), 1619.
- PUSIĆ, Eugen. »Bureaucratic Power of Self-government Community.« *Enciclopaedia moderna*, 2 (1967), 10—14.
- RALIC, Prvoslav. »Unity of Theory, Action and Organization of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia between Political Mediation and Integration in a Self-government Society.« *Socijalizam*, 10 (1967), 1287—1290.
- SADIKOVIĆ, Čazim. »The Creative Nature of Power in Socialism.« *Gledišta*, 5 (1967), 749—758.
- SMAILAGIĆ, Nerkez. »People's World of Democracy.« *Politička misao*, 4 (1967), 558—576.
- SMAILAGIĆ, Nerkez. »The League of Communists of Yugoslavia — the Moral Political Force of the Socialist System.« *Politička misao*, 1 (1967), 26—41.
- STANOVIĆ, Vojislav. »The Necessity of Adjusting the League of Communist of Yugoslavia to the Processes of Democratization of Society.« *Socijalizam*, 10 (1967), 1291—1296.
- STOJANOVIĆ, Svetozar. »Social Self-government and Socialist Community.« *Praxis*, 5—6 (1967), 643—650.
- SOSKIĆ, Budo. »The Nature and Topical Character of Democratic Relations in the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.« *Socijalizam*, 10 (1967), 1297—1302.
- TADIĆ, Ljubomir. *Freedom and Order.* Kultura, Belgrade, 1967.
- VASOVIĆ, Vučina. »Elections and Democracy.« *Socijalizam*, 7—8 (1967), 958.
- VOJINOVIĆ, Vojica. »Lenin's Conception of a Socialist State.« *Međunarodni pokret*, 5 (1967), 83—97.
- VRACAR, Stevan. »Dilemmas of a State Power.« *Gledišta*, 5 (1967), 771—784.
- VRACAR, Stevan. »Party Monopolism and Political Power of Social Groups.« *Gledišta*, 8—9 (1967), 1053—1065.
- VRANICKI, Predrag. »State and Party in Socialism.« *Praxis*, 5—6 (1967), 643—650.
- VRATUSA, Anton. »Electoral System under the Conditions of Social Self-government.« *Encyclopaedia moderna*, 3—4 (1967).
- ZVAN, Anton. »Self-government and Avant-garde.« *Praxis*, 5—6 (1967), 812—823.

1968

- BAJT, Aleksander. »Social-Property — Collective and Individual.« *Gledišta*, 4 (1968), 531.
- BAKARIĆ, Vladimir. »Etatism — Self-government, Socialism.« *Socijalizam*, 1—2 (1968), 57—70.
- BILANZIĆ, Dušan. »Considerations on the Role of Bureaucracy in the Development of Soviet Society.« *Naše teme*, 12 (1968), 1835—1845.
- CVJETICANIN, Veljko. »Presuppositions, Essence and Perspectives of Bloc Socialism.« *Naše teme*, 12 (1968), 1934—1952.
- DISCUSSIONS: Corrections or Reorganization of the Political System. *Teorija in praksa*, 10 (1968), 1375.
- DJURETIĆ, Jagoš. »The Dilemmas of Proletarian Constitution of Power.« *Gledišta*, 4 (1968), 521.
- DRAGICEVIĆ, Adoif. »Economy and Policy in the System of Self-government.« *Naše teme*, 5 (1968), 689.
- GOJKOVIĆ, Boro. »Revolutionary Compulsion and Significance of History.« *Pregled*, 5—6 (1968), 499.
- HRZENJAK, Djuka. »Forms of Direct Democracy and Their Functioning.« *Socijalizam*, 7—8 (1968), 917.
- KARDELJ, Edvard. »The Working Class, Bureaucratism and the League of Communists.« *Socijalizam*, 1—2 (1968), 4—56.
- KLINAR, Peter. »Federation as a Social Community.« *Socijalizam*, 11 (1968), 1426—1434.
- KRANJČ, Stane. »Party and Democracy.« *Teorija in praksa*, 11 (1968), 1507.
- KRESIĆ, Andrija. *Dialectic of Politics.* Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo, 1968. 145 + III pages.

- LALOVIĆ, Miroslav. »Many-party System in Socialism.« *Gledišta*, 3 (1968), 470-480.
- MARKOVIĆ, Ljubislav. »Changes in the Socio-economic Structure and Transformation of the Role of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.« *Socijalizam*, 1-2 (1968), 80-92.
- MARUŠIĆ, Ante. »Reflections of the Fate of the Socialist Revolution.« *Naše teme*, 12 (1968), 1899-1909.
- MILOSAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »Democratic Tradition and the System of Assembly.« *Gledišta*, 4 (1968), 545.
- MILOSAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »Socio-political Organizations and Elections.« *Socijalizam*, 4 (1968), 480-491.
- MILOSAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »Theoretical Foundations of the Federal Order in Self-government Society.« *Pregled*, 8 (1968), 1065-1076.
- MILOSAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »A Sketch of Theoretical Problems of the Political System of Yugoslavia.« *Praksa*, 2 (1968), 12.
- MILOSAVLEVSKI, Slavko. »Democratization in the League of Communists - a Function of its Leading Role.« *Teorija in praksa*, 5 (1968), 714.
- MLINAR, Zdravko. »Concentration and Dispersion of Political Power.« *Teorija in praksa*, 10 (1968), 1444.
- PASIĆ, Najdan. »A Critical View of Various Concepts of Self-government.« *Socijalizam*, 4 (1968), 403-424.
- PASIĆ, Najdan. *Classes and Policy. Elements of a Marxist Political Science*. Rad, Belgrade. 1968. 412 + II pages.
- PASIĆ, Najdan. »De-etatization of Socio-political Communities and Development of Federalism.« *Socijalizam*, 11 (1968), 1404-1412.
- PECULJIC, Miroslav. »Social Groups and Political Power.« *Socijalizam*, 7-8 (1968), 959.
- PERKOVIĆ, Božidar. »Democratic Political Action in Conceptual Sphere.« *Gledišta*, 2 (1968), 278.
- PETRANOVIĆ, Branko. »Socialist Revolution in Yugoslavia, and Ways of Creation of a New Political System.« *Međunarodni radnički pokret*, 2 (1968), 61-87.
- PETROVIĆ, Borislav. »The Structure of the Assembly and Electoral System.« *Gledišta*, 5 (1968), 776.
- POPOV, Nebojša. »Boundaries of Power and Possibilities of Socialism.« *Gledišta*, 10 (1968), 1331.
- PRIBIČEVIĆ, Djordje. »Stalinism as one of the Forms of Technocratic-Etatist Structures of the Contemporary World.« *Naše teme*, 12 (1968), 1846-1865.
- PUPIĆ, Borivoje. »Organizational Structure and Elections of Representative Bodies.« *Gledišta*, 3 (1968), 371-382.
- RUPNIK, Janko. »Political System and Federal Administration.« *Teorija in praksa*, 3 (1968), 421.
- SADIKOVIĆ, Cazim. »The League of Communists and Democracy.« *Pregled*, 11-12 (1968), 623.
- SADIKOVIĆ, Cazim. »Some Theoretical Aspects of the Assembly in our Society.« *Pregled*, 7 (1968), 949-969.
- SMILAGIĆ, Nerkez. »Socialism as Worker's Democracy.« *Pregled*, 3 (1968), 185-208.
- SMILAGIĆ, Nerkez. »Socialism as Worker's Democracy II.« *Pregled*, 5-6 (1968), 479-498.
- STANOVIĆ, Vojislav. »Some Problems of Theory and Practice of Self-government.« *Praksa*, 5 (1968), 781.
- STANOVIĆ, Vojislav. »On Political Responsibility and Irresponsibility in our Society.« *Socijalizam*, 6 (1968), 719-739.
- STOJANOVIĆ, Svetozar. »Once More the Etatist Myth of Socialism.« *Socijalizam*, 1-2 (1968), 191.
- SKRBIC, Milan. »Possibilities and Perspectives of De-Stalinization in the States of Warsaw Pact.« *Naše teme*, 12 (1968), 1966-1975.
- SUVAR, Stipe. »Socialisms Help Each Other Fraternally.« *Naše teme*, 12 (1968), 1876-1898.
- TADIĆ, Ljubomir. »Authority and Authoritative Thought.« *Filozofija* 1-2 (1968), 79.
- VASOVIĆ, Vučina. »Federation and Constituting of Self-government Society.« *Gledišta*, 12 (1968), 1725-1731.
- VIDAKOVIĆ, Zoran. »The Relation of the Programme of Reform and the General Communist Programme.« *Naše teme*, 5 (1968), 724.
- VIDAKOVIĆ, Zoran. »Trade-Union and Communist Avant-garde.« *Socijalizam*, 5 (1968), 557-568.

- VIDAKOVIĆ, Zoran. »The Main Development Line of the Socialist Revolution in Yugoslavia.« *Socijalizam*, 7-8 (1968), 987.
- VIDAKOVIĆ, Zoran. »What Do the Force and Weakness of Self-government Consist of?« *Gledišta*, 12 (1968), 1455—1494.
- VIDOJEVIĆ, Zoran. »What Do the Force and Weakness of Self-government Consist of?« *Gledišta*, 12 (1968), 1675—1712.
- VIDOJEVIĆ, Zoran. »Avant-garde between Monopolization of Policy and Spontaneity of the Development of Socialist Society.« *Gledišta*, 8—9 (1968), 1085—1104.
- VOJINOVIĆ, Novica. »Socialism and Bureaucracy.« *Pregled*, 8 (1968), 1177 to 1191.
- VRACAR, Stevan. »One Page of Text and Many Misunderstandings on Party System in Socialism.« *Gledišta*, 1 (1968), 150.
- VUKADINOVIĆ, Radovan. »Relations among Socialist States.« *Pregled*, 11-12 (1968), 1489.
- VUKMANOVIĆ, Svetozar. »Contradictions of Self-government Society.« *Naše teme*, 4 (1968), 503—537.
- ZUN, Anton. »Political System With Us.« *Teorija in praksa*, 11 (1968), 1580.
- ZUPANOV, Josip. »Self-government and Reform.« *Naše teme*, 5 (1968), 673.
- ZUPANOV, Josip. »Behaviour of the Super-system.« *Naše teme*, 12 (1968), 1966—1998.

(SELECTED BY MATJAZ MACEK)



## Editorial note



**dear readers,**

this is the first international issue of the review

**Teorija in praksa** which is published in Ljubljana.

This issue was published in Slovene as number 6/7 of the 6<sup>th</sup> year in enlarged edition; due to the great interest in its contents we have also prepared an international edition in English.

It is published in a limited edition. Orders should be sent to:

Editorial Office:

**Teorija in praksa,**

Titova c. 102, Ljubljana.

Single issue costs 4.00 US dollars with postage included.



naše teme

PREGLED

PRAXIS

Rinascita

FILOZOFIA

neue  
kritik

ΠΟΓΛΕΔΙ

sociologický  
časopis

kulturní  
radník

NOVÁ  
MÝSL

TEORIJA  
in PRAKSA

*new left review*

Das Argument

KULTÚRNY  
ŽIVOT

sociologia

FILOSOFICKÝ  
ČASOPIS

Lupta  
de clasă

SOCIJALIZAM

REVISTA DE  
FILOZOFIE