

ON
PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY
in
YUGOSLAVIA

by Edward Kardelj

Published by:

YUGOSLAV INFORMATION CENTER

This is a translation of an article by Edward Kardelj, published in the July, 1949, issue of *The Communist*, theoretical organ of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. The article itself is actually a somewhat expanded speech delivered by Edward Kardelj before the People's Assembly in May, 1949, during the debate on the proposed New Law concerning People's Committees.

On People's Democracy in Yugoslavia

The Government submits to the National Assembly a considerably changed and amplified law, in fact, a new law concerning people's committees. I shall not exaggerate when I say at the outset that, by its deeply democratic character and its concrete organizational elaboration, this law constitutes a long step forward in the further development of our Socialist state and that, by the same token, it is also a real contribution to the theory and practice of Socialist development. In complete harmony with the principle of unified power and democratic centralism, our aim is to give, through this law, the most powerful expression possible to that deep democratic striving of the masses of the people toward self-government, toward direct participation in the administration of the state, which has always characterized genuine people's movements all over the world, and which in particular must be characteristic of the revolutionary proletariat and of Socialist democracy. Of course, by saying this, I do not mean to imply that in this law we have given a model of perfect democracy which is above any criticism and which is not subject to further development. Such perfection does not exist. When at some future time social conditions become ripe for such a "perfect" democracy, it will no longer be a democracy. It will then die out as a form of state organization and be replaced by a free human community.

But this is not the place for me to discuss these stages of future development. By means of this law we wish to take one more step in that direction, making it at the same time even clearer that the democratic forms embodied in this law will be constantly further developed and deepened along with the development of the internal socio-economic structure of our country. In that sense, this law is a significant step in the consolidation of the democratic gains won in the course of our People's Revolution.

In comparison with the old law on people's committees, the present law is especially characterized by the following:

1. it further develops and deepens our People's Socialist Democracy.
2. it defines more accurately the competence of the people's committees, in the spirit of the consistent application of the principle underlying the unity of powers, self-government and democratic centralism;
3. it provides greater flexibility for the organizational forms in the people's committees, which will not hinder them in their further development, and will, at the same time, offer broader possibilities for the development of independent creative work and initiative among the local organs of government, without weakening in any way the leading role exercised by higher governmental bodies and their over-all control;
4. it will enable a further elaboration of the principle of a federative state order, which is based on a clearer definition of the rights of individual bodies of state authority;
5. it will provide a much clearer perspective for the future growth of the people's committees as the political and organizational bases of our state order and our Socialist democracy, primarily by bringing about the increasingly direct and extensive participation of the masses in the mechanics of governing the state.

In connection with all this, permit me first to go into the question of certain principles underlying the development of a People's Democracy. And then I should like to discuss the concrete tasks connected with the development and strengthening of our people's committees.

1. Concerning Definitions of People's Democracy

I should like first to underline a number of basic characteristics of people's committees, which can be seen in the history of their development, because these characteristics have determined the nature of the entire system of People's Democracy.

1. Our people's committees developed as organs of the struggle of the people against the Axis occupation powers, their supporters and all sorts of traitors, who were produced in abundance by the bourgeoisie and its political agencies in the course of the War for National Liberation. On the liberated territory, these organs of struggle developed immediately and directly into organs of government, or else they were created to perform both functions. In this manner, the old regime was completely destroyed, both as an organized system of government and with respect to the composition of its administrative apparatus.

2. From the very beginning, the leading role in people's committees belonged in the main to the working class which, through the people's committees, kept forging strong ties with the masses of other toilers. Naturally, this does not mean that this role was realized and assured in every individual people's committee. No, indeed! Even today we cannot say that the influence of the enemy has been completely liquidated in each and every people's committee. But each individual people's committee found itself in such a system of unified people's authority that the enemy influence in individual people's committees could not materially affect either the character of the regime as a whole or its functions. Besides, we had a unique political weapon in our People's Front. This Front drew its basic strength from the alliance between the workers and other toilers under the leadership of the Communist Party. Through the People's Front this alliance was constantly strengthened, and thus also the leading role of the working class and the Communist Party. The People's Front became the main political support of people's committees among the masses. Moreover, it is well known that, at the outset, the organs of the People's Front were identical with the organs of the people's authority. It is perfectly clear that, given such conditions, the people's committees of necessity directly and immediately grew into the militant organs of the People's Revolution, because it was impossible even to suppose that the masses of toilers, who had begun to run the state, could be satisfied with a simple return to the old state of affairs.

In view of the fact that our Revolution began to develop in the conditions of the National Liberation War, in its first phase it possessed the form of a People's Democracy, but, in view of its class forces and the internal relationship of these forces, it could in fact only be a Socialist revolution. It is not of the slightest moment that, in the course of the National Liberation War, our revolution resolved mainly—in addition to the question of power as such—only the tasks of a general democratic character, and only in the concluding phase I of the war and directly afterward it began to grapple with the tasks of the Socialist revolution on a broader front. The fundamental point at issue here is the character of the authority, and the internal relationships of the motor forces of the revolution, and not the tempo of the revolutionary changes, which depends upon objective conditional and tactical means at the disposal of the leading revolutionary force. This is why we rightly maintain that our People's Revolution represents a specific form of Socialist revolution, which arose out of, and began its development in conditions created by, the National Liberation War, which was led by the working class with its vanguard, the Communist Party.

3. As people's committees became the political and organizational basis of the system of people's authority, they gave the name to that authority and to the principle of People's

Democracy. Higher administrative organs of the state—on the country, republican and federal levels—grew out of the people’s committees. And—just as in the Soviet system, as Stalin describes it—they constituted themselves into a single unified system of people’s authority and into a state of People’s Democracy. Thus, in the course of 1942-1943 the National Liberation Committees gave birth to AVNOJ (Anti-Fascist Council of the National Liberation of Yugoslavia), which was the revolutionary National Assembly, the supreme committee of the National Liberation movement, together with its executive apparatus. So, from the beginning our People’s Democracy was fundamentally different from the system of parliamentary democracy with which some so-called theoreticians in the Soviet Union and in the countries of People’s Democracy tried and still try to identify it.

Anyone who has at all studied the form and substance of our people’s committees and the whole system of our people’s government, must realize at a glance that the gist of this matter is that here we have a system differing fundamentally from a bourgeois parliamentary democracy, as regards both its substance and its form; here, in principle, we have a Socialist democracy of a type resembling the Paris Commune or the Soviets, but naturally with additional specific features, which, nevertheless, do not alter the essential principles of its structure.

When we take into account all these facts and, above all, the fact that People’s Democracy, as a new phenomenon which has appeared in the course of the Second World War, received its name during our People’s Revolution from our people’s authority and our people’s committees, then it becomes clear what an extraordinary confusion prevails in the heads of those “theoreticians” who have spent several years in an effort to prove that People’s Democracy is *in principle* something new in the development of society, a sort of bourgeois-democratic entrance hall in front of the next stage—the dictatorship of the proletariat. This revisionistic confusion is drastically reflected in an article by an Italian Communist, Eugenio Reale, who formulated the role of People’s Democracy in the following manner:

The new People’s Democracies are like a bridge thrown between two epochs.

(*Rinascita*, Rome, May, 1947, p. 120)

In order to indicate more clearly what kind of epochs Eugenio Reale has in mind, I must add the following quotation from his article:

In the conflict between the capitalistic and socialistic orders in the world of today is it possible at a certain stage for a third form to appear, a form that has neither the characteristics of the one nor of the other but constitutes historically an expression all of its own, a special kind of solution, a fact clearly marked and unique? To these questions, which many writers and politicians are asking and which are arousing the interest of an increasing number of students, we feel that we can give an answer: such a development is not only possible but also almost natural. But one has to recognize the inevitability of historical development, not only possible but also logical, only one has to understand the meaning of progress which nothing can restrict into a mold, into established and immutable formulas.

(*Ibid.*, p. 118)

We learn, thus, that between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat there is something else, “an expression all of its own,” “a special kind of solution,” “a fact clearly marked and unique”; that is, some sort of social system which possesses neither the characteristics of capitalism nor those of Socialism, in other words—something round and yet angular. Of course, it is impossible to pass from capitalism directly to well-developed Socialism; a transitional stage is necessary. However, so far as this transitional period is concerned, the

premises of Marxism-Leninism are absolutely unequivocal, and up to this time no facts have been produced to bring these premises into question. As is well known, Marx says that between capitalism and Socialism there, is a transitional period, which carries the imprint of the old order but in which at the same time the elements of a new Socialist order are born and developed and strengthened more and more until they win a complete victory over the elements of capitalism. This transitional period can be nothing else except a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat which makes use of the machinery of the state, as a remnant of the society based on class distinctions, for the purpose of destroying the resistance of the remnants of capitalism and building a Socialist society. Clearly, the structure of this transitional period is no longer capitalistic, nor is it fully socialistic, because it contains elements of both. But the state during this transitional period is a Socialist state – although not fully developed – both by the nature of its authority and by the fact that it directly serves the cause of the destruction of capitalism and the building of Socialism.

I cannot but recall at this point the following classical formulation offered by Karl Marx in this connection:

Between a capitalist society and a Communist one, there exists period of revolutionary transformation of one into the other. It has a corresponding political transitional period as well, so that a state in this period can be nothing else but a *revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*.

(Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, p. 3, published by “Kultura,” Belgrade, 1946)

According to Marx, then, the dictatorship of the proletariat is “a political transitional period” in which there occurs the “revolutionary transformation” of the capitalist into the Communist society. And this is precisely the essence of the present-day People’s Democracy in the countries of eastern Europe. That means that a People’s Democracy is not “a bridge” between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat, but that it can only be a name for a whole series of forms during the period of transition into Socialism, the essence of which is actually dictatorship of the proletariat and not “some third thing” and which is characterized by a determined struggle between the growing elements of Socialism and the steadily vanishing elements of capitalism, until the latter are completely liquidated. Naturally, there is nothing—no third force—between these two contending forces. This “third force” could have been invented only by opportunistic philistines who were afraid of the struggle and of* the difficulties which had to be surmounted during the transitional period, and who, therefore, sought refuge in academic dogmatism which offers no basis for an understanding of the essence of the concrete forms of revolutionary development, for they cannot be fitted into any preconceived schemes and prescriptions.

I should not have quoted Reale if he were the only one to hold this opinion. I have quoted him because he most tangibly holds those views which have appeared since the war among many influential men in the Communist movement both in the Soviet Union and in the countries of People’s Democracy as well as in the capitalistic world.

In September, 1947, for example, Eugene Varga wrote as follows:

The social structure of those states [meaning the states of People’s Democracy-E. K.] differs from the structure of the states so far known to us; it is an entirely new phenomenon in the history of mankind. It is neither a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie nor a dictatorship of the proletariat. The old state apparatus is not destroyed, as was the case in the Soviet Union, but is being renovated with the steady absorption of the followers of

the new regime. Those are not capitalistic states in the ordinary meaning of the word. But neither are they Socialist states. Their development in the direction of Socialism is based on the nationalization of the chief means of production and on the very character of those states.

(Democratic Nouvelle, September, 1947, p. 463)

Thus, to Varga also People's Democracy is neither fish nor fowl. Nevertheless, Varga sees in People's Democracy the possibility of Socialist development. This development, according to him, however, is not guided by the proletariat, that is, by the authority of the proletariat, but by something unknown, a third factor which is contained in the "very character of the state." But in what precisely that character consists remains a complete mystery.

Eugene Varga's countryman and member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Hungary, Horvath Martin, wanted to state the matter in a more concrete manner. Arguing against those enemies who supposedly "are confusing" People's Democracy with Socialism, he says:

Their arguments in short come down to this: who is against Socialism is also against People's Democracy and is a follower of bourgeois democracy. In the first place, this is not theoretically correct. In view of the fact that People's Democracy does not destroy the right to own the means of production, it can simply be regarded as the most progressive form of bourgeois democracy (or, to put it more correctly, its only progressive form).

(Tarsadani—midományi szemle, October, 1948)

So, the matter is quite clear: People's Democracy is a type of bourgeois democracy and, in addition, its only progressive type.

However, after this "lucid" exposition of the line comes the most loquacious and at the same time the most confused tribune of the "Cominform line," Matyas Rakosi, and commits the following monstrosity:

Finally, we should say a few words about the question how and at what point the establishment of the Hungarian People's Democracy merges with the road which leads to Socialism. During the last 25 years the Communist Parties of the world learned that there are several roads which lead to Socialism and accordingly we cannot build Socialism if we do not build our own road, taking into account the special conditions prevailing in the country. We have learned that lesson, and, while we are strengthening the Hungarian democracy, we are not doing this because of tactical reasons or in order to achieve some secret aim, but because of our deep Communist convictions, and we will do whatever we can to fill the frame of that democracy with the largest possible Socialist content. That will speed up the progress which leads mankind into Socialism. We also know that, although Socialism utilizes a multitude of international experiences, our Socialism can be created only as a result of the development of Hungarian history and Hungarian economic, political and social forces. That will be Socialism born on Hungarian soil and adapted to Hungarian conditions.

(From a speech delivered by M. Rakosi before the Second Congress of the Hungarian Communist Party)

According to Rakosi, therefore, People's Democracy and the road to Socialism are supposed to meet somewhere. To be sure, we are left completely in the dark concerning the meaning of People's Democracy, but, anyhow, it is supposed at some point to meet the road that leads to Socialism. Rakosi, thus, refutes what Horvath has said—namely, that there is no connection

between Socialism and People's Democracy—and states, on the contrary, that they want People's Democracy with the largest possible Socialist content.

At the same Congress of the Hungarian Party of Toilers, Rakosi was followed by Jozsef Revai, who explained the real meaning of the road to Socialism through People's Democracy as follows:

This progress toward Socialism no doubt is much slower than the course which we followed in 1919; but, comrades, for the sake of our intelligentsia, our peasantry, our small businessmen, therefore, for the sake of all of our working people, we gladly go into Socialism more slowly and less painfully, rather than going more rapidly at the cost of a bloody civil war.

So the Hungarian Communists decided in favor of People's Democracy because the road from it into Socialism is, according to Revai, easier than some other road, and the Hungarian Communists, "in the interest of the working people," prefer to go more slowly but less painfully rather than quickly and painfully as was the case in 1919! (However, Revai owes us an answer to the question who it was in the final analysis that suffered pain because of that "speed.") But, you see, after this statement he immediately threatens his enemies as follows:

Should our enemies succeed in stopping or preventing the development of People's Democracy, then there can scarcely be any talk about that painless road to Socialism.

This means that the Hungarian Communists are moving toward Socialism by way of People's Democracy in order to go slowly and painlessly, and that they are doing this solely out of their magnanimous regard for the working people. But, at the same time, they declare that they will – should the enemy try to stop them on that road – go faster and more painfully, that is, over some other road, fast road, perhaps the road followed in 1919. As is well known, the Hungarian revolution of 1919 ended in defeat, and it is, therefore mere double-talk to say that that road was quicker than the road being followed today. So far as the Communists and toilers of Yugoslavia are concerned, matters must be different with us, because if we had the choice between a slower and a quicker road we should certainly choose the quicker road even though to some it would prove a little more painful. However, our progress is just about right, that is, as rapid as the objective factors of Socialist development demand and allow us to go. Of course, subjective factors also play an important role in our progress, but their value consists precisely in their ability to indicate that tempo of Socialist development which is in harmony with the objective factors. If we go too slowly, we will be defeated; if we go too quickly, the result will also be bad. But look, the Hungarian Communists are in a better position—they are able to choose either to go slowly or to go more quickly. Being good and peace-loving men, they have decided to go slowly.

However, after all this, the question still remains: What is this Hungarian People's Democracy? In order to give as clear an answer to this question as possible, I cannot avoid giving you one more Hungarian quotation, and again from an article by the "most learned" Hungarian "theoretician," Jozsef Revai, which is as follows:

The essence of state authority in a People's Democracy is the division of authority between the working class and the working peasantry.

(Information Bulletin of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Communist Party, 1948, No. 8, p. 14)

Of course, stated in this manner, the concept is nothing but an empty scholastic play with

words and ideas. But its real meaning becomes clear after reading the following words from the same article:

In order to progress toward Socialism by way of People's Democracy, it is necessary *more and more to unify* our state authority.! Our present state authority has made great progress in the direction of unification. In spite of this, however, our present authority is not a unified state authority in the sense that *all power in the state resides in the hands of one class.*

[Italics author's.)

(*Ibid.*, pp. 14-15)

In other words, Revai wants a "pure" class government, that is, of the working class. Since the present Hungarian system, according to Revai, represents a "division of authority" between the working class and the working peasantry, it is necessary as soon as possible to deprive the working peasantry of any participation in the government. Such are the stupidities that can develop in the heads of half-educated, so-called, theoreticians in their scholastic method of reasoning and their completely idealistic method of work, which is not based on objective facts but rather on a chrestomathy of separately collected citations.

This is what Engels has to say about this method of work:

The materialistic method comes into contradiction with itself if it is not used only as the guiding thread in historical inquiries but instead as a ready-made answer in accordance to which historical facts are shaped and reshaped.

(Fr. Engels, "Answer to Mr. Paul Ernot," *Works of Marx and Engels*, Sixteenth Russian edition, Vol. II, p. 73)

Evidently, Revai would like to see in Hungary some sort of "a pure dictatorship of the proletariat" freed from any participation in the government on the part of other toilers. However, a proletarian dictatorship of this type would be possible only in the event of a transition into Socialism from "an ideally pure capitalistic society," which exists nowhere. That is, there is not now any society in which there are only two classes, the capitalists and the working class. Since such a society does not exist, there are no "ideally pure" bourgeois or ideally pure proletarian dictatorships. As is well known, Lenin defined the dictatorship of the proletariat as a specific alliance of the working class with other toilers, with the working peasantry in the first place. Can such an alliance exist if the working class does not share its authority with the masses of other toilers? Of course, it can not. But if a government of this type is to be in essence a dictatorship of the proletariat, it is absolutely necessary that the leading role of the working class be unchallenged—a role which will make sure that the working peasantry will participate in the government as a class of toilers whose interests coincide with those of the working class. *A toiling peasant* is an ally of the workers; *a peasant speculator* is not. The authority of the state is used against the latter, and for that reason it constitutes a dictatorship of the proletariat. *It is the assurance of the leading role of the working class, which is expressed, above all, in the leading role of its revolutionary vanguard, the Communist Party, in the organs and apparatus of the State, that constitutes that jump from quantity to quality which at the present time gives to a government the character of a dictatorship of the proletariat, without regard to forms, without regard to any greater or smaller remnants of the past, and without regard to the degree and the manner in which other toilers participate governing the state. It is clear that, at the present time and under such conditions, to speak about "a division of authority" between the working class and the working peasantry is stupid from the point of view of theory, while from the point of view of practice it constitutes an undermining of the alliance of the workers, the working peasants and*

other toilers.

"Theories" of this kind are typical of those half-educated but extremely pretentious "theoreticians" who stick to the "rules," using their theoretical knowledge not to find their way in practical work but to prove their theoretical "wisdom." Actually, their knowledge consists of a heap of quotations and definitions which have become unchangeable dogmas in their heads. So it is in this case. Instead of rejoicing that today, in the struggle for Socialism, mankind, led by the proletariat, is more readily responding to the ideals and practices of Socialism than was the case at the time of the October Revolution, Revai regards this readiness as a temporary evil, which must be endured for the time being but from which we must rid ourselves as quickly as possible. He cannot look at things differently, because practice and theory are not in agreement in his half-educated head, and he is obliged, therefore, to fit the practice into his "theoretical mold."

He himself sees the stupidity and harmfulness of his theory. For that reason, he tries in the same article to convince the peasants that the Hungarian Communists "are not striving for a monopoly of power." But here he comes into conflict with his main theory. In spite of that, however, he does not renounce this theory. Only a few months later—after a lecture delivered to him by the Moscow professors—he performs an act of self-criticism in the name of all Hungarian "theoreticians," "correcting" his stand but in a most "original" manner, which I shall discuss later.

I think that this is sufficient to show what a monstrosity the Hungarian Communists have made out of the concept of People's Democracy. Front all this only one thing is clear. Until the beginning of this year, the Hungarian Communists looked upon People's Democracy as a transitional period, which is not a dictatorship of the proletariat, but which will lead into a dictatorship of the proletariat. But what is this period which is not a dictatorship of the proletariat? According to Jozsef Revai's explanation it is supposed to be—"division of power between the working class and the working peasantry," But both groups are building Socialism. One does it slower and less painfully; and the other quicker but more painfully. No doubt, this is an original "discovery."

It is not at all accidental that, in precisely such Communist Parties as the Hungarian Party, these anti-Marxian theories should have developed as they did. The Hungarian Party did not go through the flames of revolutionary practice in which it would have freed itself of professorial dogmatics and idealist "schematism." Prescriptions and schemata here replaced living revolutionary initiative.

However, there is nothing more ludicrous or more dangerous than the futile attempts to make all the limitless varieties of social development from capitalism toward Socialism conform to the code of obligatory prescriptions and to proclaim all such recipes as the laws of social development. Marxism-Leninism has given us the means whereby to understand the objective laws of social development and the conscious guidance of this development—but only as long as we keep to the basis of these objective laws and remain inside those limits within which we are really in a position to learn them by using scientific means. The moment we go beyond this, as soon as we endeavor to substitute for these laws some sort of dogmatic structures, which are a violation of objective reality, we arrive at the position of idealism and thus begin to obstruct all progress. This happens in the case of the Hungarian "theories," and, it might be said, in general, in every case, when objective laws are confounded and identified with dogma.

Permit me to give other quotations which show that this position is not a Hungarian specialty. Here is what Georgi Dimitrov has to say about People's Democracy:

Bulgaria will not be a Soviet republic but a people's republic in which the functions of

government will be performed by an enormous majority of the people—workers, peasants, craftsmen, and the people’s intelligentsia. In this republic there will be no dictatorship of any kind....

(From a speech delivered by Dimitrov in September, 1946, published by the “Kultura” Publishing House, Belgrade, 1947)

Here, also, People’s Democracy is represented as something different in principle from Soviet power, something that is neither a dictatorship of the proletariat nor any other kind of dictatorship. “Our people favor a parliamentary republic which will not be a plutocratic republic,” Dimitrov said in the same speech. This means that a People’s Democracy is neither a bourgeois nor a proletarian dictatorship nor a Soviet democracy but a parliamentary republic of a majority of toilers. In this manner, Georgi Dimitrov gives us no explanation of the socio-historical content of People’s Democracy.

Let us examine also a statement made by Boleslav Bierut in June, 1946, in Cracow:

The essence of the new social and economic order consists in the *specific harmony of two factors* [italics mine—E. K.]; on the one side, the leading role of the State which has at its disposal abundant means of production and which is guided in its activities by the interests of the nation as a whole and, on the other side, the spirit of enterprise, the energy and free initiative of the mass of independent entrepreneurs in agriculture and handicrafts as well as in the medium-sized and small private factories and enterprises employing hired labor. This specific system is not based on any existing model. It is not similar to the Soviet socialist economic order nor to the classical economic system of the countries of the West. But this system is best adapted to the social structure created in our country as a result of the changes caused by the war.

According to this statement, which is full of all sorts of polite references to capitalism and its “classical” order, People’s Democracy appears as a special kind of system which is characterized by “the specific harmony” which prevails between the state of People’s Democracy and its economic sectors; that is, between the Socialist-sector, on the one hand and the capitalistic and small producer elements of the economy on the other. This system, Boleslav Bierut tells us, resembles neither Socialism nor capitalism, but is something different: from both. Up to this time we looked upon the transitional period! as a specific time of conflict and life and death struggle between the; growing forces of Socialism and the remnants of capitalism. But, contrary to this, the Polish period of transition is a period of “specific harmony” among those elements. In other words, it is a time of peaceful absorption of capitalism by Socialism.

We have never said anything of this kind. The resolution of the Informbureau, however, accuses us, not Boleslav Bierut, of this mortal sin. The Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Poland is, as you know, in spite of this, one of the Informbureau defenders of the “true” Marxist-Leninist line concerning the development of Socialism in the countries of People’s Democracy. He was not even asked to pray—*confiteor*.

As a curiosity I should like to point out that I have taken the above quotation from Bierut from an article by a certain Soviet citizen, Puhlov, who referred to that stand as the pinnacle of Polish wisdom. His name is perhaps known to some of you, because recently, in Judin’s periodical *For Lasting Peace and People’s Democracy*, he attacked our party, which, according to Puhlov, defends the theory of peaceful absorption of the capitalistic elements into Socialism. Really, the history of sports must record that the Informbureau has encouraged a mass execution of the most fantastic and comical *salto mortales* beyond the inventive power of human fantasy.

And it is necessary to emphasize that this confusion prevails not only in the countries of People's Democracy, but also among the learned Soviet professors, very few of* whom have dared to engage in an analysis of the new revolutionary phenomena produced during and after the Second World War. Be it noted also that a majority of those Soviet professors who have done so manifest a fundamental confusion in their heads. I shall give a number of quotations bearing out this point.

The case of E. Varga is well known and I shall not quote him. But it is completely erroneous to think that his was an isolated case. Not at all. It must be admitted that a majority of other Soviet theoreticians were less brave and, possibly, less clear in the formulation of their views, but there is no essential difference in their opinions.

Here are a few thoughts of the academician I. P. Trainin, from the year 1947:

Under the conditions of democratic revolution, which has built a new type of democracy, the trend is not in the direction of the growth of private property/ Although the principles of private property remain, they are no longer broadened. Under these conditions there is no longer a government of finance capital, monopolies and trusts. The purpose of democratic institutions is to raise the economic and cultural standard of the people which cannot be accomplished if the broadest masses of the people do not take an active part in politics...

Trainin then asks:

What, therefore, is the social nature of this special type of democracy? Naturally, it is not a proletarian (Socialist) democracy. Proletarian democracy is identical with the dictatorship of the proletariat which does not share its power with any other class.

(The Soviet State and Law, 1947, No. I)

In other words, this is not a proletarian Democracy because it is not a dictatorship of the proletariat, because in it the proletariat shares power with somebody else, and since it is not a dictatorship of the proletariat it has nothing in common with Socialism—except that private property no longer grows.

Trainin says further:

The hegemony of the proletariat is expressed in the fact the proletariat, in the shape of its vanguard—the Communist Party—tends towards finding solutions for these tasks not through the strengthening of capitalism, but through the gradual consolidation of the principles of real democracy, which correspond to the interests of the working class and all working people, that is, the overwhelming majority of the people. The hegemony of the proletariat has already resulted in its serving as the guiding line in the organization of economy and government, which derives from genuine democracy.

And finally:

Democracy of a specific type corresponds to new production relationships which are being formed and which do not belong to capitalism, such as those in lands of the old-type democracy, but they are not socialist either. By virtue of their building-up process, arising from specific historical developments in various countries, (his special type of democracy yields a new historical pattern of both political and economic development which is sharply differentiated from the common bourgeois

economic development.

(*Ibid.*, No. 3, 1947, p. 3)

And Professor A. Leontiev, as if he had forgotten that Marx and Engels had seen in a democratic parliamentary republic a possible form of dictatorship of the proletariat, writes in 1947 as follows:

...Such a form [a People's Democracy—1£. K.] Marx and Lenin could not and did not foresee because it was created by a completely new set of historical circumstances, special conditions, which could not be foreseen.

(*Planned Economy*, No. IV, 1947)

Actually, Marx and Lenin did foresee a transitional period of this kind, only A. Leontiev does not understand what it is all about. And he, like the others, seeks in a People's Democracy some "third form."

Let us also look at what M. Mitin had to say about this in 1947:

In these countries there have arisen new, higher forms of democracy as compared with the old, bourgeois-parliamentary democracy. These countries have so developed and expanded democracy as to signify the participation of workers and peasants in the state administration and make the benefits of democracy accessible to the broadest masses. Thus, new forms of state polity have been created which are a big step forward in comparison with the bourgeois-democratic states and which offer possibilities for further progress by these countries in the economic and political fields.

(*Bolshevik*, No. 6, Moscow, 1947, p. 23)

This means that as against a common bourgeois democracy, the People's Democracy is a "big step forward" which makes possible "further progress." But as to the fact that, in these cases, power has changed hands—there is not a word.

Last year (1948) Dr. Levin adjudged the Rumanian constitution in the following terms:

It is understandable that it [viz., a people's democratic state —E. K.] may not be approached either with the criterion of the "common," "generally accepted" democracy, that is bourgeois parliamentarianism with its formal "separation of powers," with its unaccountable head of the state, with its independent executive, etc.; or with the criterion of the well-developed socialist democracy, peculiar to the socialist state. The starting point should be that Rumania is a state of a specific type which is advancing to Socialism along its own specific path.

(*Soviet State and Law*, No. 6, 1948, p. 43)

In other words, the present-day people's democratic states are not in essence Socialist states as was the USSR after October, but rather some kind of special, third type of state which, nonetheless, leads towards *Socialism*. It is obvious that the confusion is complete.

I could read to you innumerable quotations of the same kind but it would take too much of your time. In its first phase this professorial discussion in the USSR succeeded in establishing the fact that a People's Democracy is not an ordinary bourgeois democracy; and at the same-time it "proved" that it is not a Socialist order. What

a discovery! As if it were possible to jump over night from capitalism into Socialism without any transitional period! That would be good; unfortunately, it is impossible.

On the other hand, it is really interesting how these Soviet theoreticians “permitted” the Soviet Union a period of 20 years for the building of Socialism without denying it the character of a Socialist state. In the meantime, they are emphasizing that the remnants of capitalism are a special characteristic of a People’s Democracy, as if they had been less characteristic of the Soviet state after the October Revolution until the final victory of collectivization. But, there, if we speak about building up Socialism we are accused of being adventurers. Actually, since the facts destroyed all these theories and proved the correctness of our stand and our policy, it is now being admitted that, to be sure, it is possible “in a People’s Democracy” also to move in the direction of Socialism but “not without the support of the USSR,” The meaning of this phrase and what is concealed behind it are best shown in the attack of the Informbureau on our country and, in the first place, in the attempts to replace the principle of equality and voluntary agreement among the Socialist countries by one-sided oppression.

However, what exactly is a People’s Democracy—since it is neither one nor the other? To this, the Moscow professors have, until this year, made no reply whatever. They were, nevertheless, so happy with their results that K. V. Ostrovitianov, in speaking of some self-critical statements made by E. Varga, had this to say:

Nothing but the warmest praise can be extended to such an evolution in the conceptions of Comrade Varga. It is my opinion that such an elaboration will be fully welcomed by Communists and progressive public workers in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and other lands of New Democracy, who at the outset had been confused by the incorrect assertions made by Varga on state capitalism.

(Supplement to review *Mirovoje hozjajstvo i mirovaja politika*, No. 11, Moscow, 1947, p. 58)

This statement, first of all, shows with how much disdain some professors in the Soviet Union regard the theoretical work by Communist parties outside the USSR, a disdain which looks very much like a desire to monopolize all Marxist-Leninist theoretical work. Moreover, E. Varga has hardly succeeded in confusing anyone in Yugoslavia, but, on the contrary, his attitude, just like all similar ones, met immediate opposition in our country. Varga has perhaps managed to disorientate some Moscow professors and their “copyists of texts” in other People’s Democracies, but they are no better orientated now, either. From the very first, we, however, maintained that the name of People’s Democracy in our country stood for specific processes, identical in their substance with those which took place during and after the October Revolution. No one of us has ever said, for instance, that “in the People’s Democracies we have a new phenomenon in principle,” as Ostrovitianov stated in the criticism of E. Varga cited, whereby he actually took the same position as the latter in his revision of some of the basic premises of Marxism-Leninism. As opposed to this, we always stressed that it was not a question of some kind of “new phenomenon in principle,” but of some specific forms in the transitional period, and that in this sense alone could there be talk of “new paths” to Socialism.

At any rate, this special new path to Socialism has been widely spoken of in all the People’s Democracies—except in Yugoslavia. We have always maintained that the point at issue was not new paths but various forms along the general road of Socialist development—forms which can greatly differ from those known in the Soviet Union, but whose essence and over-all line of development must be the same. We owe the victory of our People’s Revolution precisely to the fact that we nurtured no illusions as to the “new paths in principle” which lead to Socialism. We

were the only ones to set out this attitude clearly at the first session of the Informbureau. Contrary to it, the leaders of the Communist Parties of the other People's Democracies constantly made some kind of "discoveries" about their own—in principle—"new path" to Socialism, about various "specific harmonies" between Socialist and capitalist elements, and about the especial worth of some vestiges of bourgeois democracy, which they glorified as a singular aspect of a People's Democracy. And all of them were unendingly claiming patents for these "discoveries" of theirs. Then the Soviet professors repeated these phrases in countless variations. That is why the Soviet press always gave more prominence to various opportunistic absurdities from the other People's Democracies than to facts about new Yugoslavia, which stood far ahead of all the others. And we, who contended that we had won our Socialist revolution, that our People's Democracy was of the Soviet type, we were told that we were narrow-minded sectarians and entirely incapable of inventing something new, despite the fact that practically everything that is really new in the present People's Democracy has been created in our country.

However, later on, all at once—as is the custom of Soviet professors—who obviously believe that to go from one extreme to another is the surest way to hit occasionally upon the golden mean — there came a turnabout, and comments such as the following in the *Bolshevik* started to appear:

The assertion that every country advances towards Socialism along its own specific path cannot be recognized as correct as well as the contention that there are as many roads in this direction as there are countries. To utter this means to deny the international portent of the Bolshevik experience. The general laws of transition from capitalism to Socialism, discovered by Marx and Engels, and tested, put to concrete use and developed, by Lenin and Stalin on the basis of the experience of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state, are binding upon all countries.

(Burdzalov, "On the International Significance of the Historical Experience of the Bolshevik Party," *Bolshevik*, No. 17, 1948, p. 51)

This of course came after the notorious Informbureau Resolution.

Here not only are the general laws binding as such but precisely in their "tested" and "concretized" forms, as yielded by the experience of the Soviet state; and nothing new at all happened with the creation of the People's Democracies. And now—here we go again—the copyists in the People's Democracies not only one after the other renounce their patented original "discoveries," but they even declare that we are conceited nationalists because we hold that the process of Socialist revolution in Yugoslavia gave a series of specific new forms, which in terms of experience, are valuable not only for us but also for other lands treading the path of Socialist development. This, finally, can also be confirmed by examining the constitutions and other laws in the People's Democracies and seeing that much in them has been copied from our Constitution and our Laws.

But after the above-mentioned Burdzalov took this opposite extreme stand, would one not suppose that he would direct his criticism against various Hungarian, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Polish and other similar roads to Socialism? No, not at all. Quite to the contrary, it is our Party which is accused of inventing that "third" form, that "bridge between two epochs," that "specific harmony," that slow and painless" business and all the various "theories" which I have mentioned. And this, in the Soviet Union today, is called-principled criticism.

As far as principle is concerned, it is a question which does not arise when talking about this kind of Soviet "critic" and "theoretician." It is characteristic of them to display a profound disdain of the theoretical value of the experience and work of revolutionary forces outside the Soviet Union and an equally strong conviction that they alone can offer "final" and "irrevocable"

estimates of all world phenomena.

But, words and “estimates” alone do not constitute reality. They are forceful only when they correspond to the truth; that is, when they coincide with reality. This is today forgotten by Soviet theoreticians who have an idea that they only need to pronounce something for it to become the embodiment of truth, even though this may be at odds with the objective facts. Instead, they only descend to the positions of idealism and violate truth and reality. On the other hand, it is politically detrimental and utterly anti-Marxian to belittle the theoretical work done by revolutionary movements in our day.

There can be no doubt but that every step taken towards the growth of the proletarian revolution simultaneously represents a step forward in the theory of Marxism. The proletarian revolution did not follow hard and fast rules of Marxist-Leninist theory, but rather it was this theory that served as a general guide, compass and concrete aid in everyday practical work. The revolutionary process itself helped this theory to enrich itself, be supplemented, and, on certain points, even amended. Lenin, for instance, speaks of the development of Marxism *up to and following* the Paris Commune. It is indisputable that the events of the Paris Commune confirmed a whole series of general premises made by Marx and Engels. And this even more holds true for the great October Revolution in the USSR and for the whole subsequent development of that land. Even the fruitless revolutionary attempts in Europe after World War I, as well as the colonial wars, and also the whole activity of the international working class movement, introduced a host of new elements into the development of Marxism-Leninism.

But now we hear “critics” who see nothing new in the field of theory and science in the revolutionary events in Yugoslavia, China, etc.; moreover, they declare all those new elements demonstrated by our Revolution and which helped it to victory to be mistakes, to be adventurous, and even traitorous, etc., only because they do not fall within the fat Marxist-Leninist chrestomathy composed of passages which referred both to other conditions and other times. Lenin once spoke thus about the viewpoints of such sages with respect to new phenomena and slogans:

Every slogan is and will be “traitorous” for those who repeat it mechanically, ignorant of its meaning, not delving deeper into the matter and adhering strictly to memorizing words without, an analysis of their meaning...

(Lenin, *Works*, 3rd Edition, Book XIX, p. 198)

And the following words by Lenin are especially applicable to this kind of “theoretician”:

Precise facts, irrefutable facts—these are the things which such; writers cannot bear and which are most important if we really want get our bearings in a complex and difficult question, which is most often deliberately confounded. But how to assemble the facts? How to ascertain their relationships and mutual dependence? In order that this might really be the foundation, it is necessary to take not individual facts, but the whole assembly of facts relating to the problem in hand, without a single exception, for otherwise doubt will inevitably arise, and a fully justified doubt that the facts were chosen arbitrarily, that instead of the objective link and mutual dependence of historical phenomena in their entirety, a “subjective” hodge-podge is proffered in order to justify, it may be, a foul affair. And this happens... more often than it would seem.

For these reasons, we have decided to start with statistics, fully aware, of course, of the deep-rooted antipathy which statistics provoke among some readers who prefer the “delusion which elevates us” to the “lowly truths,” and among some writers who, under the guise of

“general” considerations of internationalism, cosmopolitanism, nationalism, patriotism, etc., are wont to serve up political counterfeit.

(Lenin, *Collected Works*, Volume XXX, Moscow, pp. 302-304)

It is, indeed, as though Lenin wrote these words for the present slanderers of the Yugoslav Communist Party. Their “subjective” hodge-podge is also cooked up with the object of justifying a foul cause. And truly, there is more of this than meets the eye at first glance. But let’s leave this, and return to the considerations of People’s Democracy.

I could cite many more quotations and statements and articles of various Communist leaders and all sorts of professors in the USSR and other countries, but what I have cited so far is sufficient to show the ideological and political confusion which has prevailed and still prevails among the top leaders of certain Communist Parties.

In our country and in our literature and in the policies of our Party you will not find similar phenomena and theories. And that is easily understood. Our Party has passed through the fire of a revolution which produced a series of special forms but which at the same time confirmed the basic revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism. It is precisely for that reason that the revolutionary perspective has always been clear to us and that we have never forgotten that we are a revolutionary party.

It is true, we never raised the slogans about the dictatorship of the proletariat, just as we are not raising them now. Rather, we regard it as absolutely unnecessary to raise them because we no longer live during the period of the Second International, a time when it was necessary to fight for the renewal of the revolutionary content of Marxism with respect to that question. But we never denied that it was the essence of our people’s authority nor did we spread opportunistic illusions or propaganda about various “specific harmonies.” From the very beginning, we fought for this type of people’s authority, placing the emphasis on assuring the leading role in the struggle and in the people’s government to the Communist Party.

This we did without pathetic self-praise and threatening noise but with a great deal of self-consuming struggle, during which our toilers learned to know our Party, learned to value it, and gave it their confidence. For that reason, at the end of the war, ours was the only Communist Party whose leading role was unquestioned and assured, not only through the confidence of a majority of the people, but also through its revolutionary arms. We were able to achieve this because Comrade Tito and the Central Committee of our Party never educated our Party cadres in the spirit of all sorts of opportunistic illusions, as was done during the war by certain other Communist Parties. Our Party has always maintained a clear-cut revolutionary perspective, and, therefore, there has never been any lack of clarity among us concerning the essence of People’s Democracy and the direction of its development.

In view of this, against whom should the criticism of the Cominform be directed? Evidently against those who signed its infamous Resolution against the Communist Party of Yugoslavia! And they have actually “corrected” their stand, but did so in a manner which threw them into an even deeper error, as I shall show later.

2. People's Democracy and Dictatorship of the Proletariat

As I have already stated, when we speak about the dictatorship of the proletariat, we understand by it a definite socio-historical category which denotes the state during the transitional period from capitalism to Socialism. That period may have an infinite number of different forms, and the degree of democratization may be greater or smaller, depending on a whole series of factors into which I cannot go at this time.

There is no doubt whatsoever that this Socialist democracy must, with time, inevitably become deeper and more inclusive. It would be absolutely erroneous to regard the dictatorship of the proletariat after the October Revolution in the Soviet Union as the only form of the dictatorship of the proletariat and as a general prescription for all countries. It must not be forgotten that Lenin said that the Bolsheviks "were compelled to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat in its most ruthless form" (XXIII, p. 313), because, among other reasons, the October Revolution occurred under such objective historical conditions that it had to face the opposition of the entire petty-bourgeois democracy. It is clear that these historic conditions may be completely different—as, for example, in our war for National Liberation—and this gives to the dictatorship of the proletariat an incomparably more democratic form.

All of us know that by its class and social composition even the most liberal bourgeois-democratic republic is actually a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie may from time to time, within the framework of democracy, enter, for any reason whatsoever, into various forms of cooperation in the government itself, sometimes with the remnants of feudalism, sometimes with factions of the radical petty-bourgeoisie, and sometimes even with the representatives of the working class—with Communist parties. In such cases, the bourgeoisie retains its hegemony, assures to itself the key positions of authority, by controlling the military forces of the state. Thus, this type of government remains in essence a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, although in some cases the bourgeoisie finds it difficult to maintain its position, and sometimes it is even compelled temporarily to share its authority and even to bring it into danger.

In the recent past, we had such an example in the participation of the Communists in the Italian and French governments during the concluding phase of the Second World War and immediately after it. Some Italian and French Communists were saying then that, because of their participation in them, these governments were actually People's Democracies. They claimed that these countries were already traveling along the road of People's Democracy. Actually, there was no People's Democracy of any kind in those countries. Rather, the Communists there participated in a bourgeois-democratic government in which the leading role belonged to the bourgeoisie, which was so weak that it was forced to seek a temporary coalition with the Communists.

Similar situations we can encounter within the framework of power held in the hands of the working class. Take, for example, the participation of the Shubashich-Grol bourgeois fraction in our government. Although that fraction hoped to turn the development of our People's Democracy onto the road of bourgeois democracy and renewed strength for the capitalist system, its hopes proved to be ill-founded. This was because the leading role of the working class and its advance guard, the Communist Party, had been firmly established. Although our government at that time represented a specific transitional coalition, dictated above all by reasons of international policy, still, exactly because of the leading role of the Communist Party, the Shubashich-Grol fraction was unable to limit the authority of the working class or to prevent the

growth of Socialist elements in our social development. In this instance, therefore, there can be no talk about any kind of “division of authority.” It never occurred to us, because of such transitional coalitions, to proclaim “a new road to Socialism” or something “third” between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

There is no doubt at all that this sort of opportunism on the question of the essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat – that is People’s Democracy—caused the greatest amount of harm to the international proletariat and to the development of Socialism after the Second World War.

The essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not oppression, but simply the fact of the leading role of the working class. This class and nobody else can be the gravedigger of the capitalist system. Therefore, this class and nobody else can make this type of authority secure and put an end to the exploitation of man by man. “The difficulty of transition/” says Lenin, “lies precisely in the fact that it is combined with dictatorship, with a period when the *leading role* (Italics author’s) belongs to only one class, the proletariat/” (Lenin XXIII, p. 321)

In the meantime, as I have already indicated, the forms in which this leading role may be expressed can be most dissimilar, with an insignificant or a very high degree of Socialist democracy. The form, therefore, must not be confused with the essence, as is being done by. Rakosi, Revai and others.

The question of People’s Democracy, therefore, should be looked at from this point of view, and we have always looked at it in this manner. Anybody who is at all acquainted with the policies of our Party could have verified this. This was clearly expressed in the reports made by the delegation of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia during the first session of the Informbureau in 1947, and especially during the Fifth Congress of our Party.

Let me direct to your attention the following passage from the program of our Party adopted by the Fifth Congress:

People’s authority in Yugoslavia is that authority with whose help the toilers in our country are waging a successful struggle against capitalistic elements and for the construction of a Socialist society. The leading role of the working class in the people’s government ensures that it will have those basic characteristics of the dictatorship of the proletariat which will guarantee the Socialist development of the country. These characteristics are: that the authority is capable of breaking the resistance of the exploiters; that it is capable of organizing the building of Socialism; that this authority is best suited to unite the broadest masses of our working people for the realization of Socialism.

(Program, Kultura, 1948, p. 38)

It seems to me that it is necessary to underline this, because all sorts of “theoreticians” are boasting today that they have discovered America because they are writing now that People’s Democracy does have some connection with the dictatorship of the proletariat and with Socialism. In doing this they are now and then unable to conceal the influence of our pronouncements. But before the Fifth Congress of our Party took place, if they wrote about this question at all, they wrote only to say that a People’s Democracy is not a dictatorship of the proletariat. Now, however, as you can see, these same men have not only discovered that the dictatorship of the proletariat exists in a People’s Democracy and that it exists *in their own countries* but they have also “discovered” at the same time that *in our country* the leading role does not belong to the proletariat and to the Communist Party and, in addition, that we are being transformed into a sort of bourgeois republic with a kulak dictatorship.

So far as these libelous accusations are concerned, permit me to refer in passing to two quotations; first, to a statement made by Stalin in 1925, and used by him in the struggle against

the “fractionists,” which can be correctly applied today to the maligners of our Party.

Why, then, [says Stalin] do they continue spreading intrigues and untruths? What kind of fighting method is that? They say that it is an ideological struggle. That is not true, comrades. It is not an ideological struggle. In our Russian language it is called simply a libel.

(J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. VII, pp. 363-364)

Besides, it may not be superfluous to cite the following passage from the Preface to the Program of the First International formulated by Karl Marx in 1864:

It [that is, the First International—E. K.] declares: all organizations and individuals which join it recognize truth, justice and morality as the rule guiding the relations prevailing among them...

The present-day followers of the Resolution of the Informbureau have violated these principles, and that is why their “proofs” are becoming less convincing every day.

But let me return to definitions of People’s Democracy. I have already pointed out that toward the end of 1948, and especially in the course of this year, there occurred a sharp break in the estimate of People’s Democracy by these “theoreticians.” Let us see how those same men at the present time in the post-Informbureau phase of affairs, look at their own People’s Democracies.

At the Congress of the United Polish Workers’ Parties toward the end of last year, Boleslav Bierut said that “a state of People’s Democracy is the direct result of the historical victory of the Socialist state over the imperialist-Hitlerite aggressors in World War II.” That is to say, such a People’s Democracy is not the reflection of the concrete relations of class forces within Poland, under favorable international conditions—in which, of course, the victory of the USSR is the main factor—but is simply a gift from without. This same idea is even more clearly stated, although in a very abstract form, in the following sentence:

It follows from this that People’s Democracy is a special form of revolutionary authority which came into being under new historical conditions of our epoch, that it is an expression of new relations among classes in the international arena.

All these phrases—“a special form,” “revolutionary authority,” “under new historical conditions,” “an expression of new relations,” “in the international arena”—these are deliberately vague, designed not to say anything clearly. It is clear, however, that Poland is not the architect of its own People’s Democracy, but that it received it as a present from another power, and that this “gift” aspect is its chief characteristic. This theory of People’s Democracy is questionable, servile and harmful. Boleslav Bierut says, furthermore:

In the state of People’s Democracy there still exist classes which live by exploiting the work of others; these are the capitalists—various entrepreneurs, well-to-do merchants, factory owners employing a certain number of workers, rich peasants, speculators and other non-workers.

Let us overlook the fact that without justification Bierut identifies all People’s Democracies with Poland in respect to the presence of various sorts of capitalists, who supposedly continue to exist in all People’s Democracies. We know that in our country there are no “entrepreneurs,” no “well-to-do merchants,” no “factory owners”—and accordingly they are not indispensable components of a People’s Democracy. There are, to be sure, rich peasants and various sorts of speculators among us, but they are not an inevitable and permanent feature of People’s

Democracy—which can be seen by the growth of our cooperative organizations. But let us ignore all this. The important thing is that Boleslav Bierut, contradicting the quotations which I gave you before, now admits that in Poland there are real capitalists, as in other countries, against whom it is necessary to fight, just as the Bolsheviks fought them during the October Revolution and after it, and just as we fought and are still fighting them. It follows from this that in Poland there is no “specific harmony” between the two “factors,” the Socialist state and the “mass of independent entrepreneurs” the name which Boleslav Bierut in 1946 politely gave to the capitalists, but that a class struggle is going on there. Really, it seems that the Resolution of the Informbureau was sent to the wrong address.

Georgi Dimitrov, on the other hand, speaks as follows:

Transition to Socialism cannot be achieved without a dictatorship of the proletariat for the purpose of destroying the capitalistic elements and organizing a Socialist economy. While the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is a dictatorship of the capitalists, People’s Democracy performs the functions of a dictatorship of the proletariat in the interest of the enormous majority of toilers and it is the broadest and the most complete democracy of all Socialist democracies.

(*Pravda*, December 27, 1948)

According to this, what Dimitrov previously stated is not correct: namely, that in Bulgaria there is no dictatorship of any kind. It appears now that in Bulgaria there is a dictatorship of the proletariat, and, also, that it is not correct that a transition to Socialism is possible without a dictatorship of the proletariat, as Dimitrov and others formerly claimed, but that the transitional period between capitalism and Socialism must lie a dictatorship of the proletariat.

“Discoveries” of this kind prompted Matyas Rakosi to define a People’s Democracy “more precisely” as follows:

A People's Democracy is a dictatorship of the proletariat without the Soviet form.

And further:

The question is clear: there are various forms of transition from capitalism into Socialism. One of its forms may be the Soviet form and another may be People's Democracy.

(*Sabad nep*, January 16, 1949)

All this was then “crowned” by Judin in *Pravda* of April 27, 1949, with the following “definition”:

In this way, historical experience has proved that dictatorship of the proletariat exists in two forms: in the form of Soviets and the People’s Democracies. The realization of the dictatorship of the proletariat within the form of the People’s Democracy has been possible in view of special historical causes and conditions.

At first glance, only one thing in this definition is clear, namely, that it lacks what is really important. It does not explain what a People’s Democracy is, and in what respects it differs from Soviet authority. However, this does not hinder Jozsef Revai from servilely proclaiming the empty phrases of Rakosi as an important contribution to Socialism.

But right after this, Jozsef Revai continues:

However, when we say that our state is a dictatorship of the proletariat without the Soviet form this should not be interpreted to mean that there is nothing that we can learn and adopt from the Soviet form of proletarian dictatorship. On the contrary, there are things that we can

learn from it. The organization of our state must approach more closely the Soviet type of proletarian dictatorship, for example, in connection with the reorganization of our state administration and the abolition of the duality of the administration by steadily increasing participation of the working people in state administration and in its executive departments. Unquestionably, we must also reform our parliament, because it still has within it some remnants of the bourgeois blabbing parliamentarianism and the separation of the legislative and executive power.

But when the Hungarian Communists really correct all the imperfections in their People's Democracy, mentioned by Revai, they will end with nothing else but—the Soviet form of authority. For, in the final analysis, what are the principles which Revai is discussing? Nothing else but the principles which constitute the essence of the Paris Commune or of the Soviet authority or of our people's committees and similar organs in China, etc. Evidently, Revai and others have not even tried to find out for themselves the real nature of this Soviet form of authority which they worship with so much fetishism. Evidently, they have just as little understanding of the principles of Soviet authority as they have of the essence of People's Democracy.

Translated into simple language, all that these definitions show is that the dictatorship of the proletariat does not have to appear immediately in the form of Soviet democracy, but that it may for a longer or shorter period carry within itself some remnants of the old state system. For that matter, this is a characteristic of the period of transition. During this period various forms of the old state system may even be dominant. Had Rakosi, Dimitrov, Bierut, and others put the matter in this way, they would have been right. But to claim as their original "discovery" the forms which they borrowed from the bourgeoisie – and which for a time may better correspond to the concrete relationship among class forces and to the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat than the forms of the Paris Commune, Soviet authority, our people's committees, etc.—is worse than mere inability to comprehend the basic questions of the development of Socialism. And, finally, the authors of such "original" theories of the dictatorship of the proletariat should at least remember that the reformists of the Second International have a copyright on such theories, for they said the same thing long ago, "*forty long years ago*," that is, they "attempted to immortalize the bourgeois parliamentary republic as the pinnacle of "Socialist" democracy. On the other hand, the authors mentioned should not forget the following thought expressed by Lenin:

Socialism leads to the withering away of *all forms* of state and, accordingly, of all forms of democracy, but Socialism cannot be realized except through the dictatorship of the proletariat, which unites within itself violence against the bourgeoisie, that minority of the people, with the *complete* development of democracy, namely, truly equal and truly universal participation of the *entire* mass of the inhabitants in all *state* affairs – all complicated questions concerning the liquidation of capitalism.

(Lenin, *Works*, Fourth Edition, Vol. XXIII, p. 13)

Can the remaining forms of bourgeois democracy in the countries of People's Democracy guarantee such "a complete development of democracy, that is, such "a truly universal participation of the entire mass of the inhabitants"; in state affairs? Of Course not. It is certain, therefore, that the Hungarian and other Communists—insofar as they are willing to pursue the aim of enriching Socialist democracy—will be compelled sooner or later to adopt the main features of the Soviet form, which will in effect transform their People's' Democracy into a democracy of the type of the Soviets, the Paris Commune and our people's committees. The

other countries of People's Democracy will inevitably have to go in the same direction, each in its own way, in its own way, in its own specific forms.

Besides, Marx did not use these words accidentally;

The existence of the Commune alone brought with it, as something self-understood, local self-government, but no longer as a counterweight to state authority which now becomes superfluous... *Its true secret consisted in this: it was in essence the authority of the working class, the result of the struggle of the working class against the class of exploiters; it constituted, finally, the political form under which it was possible to carry out the economic liberation of labor...*

(Marx, *The Civil War in France*, p. 67)

In Marx, therefore, the principles of Socialist democracy and the direction of its development through the Paris Commune are clearly determined, although these principles were not fully realized either in the Paris Commune itself or in the Soviet authority in the USSR. Of course, all nations cannot immediately fall into a ready-made form of Socialist democracy. The progress of the countries which have passed through a revolution in which broad masses of the working people were involved (the Paris Commune, USSR, China, Yugoslavia), is quicker. It is slower in the countries which, because of specific conditions, did not travel this road and find it more difficult to resist the influence of the remnants of the past.

To identify the remnants with People's Democracy, to claim that they represent "a new principle" on the road to Socialism, is more than laughable. It is possible to speak about different roads leading into Socialism. It is possible, even without the Soviet form, to advance a long way in the construction of Socialism, but a full flowering of Socialism and Socialist democracy is impossible without a steady and full development of those principles which were contributed in embryo by the Paris Commune through its form of authority, by the October Revolution through the Soviet authority, and by our People's Revolution through its people's committees.

To be sure, there are significant *new* things in People's Democracy, but these are really new and not a remnant of the old form of bourgeois authority. The newness *lies in the fact that they constitute a broadening of Socialist democracy and further development of those principles which have been given to us by the Paris Commune and the Soviet authority.* Such a new phenomenon is unquestionable and in the first, place it is represented by the type of people's front which developed among us and which constitutes an exceptionally appropriate means of increasing the participation of the masses of the people in the administration of state affairs. In this sense, the future development of Socialist democracy will show an abundance of new forms. In this sense we can and we must speak about the various roads which lead to Socialism. But to declare as being new the fact that the revolutionary transformation of various countries proceeds faster or slower, with more or fewer remnants of the past, and to immortalize a passing phase in this development as being "one's own path," this "discovery" has nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism.

A People's Democracy, therefore, is a People's Democracy only *because and insofar as* the leading role of the working class is assured in it and to the extent that it has started to put into practice the principles of Socialist democracy, but not because in some countries the state system is full of the remnants of the past. On the contrary, these remnants reduce the effectiveness of People's Democracy and retard its progress. Under no circumstances should they be called its basic characteristic.

Really, as our people say: "What a wise man is ashamed of, to a fool is a matter of pride!"

Let us consider the other side of this question. We have already seen that the above-mentioned “theoreticians” found an easy “solution” to the question of People’s Democracy: according to them, People’s Democracy is a proletarian dictatorship without the Soviet form. However, in giving us this definition, these “theoreticians” have “forgotten” to explain, firstly, wherein lies the difference between People’s Democracy and the “Soviet form,” and, secondly, what it is that is common to all the countries of People’s Democracy which makes them what they are and which differentiates them from the “Soviet form.”

It is sufficient to put this question thus, to realize to how great an extent the Judin-Rakosi definitions are absurd and unscientific. If the dictatorship of the proletariat is the substance of both the Soviet Authority and People’s Democracy – and it seems that now all are agreed on this, including ourselves—then it means that the difference is in the forms.. But, the question now arises, what is it that is common in the form of People’s Democracy, which separates it as such, from the Soviet form of democracy?

The question put in this manner makes it clear that, for instance, the difference between the forms of people’s authority in Yugoslavia when compared with the Soviet authority, is immeasurably smaller than, for instance, between our people’s government and, let us say, the Rumanian, or Hungarian, Polish or any other regime of People’s Democracy. Moreover, how can one compare our people’s committees – born and developed in the course of the bloody popular revolution, and which as organs of this revolution developed into the organs of people’s authority, which withstood the terrible pressure of the invaders, the home-bred and world reaction, and which arose after the old state machinery was crushed and destroyed to its very foundations—what comparison can be made between such committees, which hold all the power in their hands, and Rumanian; or some other district and county commissioners, or Hungarian bans, some appointed by the Ministry for Internal Affairs? Obviously, there is no similarity between the two, and much less can any comparisons be drawn. Comparison can only be made between these new chiefs and the former commissioners of various Rumanian, Hungarian and other police regimes, but not with the organs of our revolutionary democracy. We do not, it is true, reproach the Rumanian, Hungarian and other Communists for having retained these old forms. They have even had to do so. What they can be reproached for, however, is for having too long persisted in such compromised and undemocratic methods. It is inadmissible, however, that they should concoct theories about People’s Democracy on the basis of such commissioners or other similarly undemocratic or insufficiently democratic institutions.

All this confirms the fact that the definition enunciated by the Informbureau “theoreticians” with respect to People’s Democracy is incorrect, false and devoid of all scientific value.

3. Concerning forms of People's Democracy

I emphasized in the beginning that the term People's Democracy in the sense in which it is used today, and the concept of the authority of People's Democracy in the Eastern European countries which have taken, the road to Socialism, first arose in Yugoslavia in the course of our People's Revolution.

This does not mean, however, that this term and this phenomenon was simply invented by us Yugoslav Communists, that we "discovered" it as something "new in principle" (as the Soviet professor, Ostrovitianov, claims), as something that the classics of Marxism-Leninism could not foresee (as yet another Soviet professor, Leontiev, claims). No, we did not do this nor did we ever claim anything of the sort. As we have already seen, this was attempted only in other countries of People's Democracy by men who simply appropriated the name from us, who renounced the dictatorship of the proletariat, and who took from the bourgeoisie certain parliamentary democratic and even less democratic forms and proclaimed this monstrosity as a characteristic of People's Democracy. Actually, this term is not at all new; it was used even by Marx. The term is not scientifically precise, but it has its proper place. If this term is not to be converted into a mere empty phrase, then, from the point of view of the science of Marxism-Leninism, the concept of People's Democracy at the present time can be nothing else but a definite *characteristic of proletarian Socialist democracy*. It is a state in which the working class has the leading role, but at the same time, through that role, supports the interests of the enormous majority of the people, the toiling majority who at the present time represent the people. And it is precisely because of this that the working class, in the struggle for the realization of its historic mission, can depend on the people. It can and must give to its class dictatorship the form of the broadest kind of democracy for the people and, thus, the dictatorship of the proletariat is becoming a people's institution in the true meaning of the word. It is evident that, in the sense, Soviet democracy is also a People's Democracy. In the sense the dictatorship of the proletariat is actually a dictatorship of the people over a handful of people's exploiters, and Comrade Tito was everlastingly right when he said:

If the gentlemen of the reaction think that dictatorship consists in the fact that we do not permit a small handful of lay and clerical reactionaries to destroy the gains of our great Liberation struggle—well, then, let them regard this as a dictatorship. But this is a people's dictatorship, because it represents 96% of the people. This is a dictatorship of 96% over 4%; in other words, the truest kind of People's Democracy.

According to this, it is absolutely erroneous to attempt to attribute to the concept of People's Democracy some sort of new content based on new principles, something "third" between the dictatorship of the "bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Of course, I am speaking here about the advanced capitalist countries and not about those in the colonial world where the development may sometimes to a certain extent assume special forms.

Accordingly, this authority of the transitional period, in view of the irrefutable role of leadership of the proletariat in it, in essence represents the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, a kind of more or less developed form of proletarian, Socialist democracy. In consequence, it is characterized as a People's Democracy by the fact that it was born in those historical conditions

which secure its reliance on the broadest masses of the working population, that is, on the people and their daily active participation in governing their country, At the present time, after thirty years of the USSR, and after the idea of Socialism has achieved its historical victory on a world-wide scale, it is this People's Democratic side of the transitional period which comes strongly to the fore, because a Socialist state can today rely on the far greater masses than was possible for the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia in the post-October period. Under such circumstances, the direct participation of the masses in the whole, state administration becomes greater and democracy consolidates and further develops.

Especially in our country this, process came to the fore. Our revolution is a Socialist revolution, but, as such, it is a people's revolution. It is a people's revolution because the working class was not only able to unite with the/working masses of the peasantry and other toilers in their daily economic and political actions against the common enemy but also because it aroused those masses to armed rebellion against the occupation forces and against the domestic traitors. In the course of this uprising, the working masses became firmly united under the leadership of the Communist Party. It was this alliance that made the Socialist idea acceptable to the broadest masses of the people. These masses, a great majority of them, at least, became willing to shed blood for this idea. Because of this, it was possible to rapidly establish the system of people's authority. In this connection, we should bear in mind the following factors which deepen and expand the popular character of our Socialist revolution and our Socialist democracy:

1. The middle peasant, on the whole, was on our side, not always consistently, not wholly, sometimes hesitatingly, but he was not "neutral"; he went along with us.

2. The vast majority of the intellectuals were also with us, and today they are exerting the fullest efforts, under very difficult conditions, in the battle for Socialist construction. Can the notable postwar development of our science, and the participation of scientists in Socialist construction be considered accidental? This, of course, is no accident, but a reflection of the stand taken by the overwhelming majority of our intellectuals.

3. We had, with us, and still have, numerous patriotic elements of the former Yugoslavia, because they became convinced in practice, although they are not Communists, that Socialism assures not only independence, but also a happy and proud future for our peoples. In 1918, Lenin wrote a series of articles in connection with the positive stand towards the Soviet authority taken up out of patriotic impulses, at a given moment, by a Socialist-Revolutionary leader. Lenin analyzed, in these articles how the stand taken by this man and others like him, would affect the dictatorship of the proletariat in the direction, of enlarging democratic forms and reducing the role of violence. Is it not true that in our country the number of such patriots was immeasurably greater than it was in those years in the USSR?'

4. It is also indisputable that the resistance offered by the capitalist elements in our was and is now relatively weaker than it was in the USSR; on the one hand, because it had much less mass support, and, on the other hand, because a section of the capitalists realized the inevitability of the liquidation of capitalism in our country—a fact which was brought home to them by the strength of our revolution and the experience of the USSR. They, accordingly, laid down their arms and began working together with the other citizens of our country.

Naturally, the people's government is not preventing those who have decided to break with the past from developing their abilities under new conditions along with all the other workers in our country. This can in no way be termed the infiltration of capitalist elements into Socialism, but rather the result of the correct revolutionary Socialist policy in present conditions and of

Socialist democracy.

Is it not self-evident, from all these facts, why our proletarian democracy is a genuinely broad People's Democracy, and why it is such a basic error to fail to see in People's Democracy; a forward surge in the development of proletarian democracy, but only the remnants of the capitalist past?

We have been advised by countless pundits that we overestimate the role of the peasantry, and underestimate the dangers inherent in capitalist elements among this peasantry. Actually, we have never done either the one or the other. But these pundits ought not to forget to facts which very specifically determined our stand towards the working peasants, and, by this simultaneously, the breadth of our People's Democracy, namely:

1. That our peasant was much more strongly proletarian and politically developed than the Russian peasant of 1917.

2. That During the Revolution, we did not mobilize our peasants on the issue of the struggle for peace and under conditions of the disintegration of the imperialist war front as during the October Revolution, but we called them to rise in arms and go to the front.

And we did actually fight under the leadership of the Communist Party over a period of several years, with an army of several hundred thousand men against all manner of enemies, against all kinds of armies and authorities, and against our domestic bourgeoisie. And the vast majority of this army was composed of working peasants. It should be obvious to anyone analyzing these objective facts, not merely mouthing scholastic citations, that, in such a war, under such conditions, there had come about a firm alliance of the workers with the working peasants and the whole working population, as well as an especially strong People's Front, a genuinely *People's* Front. It can be understood how such an alliance, with the working class in the leading role, helped to open the minds and hearts of the non-proletarian working masses to the idea of Socialism.

It was to this firm alliance, which included also the great majority of the intellectuals and all other toilers, that we owe the *popular* character of our Socialist Revolution, and of the authority born of this revolution. And precisely because our revolution was truly a *people's* revolution, the new government had to be one providing for the broadest and most active participation of the people. History affords a precedent in the Paris Commune, and another in the Soviet system which developed the principles of the Commune into a unified state system of Socialist Democracy. Our People's Democracy, likewise, from the very outset had inevitably to develop as a revolutionary democracy on the lines of the Paris Commune and the Soviet state.

In other countries, however, where the masses of the people did not participate so broadly in the revolutionary struggle for power, there have survived not only larger or smaller remnants of the old state apparatus, but also of the very form of the old bourgeois regime. These differences in the nature of the revolutionary struggle in different countries account for the variations in the form of People's Democracy in these countries. These variations are due in the main to the persistence of greater or smaller remnants of the bourgeois such as parliamentarianism; division of authority; absence of local organs, whose place is taken by organs of the Ministry of the Interior, parallel organs of people's representatives having only advisory functions; appointment of people's committees from above, and so forth.

In Bulgaria, until April, 1948, local authority was exercised by village presidents and administrators, county and regional directors; all appointed by the Ministry of the Interior. Not until February, 1948, was the law concerning people's councils passed—a law modeled chiefly on our law concerning people's committees. But, where the Bulgarian law differs from ours, it

does so in the direction of bureaucratic centralization. In fact, it makes the people's councils executive Organs of the Ministry rather than local organs of state authority exercising their functions within the framework of legally determined powers.

Similarly, in Rumania, until the beginning of this year, villages, counties and regions were administered by officials appointed by the Ministry of Interior. And today this system, in the main, continues unchanged. The Rumanian law on people's councils was not adopted until January, 1949, and this law is also based, in the main, on the principles of our law. But this law is not yet being applied since the government has only started to appoint some sort of provisional committees. It cannot be said that this whole system has freed itself of the methods characteristic of the old Rumanian regimes. Evidently, Rumanian leaders are not as allergic to these methods as Communists should be—as they themselves should be because of their moral and political sensitiveness and, above all, because of their duty to discover the shortest road to—the working masses.

In Hungary, the old bourgeois regime of the division of powers remains almost completely intact. Even on the local level, the authority resides in the hands of provincial governors and city, county, and village mayors appointed by the Ministry of Interior, while, side by side with them, there exist “self-governing” bodies of the old bourgeois-democratic type, whose authority is practically non-existent. In addition, there exist the so-called national committees, which are supposed to develop the functions of our people's committees but which, for the time being, have only some kind of advisory powers and do not mean much in practice.

It is significant that the reactionaries directed their main blow against these national committees, feeling that they are the only form through which the toiling people will really be able to take part in the government and regard its authority as their very own.

But the Hungarian Communists did not take these committees under their protection as they should have done. They have visibly been so diverted by their scholastic juggling with Marxist-Leninist quotations that they have been totally incapable of perceiving the mainspring for the further development of their Peoples Democracy.

In Poland, also, there is no elected people's authority. People's councils were created after the Liberation, consisting of representatives delegated by all democratic parties and organizations. This principle applies to all councils, village as well as provincial. Peoples councils are administered by a president who is *appointed* by the Ministry of Administration. Under the enabling statute, in their relationship to the organs of state administration the functions of the people's councils are only controlling and advisory. Thus, they are not in any real sense organs of authority. By their structure and functions, these people's councils have practically nothing in common with our people's committees which have all authority in their hands.

In Czechoslovakia; there are people's committees in towns and counties. These are composed of delegated representatives of the various political parties in line with the electoral results of 1946, with certain changes made after February, 1948, by the Action Committees of the People's Front. Regional people's committees have been appointed by the Ministry of the Interior in agreement with the other administrative departments. No elections of any kind have yet been held. These people's committees have no assemblies of their own. They constitute only a collection of the heads of the various branches of state administration. In other words, we are actually dealing here with executive organs of the central administrative authority, and people's control from below can be expressed only in a very limited degree. In this sense, also, these people's committees have very little in common with our people's committees.

I am not listing these examples for the purpose of reproaching the leadership of these Communist Parties with entirely too little effort in the direction of democratization of the forms of people's authority, although in numerous instances this reproach might be made. There is no doubt, nevertheless, that the very conditions in which the Socialist revolution has been developing in those countries slowed down the process of further development of the people's or Socialist democracy. Through these examples, I wanted in the first place to point out that what is called today "a People's Democracy" is not a unique form of any kind, like the Soviet authority, for example. Rather, we have to do here with a whole series of forms, from very backward, undemocratic, types, and through parliamentary democracy, to the Soviet types. Accordingly, it is completely unscientific, incorrect and stupid to say that the dictatorship of the proletariat can appear either in the form of Soviet authority or in the form of People's Democracy. In Yugoslavia, People's Democracy, in the main, resembles the Soviet form, while in other countries it still retains, either completely or predominantly, the form of bourgeois parliamentary democracy, and in some cases it retains even more backward forms of the old system.

In spite of this, however, we do not deny that these countries even those among them which still retain some of the most backward forms of state authority, are moving toward Socialism. More than that, as I have already stated, in our opinion, such forms cannot be changed overnight and, therefore, an enormous amount of political work has to be carried out among the masses. Above all, these masses must be firmly united with the working class. Only at this point can such democratic weapons as, for example, our people's committees, be employed. But, when some Informbureau wiseacres try to prove to us that *their* People's Democracy is the very model of People's Democracy and that, in addition, it represents a "new" form of the dictatorship of the proletariat discovered in their country; and when they, besides, attack the New Yugoslavia, which has progressed much further than all of them in the development of People's Democracy, that is, Socialist democracy—when they, say that our country is being transformed into a bourgeois republic—then we must say to them: Stop, gentlemen; you are not only up to your necks in backward forms of bourgeois democracy, but also in forms which were left to you by the old reactionary regimes in your countries. Much remains for you to do before your People's Democracy becomes *people's* in the real sense of the word. If you wish to advance further in the development of People's Democracy, you must discover those forms that will enable you to attract the masses of the people to the exercise of power; you must develop your local organs of people's authority, not as organs of the Ministry of Interior, but as the only organs of unified state authority in administrative and regional units which are responsible to the toilers who have elected them, and which will be able to carry out the basic tasks in the struggle for Socialism.

To be sure, voices are heard from time to time to the effect that the form of authority are more or less immaterial, and that the main thing is that the authority leads to Socialism, that it fights for Socialism. The main thing, these men tell us, is, who is represented by such an authority, which class, and not its form.

It is, no doubt, true that this is the main thing. But it is not enough by itself. Those who see nothing but that bring into jeopardy also the main objective. It must never be forgotten that even the most perfect bureaucratic apparatus, with no matter how able leadership at its head, is incapable of building Socialism. Socialism can grow only out of the initiative of the broad masses under the leadership of the Communist Party. Accordingly, the development of Socialism cannot follow any road except that of the steady deepening of Socialist democracy in an ever-expanding self-government of the masses of the people. The masses must have an ever-

greater participation in the operation of the machinery of the state from its lowest to its highest organs and an ever-increasing participation in the administration of each individual enterprise, institution, etc.

Lenin has this to say on the above:

The more complete democracy becomes, the nearer the moment approaches when it becomes unnecessary. The more democratic the "state" of the armed workers—which is "no longer a state in the proper sense of the word"—becomes, the more rapidly does *the state* [author's italics] begin to wither away.

(Lenin, "The State and Revolution," Edit. Kultura, Belgrade, p. 92)

The question of Socialist democracy was posed only in this manner by the classics of Marxism-Leninism. Failure to follow these principles inevitably leads to bureaucracy, to aloofness of the bureaucratic apparatus from the masses of the people, to subordination of these masses to the bureaucratic apparatus. Such a situation in a Socialist system—no matter how brief it might be—leads to a whole series of negative phenomena, such as the mania of doing things by formulas, conservatism in methods and organizational forms, strangling of creative initiative from below, education of bureaucrats without backbones, stagnation of ideas, deviations from Marxism-Leninism on the national question, and so on.

In their analysis of the Paris Commune, Marx and Engels pointed to the danger of bureaucratism arising after the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie. But they also indicated what should be the unfailing weapon in the hands of the victorious proletariat in order to safeguard itself from this danger. This weapon, according to Marx and Engels, consists of the following:

1. A system of electing and replacing all persons in positions of leadership in all the state bodies of administration and economy.

2. A system of salaried which will prevent the race for positions of leadership in the state administration.

3. The direct attraction of the masses to posts in the state administration in such a way that, as Lenin added, every man would be a "bureaucrat" for a little while, and no one would be able for this very reason to become a bureaucrat.

Today, some people describe some of Marx's interpretations concerning the Paris Commune as being utopian. In actual fact there is nothing utopian in Marx, but rather a deep-rooted, scientific general perspective with respect to the development of a Socialist society. It is impossible for these principles always to be immediately and fully realized as soon as the proletariat acquires power, but they are an indispensable guide in the development of Socialist democracy. The Paris Commune was the prototype for the Soviet authority and the people's authority of our type. Its basic principles and basic organizational forms, although undeveloped and incomplete, represent also the basis of the Soviet organization. This was neither accidental nor due to conscious imitation. The Russian masses knew nothing of the organization of the Paris Commune when they were creating their Soviets. Nor did our masses know anything about the organization of Soviets when they created their people's committees. And these same forms have appeared in the revolutionary movement in the East. Of course, the leaderships played an important role in this, but the main thing to remember is that these forms are a reflection of the deepest aspiration of the working masses to take a direct part in the government of the country. And it is exactly such forms that give them the opportunity to do so. In its struggle for Socialism, the proletariat can make use of various state forms, even bourgeois-democratic forms, but it is the forms which arose in the Paris Commune, in the Soviet authority, in our people's committees

and similar patterns capable of drawing the masses directly and in the largest numbers to the administration of the country, which correspond to the state in the epoch of Socialism, which in turn prepares the way for the dying out of the state, as such. To go in another direction would mean to abandon the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the principles of Socialist democracy.

In this connection, I should like to bring out yet another phenomenon—the contradiction between words and deeds in some Socialist lands. Very often, the highest praise is bestowed upon the democratic character of the state system, superlatives are used to describe Socialist democracy, People's Democracy, and so forth. But, parallel with this, in some countries, the shortcomings and backwardness of this democracy are hushed up, and the actual lack of perspective which is prevalent among the leaders as regards its further development is concealed. Undoubtedly, even the most backward element of the proletarian democracy, taken historically, is a progressive step away from the capitalist system, regardless of the democratic facade the latter may sport. However, it must not be forgotten that, in relation to the goals of Socialist development, the present level of Socialist democracy is still relatively low, and that its development will not continue spontaneously, but only through the conscious efforts of Communists and all the builders of a Socialist society. Consequently, it is by no means enough to sing the praises of Socialist democracy, with the idea that with it we have reached the pinnacle of human sagacity, but we must work towards further improving and deepening it. The more a Socialist democracy is really Socialist, that is, the sooner it rids itself of the vestiges of capitalism and of the negative past in general, the more it will become truly all-embracing, and the more daringly will it develop self-government by the masses, until the moment when it transforms itself into veritable freedom for all men, and thereby dies out as a state.

The characteristic trait of the champions of the bureaucratic line in Socialist lands is what Marx and Engels called superstitious awe of the state. A state, of course, does not die out by merely becoming weaker. On the contrary, it strengthens with the constant deepening of democracy, with the ever-broader participation of the masses in running the state, and, of course, with the growth of productive forces of Socialist society. Nonetheless, the progress of Socialist democracy toward perfection creates the conditions for its dying out. Therefore, the view taken by those who depreciate such tasks, while at the same time displaying a tendency towards bureaucratic centralism at the expense of self-government, is entirely erroneous. Even the vision of genius cannot foresee what creative triumphs millions of builders of Socialism may achieve, in the course of their daily work if they are unfettered by bureaucratic centralism. It is certain that, in the transitional period between capitalism and Socialism, the decisive role is played by the vigorous, revolutionary leaderships! the proletarian party, which has a clear objective in view and a definite path towards this objective. But it is equally clear that a revolutionary leadership can achieve success only if it relies on the creative activity and initiative of the broadest working masses. If such a leadership assumes that it is infallible, and that it can assure the construction of Socialism simply through a centralized administrative apparatus, without the benefit of the initiative from below, the initiative of the masses and of the lower organs of authority, such a leadership will inevitably become a stumbling-block on the road to Socialist democracy, and a brake on Socialist development in general. We do not pretend that it is possible to work without making mistakes, but we regard as less dangerous those mistakes made when initiative from below is spontaneously expressed than those made by bureaucrats who believe themselves to be above making mistakes and that only actions sanctioned by them are permissible.

Democracy is the *form* of a state, and the rule of a class its substance. Both the substance and the form die out concurrently with the state. This is not to say that form lacks significance. No, indeed; it is just as important, and not only in the conditions of a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, but also in a dictatorship of the proletariat. The essential difference between a bourgeois and a proletarian dictatorship lies in the well-known fact that the former is democracy for the minority, and the oppressive minority at that, while the latter is democracy for the majority, which has till very recently been oppressed but is now emancipating itself, in order to create conditions for democracy, for all those things which will at the same time signify the dying out of democracy as a state form. This likewise means that to deepen and extend democracy in all fields of life is a *law* of Socialist development in the transitional period and that to ignore this *law* will unavoidably lead to serious consequences, and, primarily to ideological stagnation. It would seem that little attention is being devoted to this in some Socialist lands.

Therefore, it is not immaterial in a Socialist state how its system of government is organized and how it is being developed. It is not sufficient merely for the Communist Party to have the leading role, but it is necessary, rather, to safeguard the Revolution—as Marx said—from **its own bureaucrats**, who, if they do not turn back the wheels of progress, can at least seriously arrest the tempo of development of Socialism and of the social forces of production in general.

Communists and all progressive individuals have the right and the duty to criticize a government of the dictatorship of the proletariat which attempts to perpetuate its lowest and most backward forms, or which follows the road of bureaucratic centralism. Such a government fetters the development of Socialism and of the social forces of production. Especially today, when the imperialist system is still strong, such tendencies can only weaken the world of Socialism and place weapons in the hands of the reactionary elements which they can use in the struggle against the Socialist world.

Throughout the whole of history one can trace the tendency of all revolutionary movements to enlarge the participation of the masses in the government and thereby to pose the question of self-government. History also bears witness that, all social systems which abandoned the line of progress and became reactionary took their first step on this path by isolating the state machinery from the masses, and gradually liquidating all forms of popular self-government. Marx and Engels both spoke about this, while Lenin says as follows:

The gentlemen representing the feudal aristocracy and the capitalists now in the provisional government desire by all means to preserve the old. Tsarist administration: the administrative personnel appointed from “above.” Practically all the bourgeois-democratic republics in the world nearly always did the same, except in short-lived periods of revolution in certain countries. By acting thus, they prepared and facilitated the retreat from a republic to a monarchy, to Napoleon, to military dictatorships....

Therefore, the idea of self-government is the most indispensable element, in the system of Socialist democracy, the underlying force toward deepening Socialist democracy, which can be weakened only by bureaucratic centralist tendencies. For this reason, it is a mistake to think that Socialist democracy in the transitional period will develop automatically. No, this development can come only through conscious leadership by the proletarian party and through steadfast and ceaseless struggle against bureaucratic destruction of the basic principles of a Socialist democracy. No matter what forms the Socialist democracy may have at the outset, it can develop only in one direction: toward greater development of self-government by the masses, and towards a steadily more intimate link between the state apparatus and the masses.

Let me repeat that it is absurd and inaccurate to define People’s Democracy as a dictatorship

of the proletariat without the Soviet form of authority, just as it is completely wrong to place the People's Democracy in a separate niche. As a matter of fact, People's Democracy is a general term, taken from the Marxist-Leninist treasury, which signifies the breadth of a proletarian democracy, the popular character of this democracy; concretely, the appellation corresponds to a whole range of historically conditioned forms—which I mentioned before—of the transitional period from capitalism to Socialism. That element which is common to all is the undeniable role of the leadership of the proletarian party, as the vanguard of the working class. It is this which actually gives a People's Democracy the substance of a dictatorship of the proletariat.

Therefore, the correct conclusion to be drawn from this discussion of People's Democracy is that the development of the countries of People's Democracy shows that during the transitional period, the dictatorship of the proletariat may appear in forms different from the Soviet type and that even the Soviet form of authority does not have to be identical in all countries. But, there is no doubt that the principles developed in this respect by the Paris Commune, and further developed in the form of Soviet authority, constitute the indispensable law of the development of Socialist democracy. It is evident that the development of Socialism does not stop with any of these forms, just as it did not stop with the form of Soviet authority after the October Revolution. It goes further along the road of greater and greater deepening of Socialist democracy as a democracy of the whole people, combining more and more the apparatus of the State with the activities of the masses, until mankind—in the words of Engels—discards even the last remnants of that “statehood antique.”

It is clear, therefore, that the Informbureau “theoreticians” have completely failed in their attempts to produce a scientific definition of People's Democracy. Of course, this is not an accident. Those who do not have faith in the revolutionary energy of their own people, and who look upon all phenomena in the light of ready-made prescriptions—because they never found themselves in a situation in which they would be compelled creatively to apply the principles of Marxism-Leninism in a revolutionary struggle for power—they will certainly find it more difficult to understand what is the form and what is the content, what is the main thing and what is immaterial, and what constitutes the chief link in the further development of People's Democracy.

4. Principles on Which Our State is Being Built

The main characteristics of our People's Democracy and the development of our state are as follows:

1. The people's authority in our country represents democracy for the toilers, for the vast majority of the people, for all those who do not wish for the return of capitalism. So far as the handful of remnants and agents of capitalism are concerned, the people's authority is an unrelenting dictatorship which openly offers them two possible courses of action: either voluntarily to renounce their past and make an effort to find in our Socialist society new conditions for their personal existence and development, like all of our toilers; or the hand of our people's authority will fall upon them.

In this matter, we do not fear the reproaches of the false democrats from the West who cry, "Yes, you give the benefits of democracy only to those who are on your side. You have a one-party system." Comrade Tito has given them this answer:

Let them; shout as loud as they please, since there is nothing else they can do. We can ask them one concrete question. How many parties do you have, gentlemen? You have only two. And what kind of parties are they? Basically, they are absolutely identical. Both are maintained and supported by the all-powerful dictatorship of the dollar. Therefore, they are parties of the big financial magnates irrespective of the fact that they also contain some well-intentioned followers who, however, are powerless to do anything, even if they were so inclined. Such are the democratic parties of the Western type, democratic in a very poor sense, through which the big capitalists exercise their dictatorship.

Democracy for the people—yes, but the clique of exploiters and their advocates are not part of the people. The people—those are our toilers who live by their own work, who exploit nobody but were in the past themselves exploited. They became united in the People's Front with the working class as its head and under the leadership of the Communist Party exactly in order to prevent a return of the system of exploitation, in order gradually to eliminate all remnants of that system and to build a Socialist system in which there is no exploitation of man by man. Only those masses, therefore, have the right to speak in the name of the people. Our democracy exists only for them. But, tomorrow, with the disappearance of the last remnants of capitalistic exploitation, all citizens of our country will be a part of the people, and democracy will exist for all.

The proponents of Western democracy are telling us that we have a one-party system and that, accordingly, we can have no democracy. Actually, it is not a question of parties but of classes. In the West, several parties defend the rule of one class, the capitalist class. The role of the advance guard of the proletariat as *the leading and guiding force* is something entirely different from the role of political parties in a capitalist society.

This does not mean that among the masses of our people, there are no differences of opinion with respect to individual questions. Such differences exist, and there are sometimes remnants of the past, but sometimes part of our general progress. But, political parties are not necessary to give expression to these differences, because in our country the legislative and executive powers are not divided to make it necessary for one party to obtain a majority and, thus, obtain control of the executive departments of the government. Our state mechanism is such that individual opinions find an immediate expression and are tested every day in practical construction. Such a system, naturally, is possible only if there is the widest possible participation of the masses of the

people in their government and in all of its branches. Our system is precisely a system of that kind.

It is necessary in particular to underline the fact that our People's Front constitutes an alliance of all toilers where the leading role of the Communist Party guarantees a clear socialist perspective in which each opinion—if it contains the least bit of constructive substance—can be expressed with a much better chance of being considered than under the system of bourgeois democracy. In a bourgeois democracy, individual opinions are expressed only at the time of voting for party candidates. From that point on the individual has no part in governing the state nor can he directly exert an influence on the government. Actually, every few years the individual gives up his right to participate in the government. In this sense, the most advanced type of bourgeois democracy is incomparably closer to a one-party system than our system of People's Democracy.

Of course, in this respect we still have weaknesses. We have retained certain habits of the past. Criticism is, still insufficiently developed. Certain bureaucrats still try to limit the right of individuals and of the masses of the people to participate in the government. Attempts are still being made to introduce the method of commanding in place of the method of convincing. But these are passing phenomena, and our struggle against such faults will bring a steady improvement in our system, which is already, not only in its content but also in its form, incomparably broader and more progressive than, any form of bourgeois democracy.

2. This system of People's Democracy inevitably leads to the principle of unified authority. Under the concept of unified authority we understand the unity of the legislative and executive branches as well as the unity of the so-called central and local authorities.

We have put into practice the deeply democratic principle of “the concentration of all political power in the hands of the representatives of the working masses” as set forth by Frederick Engels. At that time, under the conditions of bourgeois democracy, Engels looked upon this principle as a means of undermining the reactionary apparatus of the State and more effectively using the parliament as an instrument in the struggle against the bourgeoisie. To us, under the conditions of Socialist democracy, this principle means safeguarding unified authority as a direct weapon in the hands of the toiling masses under the leadership of the working class. This principle securely consolidates the gains of the Revolution and makes impossible the development of harmful and anti-democratic tendencies which might result in the establishment of a bureaucratic system.

It is well known that in the bourgeois democracies there is a so-called division of powers into legislative, executive and judicial. But we know also that there is in those countries a unified authority in the sense that all power is held by the capitalistic bourgeoisie with its allies and not by three different branches of authority. This division, however, is of practical importance. Every few years, the people elect parliaments through their parties and these parliaments pass laws and make other decisions. But, actually, these parliaments are completely separated from the administrative apparatus of the State over which the legislative bodies have no real, or very limited control. It is understood that the masses of the people can exert no control whatsoever from below. In this manner, democracy is in the hands of the permanent administrative and police apparatus and the reactionary armed forces, which are independent of the people. The ruling bourgeoisie ostensibly divides power among three “independent” branches, but in fact firmly combines all power in its own hands.

In our country, where the authority reposes in the hands of the *people*, with the working class at its head, the unity of authority comes fully into force. The people alone, that is, their

representatives, pass the laws; with the help of the Plan, determine the direction of the development of the country, and, at the same time, see to it that the established tasks are carried out; and elect and remove the heads of the executive organs, thus maintaining control over them. Such a system, as Marx pointed out, is the surest guarantee against the development of a bureaucracy; and at the same time this system makes it possible to attract the largest possible number of people into the administration of state affairs.

In this sense, in our country there is no difference in principle between the central and local political organs. Both are organs of the same authority. They derive their power from the people. They are an expression of the people's self-government. Both carry out their tasks on the basis of the same principles within the framework of their competence, which is determined by law on the basis of objective needs and subjective conditions.

So it follows, then, that the principle of People's Democracy cannot be separated from the principle of popular election and removal of the heads of the executive apparatus in the central and local organs of state authority. The right of the masses of the people to remove those who no longer enjoy their confidence is precisely the method by which the people can exert a direct influence on the government. It is more truly democratic than a bourgeois democracy, where the masses participate in the government only on the day when they elect a chosen representative, and then, usually, only for the legislative branch of the government. The principle of popular election and removal of all leading government officials was regarded by Marx as being of decisive importance in the development of a Socialist democracy.

In some Socialist countries, certain bureaucratic tendencies, contrary to this principle, are coming to the surface. These tendencies are expressed in practice in steadily narrowing the number of elected governmental officials and transferring an increasing number of administrative functions to officials appointed by higher administrative organs. Such tendencies appeared also among us, but we suppressed them immediately. In our country, not only the executive committee members of the people's committees are elected but *elected* officials are also in charge of the individual departments. In this manner, we have most consistently carried out the principle of Socialist democracy concerning the election of the leading government officials.

4. The next principle of People's Democracy is democratic centralism. The principle which provides for the election and removal of all organs of people's authority and of practically all executive department heads includes, also, their responsibility toward those who elected them, that is, toward those whom they represent. This principle also provides that the executive department heads shall, in effect, be subordinate to the higher organs of state authority, which are also elected by the people and hence subject to control by the people.

In this manner, the unity of people's authority is strengthened and the power of the people in the struggle to build Socialism is increased. At the same time, self-government is assured, control from below and from above, all-around initiative and a single line in the execution of the policies of the state is made possible. Bureaucracy tends to vitiate this principle and transform democratic centralism into bureaucratic centralism which constitutes the greatest danger to a correct development of Socialism.

It should not be forgotten that, during the period of transition into Socialism, all sources of bureaucratism are not automatically destroyed, but that they can even become stronger unless a struggle to perfect Socialist democracy is carried on. I have already stated that Socialism can win over capitalism only if it more quickly develops the forces of production and, thus, makes possible a more rapid increase in the standard of living of the working masses. This we can

achieve, first of all, if the Socialist system succeeds in developing individual initiative more effectively than it is being developed under the capitalist system. Individual initiative of this kind can be assured only through a consistent development of Socialist democracy. Whose greatest and most dangerous enemy is bureaucratic centralism. That is why it is necessary to fight it at all times and in all places.

Some comrades think that bureaucratic centralism is a problem only in connection with our federal organs of government. This conception is completely erroneous. As a matter of fact, there is no doubt that, owing to the current policies of our Party, bureaucratic centralism has been most successfully pushed back in the federal branches of our government, although even there it has not yet been completely liquidated. However, it is much stronger in the central organs of the Republican governments, in the various general and central boards, and even in our People's Committees, so far as their relations with subordinate organs are concerned.

The tendency toward bureaucratic centralism is especially, strong when the lower organs of state authority are not functioning properly. Everyone remembers what happened immediately after the war, when our people's committees were weak and when they were making all possible mistakes. There was a demand for limiting the role and competence of the people's committees. But the leadership of our Party, with Comrade Tito at their head, adhered firmly to the stand that the mistakes of the lower organs of government were in a large measure an expression of the weaknesses of the higher organs. They felt that the latter were not able with sufficient speed and effectiveness to assist the lower organs, or to instruct them correctly and prepare them adequately for the tasks assigned to them. They felt, also, that if we could not succeed in doing this we would be even less able to fulfill our tasks by means of some administrative apparatus not connected with the people, as in the old capitalist system.

This means that the way to eliminate mistakes does not lie in reducing the competence of the people's committees and other lower organs of government, but in taking decisive measures to make it possible for them carry out their tasks, to educate them so that they may perform all of their functions independently.

Today, no one with the exception of a few hard-bitten bureaucrats demands that the competence of the people's committees be reduced. Our experience shows the extent to which the line of our Central Committee, the line of Comrade Tito, has been correct in this respect. Our people's committees made many mistakes and are still making them, just as all of us are making them. There is still too heavy a burden of various local-patriotic tendencies and activities, but, just the same, they have accomplished an enormous amount of work which could not have been done by any other apparatus. The functional independence of our people's committees is awakening and mobilizing such forces from below in the masses of the people as cannot occur even in the dreams of narrow-minded bureaucrats.

Socialism can develop freely only if over-all Socialist leadership is correctly combined with the awakening of the initiative of the broad masses. Any step that leads to the neglect of either of these two factors constitutes a danger to the cause of Socialism and represents a brake on the optimum development of Socialism.

That, is why we. are unconditionally in favor of the principle of democratic centralism in the state and are waging at the same time a continuous and unyielding crusade against all tendencies toward bureaucratic centralism.

Finally, in connection with the question of democratic centralism, let me remind you of the words spoken by Comrade Tito at the Second Congress of the Communist Party of Croatia:

It is necessary to explain things to the people, explain them fully, instead of ordering the people around. It is useless to try to command the people. It is possible to command an army or other uniformed units, but it is impossible to command the people. The people are accustomed to having things explained to them. And Communists must always retain the quality of never becoming tired of explaining to the people what is being done.

This should be understood, by all of our leading administrative organs as the guiding rule in their work and in their relations with the lower organs of authority, which also consist not of “uniformed units” but of people’s representatives. It is necessary patiently to explain to them how the tasks assigned can be carried out, and the meaning and aim of the state policy as a whole should be stated clearly to them.

5. The principle, of people’s self-government is another indispensable and essential characteristic of our People’s Democracy—that is, of democratic centralism. Without it *democratic* centralism ceases to be democratic and becomes bureaucratic—harmful centralism.

As already stated, our local self-government is fundamentally different from local self-governments under the old social system. The bourgeoisie tolerates local self-government only as long as it serves its interests and ruthlessly destroys local self-government when and if it feels its control slipping. Local self-government, therefore, inevitably depends on the character of the central government and cannot be different from it.

During the revolutionary period in the development of bourgeois democracy, local self-government played a very positive role, but as soon as the bourgeoisie started to come into conflict with the plebeian masses, it quickly eliminated local self-government or, by means of various machination, reduced it to nothing.

In a Socialist democracy, on the other hand, people’s authority must rest on people’s self-government, at all stages of the state apparatus.

As I have said, local self-government is tolerated by the bourgeoisie as long as it does not consider itself endangered by the pressure of the masses from below. In a Socialist state, self-government is the indispensable characteristic of the organs of state authority and is an assurance against possible degeneration of authority toward bureaucratization. It also maintains contact with the masses of the people and insures development of their initiative.

Local self-government has been for centuries the ideal of progressive men and revolutionary leaders. The plebeian masses saw in it protection against the power of their class enemies. Revolutionary reform movements saw in it one of their aims. Utopian socialists made it the framework for the realization of their ideal society—for the purpose of freeing it from the oppression of the central authority of the ruling class. It was demanded by the rebellious peasants and by the Jacobin plebeian masses. It was, at the same time, the framework and the political basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Paris Commune. It was later exploited by the opportunists in the working-class movement as an attractive slogan, and as a means of attaining power, as a substitute for the revolution, rather than as an aim of the revolution.

In other words, whenever the masses were swept by the revolutionary wave, they always raised the slogan of self-government as the structure within which they would be able directly to participate in governing the State. Actually, this demand reflected the yearning of the masses to take the reins of government into their own hands, to be a part of the government. Of course, the concept of self-government, as formulated in the past, does not by itself determine the nature of authority nor does it by itself lead to it. There is local self-government in the United States and England—to be sure, in a more or less restricted and limited form, but, nevertheless, a firmly

established self-government with traditions and organizational experiences that can be of value to us even today. Still, the content of that self-government is reactionary. The essence of the matter is, therefore, the character of the authority. Only the character of the authority determines the content of the self-government of the local organs of state authority.

Marx and Engels attributed particular importance to the question of self-government and frequently wrote about it. In this connection, particularly well-known are the passages from Marx's analysis of the experiences of the Paris Commune. Here is a passage from a letter by Engels:

In addition to England and Switzerland, Holland is the only country in Western Europe in which there was no absolute monarchy from the 16th to the 18th century and which for that reason has certain advantages—that is, remnants of local and provincial self-government without a bureaucracy in the French or Prussian spirit. This is a great advantage from the point of view of national development and for the future. With relatively few changes, the working people in that country could establish their free self-government which must be our best weapon in connection with the reorganization of the system of production. Nothing similar exists either in Germany, or in France—and there everything will have to be created from the very beginning.

In this passage, Engels very clearly establishes the place and the role of the principle of people's self-government in the system of Socialist democracy.

Here, the toiling masses, with the working class at their head, have taken all power into their own hands. At the same time, they have also won self-government, not only on the local level, but in all organs of the government, from the lowest to the highest. In addition to the resistance of the capitalistic elements, only one other enemy can interfere with the fullest possible use of these organs of government for the purpose of attracting the widest possible participation of the masses in the administration of state affairs. That enemy is bureaucracy.

Accordingly, it is not sufficient for us to boast—as is being done in some Socialist countries—that the principle of self-government is already contained in the principle of democratic centralism, but it is necessary to see to it that this principle becomes realized in practice. Otherwise, democratic centralism will be changed into bureaucratic centralism and become a brake on Socialist development.

Here is what Lenin, commenting on Engels' position, has to say on this point:

Engels' conception of democratic centralism has nothing in common with the bureaucratic conception in which this term is used by the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologists, including among the latter the anarchists. So far as Engels is concerned, centralism does not exclude local self-government so broad that it eliminates all bureaucratism and all "orders from above," while the unity of the state is being voluntarily defended by the "communes" and "regions."

Our peoples' authority grows out of people's committees. The system of people's committees from bottom to top constitutes the organizational form of our government. That is why it is so important that we should be concerned mainly with the strengthening and development of our local organs of people's authority, our people's committees.

Such bureaucratic tendencies are everywhere dangerous. History tells us that the abandonment of the principles of self-government has always been the prelude to a transition to reactionary positions. It follows that the struggle for deepening the foundations of Socialist democracy must inevitably take the form of strengthening the structure of self-government.

These are precisely the reasons that give importance even to the form of the local organs of state authority, and not only to the question of *who* is represented by them. The crux of the matter is that the Socialist State must have—from the bottom up, from the village up to the central government—such forms of the organs of state authority as will not only make it possible for the people to control the apparatus of the State, but also to participate more and more fully and directly in the performance of the functions of government.

That is why, with respect to the local organs of authority, it is not simply a question of their elective and representative character, but also of their right to perform all administrative functions of the State with the exception of those which are *by law*—that is, again, through the exercise of the people's right to self-government—placed within the competence of the higher organs of state authority. Exclusive of those jurisdictions, therefore, which have been fixed by law by the central organs of state authority, the People's Committees are the highest and the only organs of state authority on their territory; that is, in their administrative territorial units.

At first glance, such statements have no practical value, but, actually, the real difference between our genuinely people's self-government and the local self-government in the bourgeois-democratic countries is concealed in them. Under our system, the central organs of government do not have either the need or the right to appoint their own executive organs in the administrative territorial units, except in those rare cases, fixed by law, where the nature of the work demands such appointment.

In the bourgeois-democratic self-government of today, insofar as it still exists, the way is being opened by means of various tricks for the establishment, side by side with the weak organs of self-government, of agencies of the central state authority which are being strengthened more and more and which, in fact, hold all power in their own hands.

In 'this connection, it is significant that, in his critique of the Erfurt Program of the German Social Democracy, Engels made following observation:

But there is one thing, that can become a part of the Program or that can at least indirectly serve to indicate what cannot be said—that is the demand for “Complete self-government in the province, county and, township through officials elected on the basis of universal suffrage; abolition of all local and regional organs of government appointed by the State.”

In another passage, Engels says:

From 1792 to 1798, in every French department and every county there was local self-government and the American type, and that is what we must have How to organize self-government and how to get along without bureaucracy has been shown to us by America and by the First French Republic and is being shown to us today by Australia, Canada and other English colonies. Such provincial and county self-governments are much more independent, for example, than those under Swiss Federalism, in which, it is true, the Canton is very independent toward the Bund but it is also independent toward the county and the township. County prefects and mayors are appointed by Cantonal governments, a practice which does not exist in the English-speaking countries, and which we will not permit to exist among us in the future, just as we will not permit the existence of the Prussian provincial and state councillors.

(Engels, “Critique of the Social-Democratic Program of 1819,” *Works of Marx and Engels*, Russian Edition, Vol. XVI, Book. II, pp. 111-112)

Finally, it is necessary to look at this question from one more point of view. A capitalist state regulates the political relations among its people solely in the interest of maintaining the rule of

the bourgeoisie, but the economic life of the country is dominated by the bourgeoisie directly through the apparatus hired by it. In a Socialist state, a different situation exists: the State not only regulates the political relations among the people, but it also directly manages the national economy; that is, the property of the Socialist State. The title to all property, formerly managed by the bourgeoisie through the trusts, cartels, corporations and so on, is transferred to the State. As a result of this, of course, the character of the apparatus of the State, and the methods of its work must be changed. First of all, the administrative apparatus is greatly expanded and becomes more complicated. This gives rise to the danger that the apparatus will become dissociated from the people, the danger of bureaucratization. Only through a powerful development of the organs of people's self-government on all levels of authority and throughout the entire apparatus of the state can these symptoms be eradicated and a correct development of Socialist democracy assured. And this means: the wider the participation of the masses in the administration of state affairs, the greater the extent of their control, the more profound the foundations of democracy. The apparatus of the State must be the servant of the people and not a force above the people—that is the fundamental principle of Socialist democracy; and it can be realized only under conditions which lead to an all-around development of people's self-government.

Since, in our country, all authority, on the central and local levels, is in the hands of the working people, since, therefore, the entire state system is a reflection of people's self-government, no differences in principle can exist between the central and local organs of government. Each organ carries out its respective tasks in the name of the same unified people's authority, and the law fixes their respective powers on the basis of democratic centralism. Under our system, it is erroneous to make a distinction between the local and central organs of government, just as it would be erroneous to fear a steady increase in the strength of the local organs of self-government. That is why our struggle must be directed both against the appearance of local separatism or particularism—which will for a considerable time have its origin in certain objective material conditions (different degrees of development of the various regions, different methods of apportionment, etc.)—as well as against tendencies, rooted in bureaucratic centralism, to depreciate the importance of the organs of local self-government.

I have already stated that people's self-government is an essential element of Socialist democracy without which the creative energies of the people cannot be freely developed. People's self-government was correctly described by Comrade Tito as “the prime mover in development of all creative forces in our people” (Speech before the Second Congress of the Communist Party of Croatia). At same time, self-government must be regarded as the frame within which the working people can make their maximum contribution to the work of the administrative territorial units in the struggle of the people and of the state as a whole in the field of Socialist construction.

It would be erroneous, however, to think that the principle of self-government applies only to such organs as the people's committees. No, this principle must be developed more and more in all organizational units of our society. We must develop it even our enterprises and other activities; in other words, in all fields where the initiative of the masses can improve the results attained. Of course, to achieve these goals it is necessary to intensify our work in the political sphere, and to increase our efforts to raise the level of consciousness of the people as a whole. This we must do if we wish to enable our Socialist society to smash as quickly as possible the remaining fetters of bureaucracy and to develop into full bloom by drawing all its strength directly from the creative energies of the people.

6. Self-government, however, remains an empty phrase if it is not accompanied by steady

efforts to bring about direct participation of the masses of the people in the work of the administrative organs of the state. So far as we are concerned, it is not sufficient for the masses of the people to participate only in the work of our people's committees and people's assemblies through their elected representatives. Were we satisfied with only this, we would be a parliamentary, rather than a people's, Socialist democracy. The toilers must take part in the administration of the state as is already happening in our country—through various commissions, advisory councils, village action committees, organs of people's inspection, and numerous other forms. These activities must be steadily developed and their mass basis broadened.

For example, in many of our factories, in which enterprising and intelligent directors have understood that their success depends on the efforts and initiative of the workers, there has spontaneously developed another form of people's self-government and of the participation of toilers in state administration. This consists in regular conferences on all questions of factory management between the directors and the most efficient workers. Without destroying the principle of personal responsibility of the director, the workers and employees participate in the management of the enterprise by means of these spontaneous councils. They submit their criticisms and make concrete recommendations. This spontaneous method must be further developed and converted into a permanent form of workers' cooperation in the management of our enterprises. Such forms of toilers' participation in state administration constitute a great step forward in the development of our Socialist democracy. They carry out in practice the principle of direct participation of the producers in the management of the economy, which was advanced by Marx and Engels. Cooperation of this kind was made possible in our country by the high degree of consciousness of our working class and by the close connection which it has with the Communist Party. This form of our People's Democracy must be developed; not only horizontally but also vertically, to make it possible for the higher organs of economic administration to benefit from the direct cooperation of workers-producers.

Similarly, our system of peasant work cooperatives and, associations of cooperatives makes possible an ever greater degree of participation of the best representatives of our cooperatives in the management of our Socialist agriculture.'

If, on the basis of the results already achieved, we take a look into the future, the perspective of the further development of our Socialist democracy is clear. The apparatus of our state administration will, so to say, become merged more and more with the masses of the people and will produce greater and greater successes, awakening every day new, unused, and undeveloped capacities of every individual citizen-toiler in our country.

The question of the participation of the masses in the work of people's authorities, finally, is not simply a matter of the formal right of each citizen to take part in the government of the State, nor is it simply a question of active assistance rendered by the citizens of our country to the people's government in order to help it to perform its functions as effectively as possible. It is, in addition, a question—the most important question of all—of educating our generations in the spirit of Socialist relations among human beings and of causing the remnants of capitalism to wither away in the minds of men, so as to enable them, in the words of Lenin, "to become accustomed to respect the elementary requirements of social life *without oppression and without subjection.*" This is the only road to real and true freedom—that freedom which the new generation will be in a position to create and which, according to Engels (Preface to Marx's *Civil War in France*), will be expressed "in new and free social conditions" and "which will be able to discard the entire superannuated institution known as the State."

Our new generations can and must be raised in that spirit, because our Revolution has created

or is creating new social relationships in which our masses can be educated for the kind of freedom about which Engels speaks.

To those who are surprised that a Socialist country like Yugoslavia can endure such pressure as is being exerted against it by both the West and the East we can say: you can find the answer in our People's Democracy, in the forms which make it possible for all of our decent working men to develop their individual capacities. That is why all of them defend this democracy. They know that nothing in the world can give them anything better than what they have won for themselves in their own country.

7. We do not regard the powers placed within the jurisdiction of the individual organs of government as permanent and unchangeable. We are moving in the direction of a steadily closer rapprochement between the people's authority and the masses. Individual tasks are placed within the jurisdiction of the individual organs of government on the basis of the objective nature of the work to be done and the subjective ability of the People's Committees to perform this or that task. It is precisely for this reason that we must constantly fight for the political and professional training of all of our People's Committees in order to enable them independently to solve as many problems as possible and perform a steadily increasing number of functions. To the extent that we keep on achieving this aim, we will have less bureaucratism and our administrative apparatus will become less expensive. At the same time, this will enable us to raise the quality of the work of the central organs of state administration, both on the Republican and Federal level. The more independence and initiative there is from below, the higher qualitatively and professionally will be the work of our leading organs.

The line along which we are constructing our State is in complete harmony with the views of Marx and Engels concerning the development of a Socialist State. According to Engels, the authority of the State in the future, that is, under Socialism, should be confined within "those limits which will be inescapably prescribed by the conditions of production." Of course, Engels does not take into account here questions of international politics; that is, the existence of an aggressive imperialist world side by side with the Socialist world; but, still, he clearly gives the line for the development of a Socialist State in the sense of a steady strengthening of the independence of those basic organizational units of the State which are closest to the people, the line which closely restricts the intervention of the State as a whole to those areas which are determined by the relations of Socialist production and by the needs of Socialist production, management.

8. Planning represents an extraordinary force which unifies the functioning of the entire mechanism of state authority. The principle of planning is applied on all levels of state authority, both administrative and executive. The unified state plan embraces all particular plans, and, in that manner, it binds into a whole the entire effort exerted by our toilers in the building of Socialism.

Certain learned professors in the Soviet Union, for example, Varga, etc., have indeed established the fact—in black and white—that there can be no planning in People's Democracies, after having previously ascertained that, in these countries, a Socialist order does not exist. But here, among us, every grown-up person, even in the most backward corners of the country, is aware of our planning and feels its existence. Aside from this, we would like politely to ask those professors who have denied that planning is possible in a People's Democracy to explain to us "theoretically" how is it possible first to create Socialism and then start planning? If they can explain this to us, we will be very grateful to them, because fulfillment of the plan sometimes causes us enormous troubles. But we understood the matter differently: it is necessary to begin to

plan on the basis of the existing Socialist elements, and, with the help of this planning, build Socialism. And, since we are fulfilling the plan, and the Socialist sector is growing stronger, this would appear to be the proof that it is possible to plan in People's Democracies and that there is something wrong in the heads of the professors.

There you can see what sort of stupidities can infect the minds of men who are otherwise convinced that, so far as the knowledge of Marxism-Leninism is concerned, the sea comes up only to their knees!

In the meantime, we not only knew that planning was possible but also that it was unavoidable as soon as we started to follow the road of liquidating capitalism and building Socialism. We knew that without planning we could not create a Socialist system.

9. In connection with this, the most important requirement is a sound and prompt system of central accounting and control, supplemented by a strong corps of instructors in problems of organization, able quickly to intervene and give assistance wherever errors and weaknesses crop up. In the development of accounting and control, we have accomplished remarkable results, but our top agencies have not yet learned how to apply these results in practice. They have not yet realized that the results achieved are their main weapons, and not something that simply facilitates their work. There is no doubt that, in the development of the Socialist system, the operating functions will become more and more decentralized and transferred to the organs closest to the masses, while the functions of planning, accounting, control, and organizational and political education, will be centralized as the principal means of general management from the center.

10. What is true of the individual organs of government also holds true, in the main, for the methods of management in the economic field and in administration. The individual manager should be functionally independent, and it should be possible for him and for the cadres subordinated to him, as well as for the entire working collective, to develop all-around initiative. The apparatus of central management should keep current records of his work and of his fulfillment of the plan; it should supervise his work and intervene, that is, come to his assistance, when the records and supervision show this to be necessary, either for the purpose of overcoming errors and weaknesses, or in the interest of improving the work as a whole.

11. It is necessary to strengthen personal responsibility, but not in one direction only. The manager must be personally responsible for his work both to his superiors and to those in whose name he manages the enterprise, institution, etc. In this instance, also, the principle of individual responsibility is being bureaucratically vitiated in that an attempt is being made to destroy the control over the manager from below. If we adopted this road, we would strengthen bureaucracy and prevent a broad development of mass initiative. This would, in effect, be a bureaucratic administrative method of management which would immediately slow down the progress of Socialist construction.

For this reason, workers' councils, about which I have already spoken, are very significant for the further improvement in the Socialist methods of business management. In my opinion, this question, also, is not being paid adequate attention in the other Socialist countries, in which, very often, the bureaucratic line with respect to the methods of management is sanctioned.

12. At the same time, it should be emphasized that, under such a system of people's authority, it is necessary constantly to strengthen legality and internal discipline. It is necessary to assure unconditional respect for the laws, and the prerogatives derived from them. The entire structure of our state administration rests on laws. Not a single administrative directive can be issued that is not sanctioned by law. People's Democracy and a broad development of self-

government have nothing in common with any kind of wilfulness or breaking of discipline—both with respect to the relations among the individual organs of authority, and with respect to the execution of the general state plans or other tasks set by the higher organs. Legality and discipline within the state administrative apparatus—these are the two powerful means for strengthening the state system as a whole. In this respect, many weaknesses still exist among us against which it is necessary to fight.

13. And, finally, in our country each citizen, as well as each state and social organization, has in all cases the right of appeal to higher authority. This democratic right is of immense significance, and more attention should be devoted to it than has been the case in the past. This right is being frequently disparaged, and the complaints are settled in a hurry. Experience shows, however, that most of the complaints of our toilers are justified. A correct settlement of these grievances, therefore, is important, not only because it satisfies the interests and the rights of the citizens, but especially because, by means of a correct adjudication of such complaints, it is possible steadily to eliminate the errors in the apparatus of the state and improve its entire work. Accordingly, the right of appeal is not only a powerful weapon in the hands of the citizens, but also a weapon in the hands of the higher organs of management in their efforts to improve the work of the apparatus subordinated to them.

I have mentioned here some of the most important principles which guide us in the construction of our state system. It is understood that, in our system of People's Democracy, there are still many defects and weaknesses. These weaknesses are partly of a subjective character and can be quickly eliminated by persistent struggle. Partly, they are due to the relatively limited scope of our democracy, which results from the fact that we still do not live in a well-developed Socialist society. We are still engaged in a bitter struggle with the remnants of capitalism on the frontiers of the capitalistic world, whose agents within our country are joining forces with the remnants of our domestic reaction and with the "fractionists" and "diversionists" of the Informbureau. Naturally, all these factors exert an influence on the development of our democracy.

It should not be forgotten that the degree of democracy in any existing social system based on classes, depends in particular on the strength of the ruling class, on its unity with masses, and that this strength, in the final analysis, depends on the socio-historical role of that class; that is, on the relationship of that class to social progress and on the extent to which, by struggling for its own interests, it can satisfy some of the interests of the other social classes. In its struggle against feudalism or against the remnants of feudalism, the bourgeoisie certainly served the interests of the peasantry and, in a sense, even the interests of the proletariat. The capitalist democracy in the West of today depends for its existence in a large measure on the exploitation of the colonial, dependent, and backward regions in general, which makes it possible for the ruling bourgeoisie to corrupt entire social strata and even parts of the working class. Insofar as these conditions are absent, the bourgeoisie is losing the support of the masses, becoming involved in deeper and deeper political crisis, and seeking a way out in the suppression of democracy. All that is required is to look around to see in what countries in the capitalist world bourgeois democracy has been able to maintain itself in any marked degree and we will see that this democracy, as a rule, is being paid for by some other people who enjoy no bourgeois democracy of any kind.

The situation is different so far as the working class is concerned. Fighting to liquidate the class of exploiters, it is at the same time fighting for the interests of the other toilers. Its interest, the interest that it has in liquidating class rule, is in harmony with the interests of the other working masses, and, in the first place, of the peasantry, not only for a certain length of time and

within determined limits, but intrinsically and permanently. And it is precisely this that constitutes the firmest basis of Socialist democracy, which is, up to this time, the most inclusive and deepest democracy known to history. But, naturally, it is not and cannot be nearly perfect in its development and progress, because it is still a form of class government, a dictatorship of the proletariat, first, in its relationship to the resistance of its own bourgeoisie and its foreign imperialistic allies and supporters, and, then, against foreign imperialism and its internal agencies. These agencies can exist, as a more serious danger, not only on the basis of the remnants of capitalism in the national economy, but also because of the persistent remnants of capitalism and reactionary past in general in the consciousness of the masses, and possible vacillation on the part of individuals which will continue to occur as long as there remains in existence a powerful group of States which are actively working for the destruction or weakening of Socialism, that is, of Socialist progress. Of course, in the Socialist States all these factors work in the direction of a relative restriction of democracy. It seems that these objective foundations of Socialist democracy and the basic sources of its power have been overlooked by the Informbureau “critics” of our Party. They counted on a quick victory in the form of some sort of ideological *Blitzkrieg* against our Party. Sliding dangerously down the precipice of idealism, and confusing their desires and scholastic theories with objective realities, they naturally found themselves on the same ground with the bourgeoisie, making use of slander to attack our country. They met with the same defeat that the bourgeoisie is meeting in its struggle against a victorious Socialism. Within our country, they have come to occupy the same anti-democratic and anti-revolutionary positions as the remnants of our internal reaction and capitalism.

Our democracy is not strong because of any propaganda on our part. It does not depend even on the opinion of such “authorities” as the Informbureau, but on the reality that, through everyday activities of millions of our working people, Socialism is being created and Socialist democracy perfected—a reality which corresponds to the interests of our working masses and in which the interests of our working class, our working peasantry, and other toilers, are merged. Leaving aside Marxism-Leninism, with which the monstrous scholastic speculations of the Informbureau have nothing in common, it is foolish even to imagine that with such empty slanderous propaganda it is possible to convince the workers that something is true when objective conditions, every-day practice, and practical results, show that the opposite is true. To fight against the unity of the masses in our country one must fight against Socialist construction. And the slanderers soon found themselves following that line. They are, today, allied with the remnants of capitalism in order to injure our Socialist economy. They are allied with the kulak elements in the struggle against our peasant work cooperatives. They are joining forces with all sorts of domestic reactionary elements and with the agents of foreign imperialism in our country in order to make as difficult as possible the efforts that our toilers are exerting in the construction of Socialism.

But, by doing this, they have accomplished precisely what the various agencies of capitalism have been accomplishing since the day of our Liberation: they are drawing upon themselves greater and greater hatred of our working masses, who look with increasing suspicion on the aims of those who, together with the forces of capitalist reaction, hinder our workers in their creative Socialist work.

5. About the Role and Strength of Our People's Committees

All of the principles for the construction of a Socialist State mentioned so far, are contained in the new Law concerning People's Committees. Some of them are developed more fully and some less fully. This is understandable, since the Law is a reflection of our present situation and our present possibilities. And, as I have already stated, it does not even occur to us to claim that our democracy is already so perfect that it is beyond reproach. On the contrary, we are fully conscious of the fact that, in spite of considerable achievements, our democracy represents only the beginning of those democratic relations which will be created in our social system when the exploitation of men by other men is completely eliminated, when the productive forces of our country become more powerfully developed, and when all remnants of capitalism are destroyed. But the seeds of that future development and those future forms are already contained in our system of People's Democracy, and our task is to develop them further in accordance with objective conditions.

I have already indicated that the classics of Marxism-Leninism looked upon local self-government as one of the tests of the democratic character of the various bourgeois-democratic movements. This test is all the more revealing under the conditions of a Socialist revolution which is, in the real meaning of the word, a people's revolution, and which cannot be victorious if it does not raise the lowest strata of humanity out of darkness and backwardness, and if it does not convert them into direct bearers of authority. As a result, the need for an all-around development of the local organs of people's authority under Socialism becomes more, rather than less, urgent. A Socialist State is not centralistic in the sense of a bourgeois State, in which the bourgeoisie rules by concentrating in the hands of the central authorities all power in the State, thus restricting the influence of the masses of the people even on the local level. Democratic centralism in a Socialist State is based on the democratically expressed will of the people, that is, of the toilers who direct the entire machinery of the State. Therefore, as we have seen, democratic centralism is characterized by unified authority, by subordination of the lower to the higher organs, by self-government of the people through each individual organ of people's authority, and by responsibility of each individual organ to those who elected it or to those that it represents. It follows from this that a high and a steadily higher degree of self-government among our People's Committees does not under any conditions tend to destroy democratic centralism, which is indispensably necessary in order to achieve maximum results,' but that, on the contrary, it strengthens it.

Exactly three years ago, in May, 1946, our National Assembly passed a Law concerning People's Committees. This was the first law dealing with people's committees passed in the Socialist world after the Second World War. Later, other Socialist countries adopted their own laws, in the main following the example set by our Law concerning People's Committees. We are being slandered with the accusation that we are being transformed into a bourgeois republic. But, through our Law concerning People's Committees, we set the example and showed the road that a People's Democracy has to follow in order to develop into a Socialist democracy; and not one of those countries which copied our Law concerning People's Committees has produced a measure more democratic than our Law. Insofar as there has been a departure in the individual countries from the principles incorporated in this Law, the departure has always been negative—in the direction of restricting self-government and making concessions to tendencies toward bureaucratic centralism.

It is not an accident that our country was the first after the war to produce a democratic law of this kind. Our people passed through a type of revolution which raised the political consciousness of the toilers to an exceptionally high level. Only this kind of people could so quickly find for its democratic authority such democratic forms as are expressed in our Law concerning People's Committees.

But, in spite of all this, the first Law concerning People's Committees had certain weaknesses, because of which life itself made it out of date with respect to many questions. Later development of people's committees, especially from the point of view of organization, came occasionally into direct conflict with certain provisions of the existing Law concerning People's Committees.

There is nothing surprising in this development. The first Law concerning People's Committees was adopted under conditions when the construction of Socialism in our country was only in its infancy. At that time, the Socialist sector included mainly large-scale and medium-sized industrial establishments, wholesale trade, banking, etc., while the sector of local economy was still largely capitalist. Therefore, the first Law concerning People's Committees stressed the regulatory and controlling functions of the people's committees, and their organizational set-up was, in the main, adapted to the fulfilment of such tasks.

In the meantime, there occurred important changes in the social and economic structure of our country which are known to all of you. The Socialist sector became dominant, both in local economy and in trade; it started to exert a powerful influence in agriculture; and, naturally enough, all these developments inevitably brought about radical changes in the methods and the nature of the work of the people's committees. They now became directly responsible for the management of the entire economic, cultural, and social construction on their territory, partly carrying out their own plans, and partly carrying out the republican and federal plans. It can easily be seen why it was necessary to make changes in the organizational structure of the people's committees, and why their role had to become more and more important.

I shall not discuss the history of the people's committees or give figures and other data about their work and strength, because that would take too much time. Besides, you are intimately acquainted with the work and achievements of our people's committees from the Liberation until today. From the very beginning, the people's committees held in their hands the entire authority in the State. They were formed as organs of authority as far back as July, 1941, and already in September, 1942, Comrade Tito wrote about them as follows:

The *temporary* character of the Committees of National Liberation [this was the name of the people's committees at that time] is no longer to be emphasized; the emphasis is to be placed on the Committees of National Liberation *as organs of authority* and as the nucleus and the basis of the people's authority in the future.

And they actually came to constitute a basis of this kind. In the course of 1942 and 1943, all other organs of people's authority developed out of them. After the war, our entire state apparatus continued to rest on them and, thus, they became even more firmly established.

From the time of their foundation, the people's committees, as organs of unified state authority, have been engaged in carrying out the general tasks set by the State and in giving effect to all measures of state management and leadership on their territories. Had the people's committees not performed their organizing role with such exceptional ability, and had they not developed all-around initiative, we could not even dream of the enormous successes that we have achieved in the field of post-war rehabilitation and in our work of Socialist construction. In their daily work and struggle, the people's committees developed politically and ideologically, while,

at the same time, the role that they played in Socialist economy became increasingly more important.

Their economic activities are most clearly reflected in the structure of their budgets. Whereas, in 1947, the bulk of the budgets of the people's committees was devoted to administrative purposes, the 1949 budgets clearly show that they are budgets of Socialist organs of local authority which are characterized in the first place by income derived from economic activities. In 1947, the revenue from the turnover tax on local production amounted to 2,595,445,000 dinars, as compared with 4,905,220,000 dinars in 1948, showing an increase to 9.5% of the total turnover tax in 1948 from 8.8% in 1947. In 1949, the turnover tax on local production is estimated to yield 5,664,000,000 dinars. In 1947, local economic enterprises received 3,937,821,000 dinars in credits for working capital purposes, as compared with 7,987,579,000 in 1948 and the estimated credits of 11,168,359,000 in 1949.

The total number of local industrial enterprises is shown in the following table:

	1947	1948
State industry (without Bosnia and Herzegovina)	1,788	2,534
State handicrafts	746	1,818
State commerce	6,458	15,118

In 1948, local enterprises accounted for 41.3% of all commercial establishments. In addition, there were 17,052 cooperative stores, accounting for 46% of the total, and 3,557 stores of various social organizations, representing 8.9% of the total.

The total value of production of local industrial enterprises, in terms of producers' selling prices, amounted to 12,802,458,000 dinars in 1948, as compared with 21,911,400,000 dinars provided in the plan for 1949.

The people's committees are also becoming very active economically in the field of building construction. Their construction enterprises are building not only local but also republican and federal projects. In 1948, the value of construction work completed amounted to more than seven billion dinars.

It is clear that the people's committees constitute a great school in which tens of thousands of the best representatives of our working people are being educated for the tasks of Socialist construction.

There are today in Yugoslavia altogether 151,313 members of people's committees, without the regional (*oblasni*) people's committees. There are 8,104 village people's committees with 119,804 committee members, among whom there are more than 40,000 members of the (Communist) Party. If to these numbers are added hundreds of thousands of citizens who take part in the work of various commissions, councils, and working groups—not including the meetings of voters—we obtain a clear picture of the enormous educational role of our system of people's authority.

The main support of the people's committees in all their activities is, of course, the People's Front, which represents a really new and exceptionally well-suited form for the direct participation of the masses of our toilers in the administration of the State and for the exercise of mass control over it.

These are eloquent proofs that our people's authority is not an* empty demagogic phrase and that it does not belong to the people only on paper but also in reality.

The facts produced so far are sufficient to indicate clearly the greatly expanded role given to the people's committees during the period of all-around Socialist offensive in our country. At the

same time, the results achieved demanded a change in the Law concerning People's Committees. It became indispensably necessary to eliminate the defects in the existing Law concerning People's Committees in order to make it possible for them to achieve their optimum development.

Of course, aside from the need for eliminating the various defects and weaknesses of the old Law concerning People's Committees, it was at the same time necessary to give expression to the progress made in the development of our People's Democracy up to the present time. All of these considerations are reflected in our new Law concerning People's Committees. The provisions of the new Law are made to conform with the existing state of affairs and, in addition, it corrects the errors contained in the first Law; that is, its too rigid prescription of the forms of organization that the people's committees had to assume. The new Law gives only the general principles and the framework of the structure of the people's committees, but, within this framework, further structural development is possible. All of us know that our people's committees, as well as all other departments of our government, are not and must not be regarded as eternal truths or static forms, but as living organisms which change together with the changes in our social and economic structure, with the development of Socialism, with the strengthening of the productive forces of our society, and with the increase in the social consciousness of the masses.

It is necessary to call attention to some of the principal characteristics of the new Law concerning People's Committees.

6. The Characteristics of The New Law Concerning People's Committees

In the first place, it is necessary to point out that both the old and the new Law stress the fact that the people's committees are the highest organs of state authority in the territorial units administered by them, and that—aside from exceptions fixed by law—all organs of state administration in their territory are subordinate to them. The new Law makes this provision even stronger and more concrete by adding that the people's committees are not only the highest organs of state authority in their territory but also the only organs—that no other organs of state authority can exist in their territory and share power with them. The intent of the Law is to emphasize in this manner that all power is concentrated in the people's committees, and that such organs of central state authority as mayors, prefects, governors, and so on, which are found in other countries, cannot exist side by side with them. Thus, the unity of the people's authority is even more strongly expressed.

There are certain exceptions to this rule. The Law permits the federal and republican ministries to appoint their own administrative organs in the territory of the people's committees to perform certain definite administrative functions. But, as I have already stated, these exceptions can be made only by law and only with respect to specified administrative tasks and functions, which, under the existing conditions, the people's committees cannot perform in a satisfactory manner, or where the nature of the work demands a completely centralized administration. Such special administrative organs are available today only to the Administration of State Security of the Ministry of the Interior (other functions of the Ministry of Interior are performed by the people's committees through their commissions for internal affairs), the Ministry of National Defense, the Federal Statistical Bureau, and the Ministry of Social Insurance. It is clear from this that these exceptions in no sense encroach upon the self-governing prerogatives of the people's committees in their administrative territorial units, but that they serve, instead, to protect them and make it possible for the higher organs of state authority correctly to perform their general administrative functions.

It is evident that the people's committees are the only organs of state authority within their territorial jurisdictions and that, within the limits set by law, they exercise direct control over the entire administrative apparatus of the State and of its enterprises and institutions. In their territories, the people's committees perform local as well as republican and federal functions. This fact most clearly expresses the unified character of our people's authority.

The principle that the relations between the higher and lower organs of state authority are based on reciprocal rights, which are determined by law, and that, therefore, the lower organs, while being subordinated to the higher, are not simply their executive departments, was already firmly established in the old law. In this sense, even the old law attempted to define the jurisdiction of the people's committees both as a right and a duty. The new Law goes further in this direction and, thus, even more firmly places in the hands of the people's committees complete authority, and delivers one more blow to bureaucratic tendencies.

We have always fought against bureaucratic tendencies, because our own experience, as well as the experiences of the other Socialist countries, show that such tendencies lead to a separation of the administrative apparatus from the representative organs of people's authority, transforming the latter into executive branches of the administration, while under these conditions the local organs of state authority have no other function to perform except to hold meetings for the purpose of hearing propagandistic speeches. For these reasons, we have always

fought against the tendency of the republican and federal administrative bodies to create their own organs with the people's committees, except in those cases where the nature of the work requires it. In addition, our aim has been to define as precisely as possible the jurisdiction of the people's committees within which they can independently carry on their work—within the framework of the plan and in line with the directions received from the higher organs—without any interference on the part of the higher organs of authority, except to the extent that their right to interfere is specified by law. Without such a guarantee, people's self-government on a local level would be an empty phrase, and bureaucratism would completely undermine the development of any creative initiative of the masses.

The Law provides further that the people's committees, as the elected organs of authority, shall perform their functions of managing the apparatus of the State through their Executive Committees. These committees carry out the orders of their own people's committees, and also transact the current business of the federal and republican departments in line with the instructions of the government or, in other words, of its ministries. The Executive Committees are responsible to their people's committees and to the higher organs of state authority. This type of double responsibility makes obligatory, on the one hand, unified execution of the general policies of the State, and, on the other hand, it makes possible mutual control from above and from below—control on the part of the higher administrative bodies over the work of the lower organs, as well as control on the part of the elected representatives of the people in the people's committees over the measures of the higher administrative organs which are being carried out in the administrative territories of the people's committees through the executive and administrative apparatus of the latter. There is no doubt that this system provides the best synthesis that has so far developed of the necessary degree of centralization in the governmental structure of people's authority with the requirements of people's self-government. Perversion of this synthesis in either direction must inevitably lead to a distortion in the development of Socialist democracy, either in the direction of making centralism weaker and, thus, giving rise to local particularism and undermining the general economic effort and progress of the country, or in the direction of weakening the structure of democracy and of people's self-government, which also acts as a brake on Socialist development.

It is particularly important to underline the fact that our Law concerning People's Committees places at the head of the individual branches of state administration Commissioners appointed by the Executive Committee from among its members, although, so far as the Ministry of Internal Affairs is concerned, the Committee may select outsiders for this work. These exceptional appointments, however, are extremely rare. The Commissioners are responsible for their work directly to the Executive Committees which appoint them and to the Commissioner of the higher Executive Committee, that is, the competent Minister of the People's Republic. The Commissioners direct the work within the jurisdiction of their own people's committees, as well as that within the jurisdiction of the higher people's committee or the ministry. In this manner, the basic principle of Socialist democracy that the leading officials must be elected and removable by the people is most fully carried out in practice. From time to time, there appeared among the higher organs of our state authority bureaucratic tendencies, seeking to transform the Commissions, established by the people's committees, into executive bureaus of the various ministries in the individual administrative regions. In this way, the Executive Committee would, in effect, cease to be the executive arm of the people's committee and the latter would be deprived of all power. We have not only smashed all these tendencies but have even increased the importance of the role played by the Executive Committee by placing its members in direct

charge of certain branches of state administration and making them responsible to the Executive Committee of their own people's committee, and through it to the people of the administrative region, as well as to the higher organs of state administration, thus assuring expert management and constant control by the higher organs over the individual Commissions. There is no doubt that this is an important achievement of our Revolution and that it at the same time constitutes one more practical proof of the correctness of the principle concerning the development of Socialist democracy established by Marx in connection with the Paris Commune.

Finally, it is necessary to point out that the Law envisages a whole series of forms for the direct participation of the masses in the work of the various organs of the people's committees, such as meetings of voters, councils, various commissions, participation in the Planning and Control Commission, people's inspection, technical councils attached to the individual commissions, etc.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE PEOPLE'S COMMITTEES

With respect to the organizational structure of the people's committees, the important changes in the new Law are as follows;

1. It establishes regional people's committees in all people's republics with the exception of Montenegro and the Autonomous Province of Voivodina, and determines their jurisdiction and rights in relation to the lower people's committees. The need for organizing regional people's committees is apparent from the reasons which I have already discussed. As long as the principal function of people's committees was regulatory, we could remain satisfied with the existence of only county and village people's committees. Now, however, that the enormous tasks of direct economic management and, especially, of the construction of Socialism in the village, have been thrown on the people's committees, it has become impossible for the governments of the People's Republics directly to manage the operations of county people's committees, nor are the latter in a position to solve all of their problems by themselves. As a result, at the initiative of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, the Presidium of the Yugoslav National Assembly some time ago passed a decree ordering that immediate steps be taken to prepare the ground for the establishment of regional people's committees.

2. In determining the organizational forms of the administrative apparatus of the people's committees, the new Law does not go into details; it does not specify concretely the structure of its organization, as was the case with the old Law, but only gives the general framework for it and establishes its basic principles. The Law provides for the establishment of such basic forms as commissions, administrations, departments, sections, groups, councils, committees and boards, with the proviso that the governments of the People's Republics shall have the right to decide how they shall be used in practice, while the people's committees themselves shall, in agreement with the higher organs, determine the structure of their administrative apparatus. Our experience shows that it is not a correct procedure to establish by law inflexible forms of organization, not only because there are still enormous differences among the various districts and regions, which demand different forms of organization, but also because, as we progress in the construction of Socialism, there must be a basic change in the organizational structure of the people's committees.

3. In place of former departments in the Executive Committee, the new Law creates Commissions, with Commissioners at their head, who are at the same time members of the Executive Committee or, in other words, elected representatives of the people. Through the establishment of these Commissions, the leading role of the individual branches of local state administration is made more important and the principle-adopted in the course of our War for

National Liberation and affirmed in the old Law—that administration of local affairs should be in the hands of the elected representatives of the people is even more firmly established. In this manner, the democratic character of our people's authority is even more strongly emphasized.

4. A significant change in the, new Law is the inclusion of the Ministry of Internal Affairs within the jurisdiction of the people's committees. There is no doubt that this is another important step in deepening the democratic nature of our people's authority. This has come about as a result of the increase in the political strength of the people's committees as organs of a Slate which belongs to the working people.

The status of the Commissioner for Internal Affairs differs from that of the other Commissioners appointed by the Executive Committee in that the former must be appointed in agreement with the Minister of Internal Affairs. This exception to the rule is necessary because of the need for unity in that field of service, which has never been purely local in character and which, in addition, demands professionally trained Commissioners. However, the Commissioner for Internal Affairs is responsible both to the Minister of Internal Affairs and to his Executive Committee.

5. Within the various Commissions, the Law envisages the formation of sectors, administrations, divisions, bureaus, groups, boards, etc. * In this manner, the independence of the individual branches of the local state administration within the apparatus of the people's committees is made more marked, while at the same time it becomes possible more effectively to combine vertically one Commission with another and with the Ministry.

6. The new Law permits the formation of Commissions whenever the need for them arises, both in the village and in the city people's committees within a district. The uniformity enforced until now in the form of organization of all local people's committees does not correspond to the differences that exist in the tasks to be performed and in the role to be played by the various village and city people's committees in our country.

ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES OF THE PEOPLE'S COMMITTEES

In comparison with the old Law, the new Law expresses the steadily more important role of the people's committees in the social, economic, and cultural development of their territories. The Law states that people's committees are in charge of the economic, social and cultural development of their territories. This means that it is their duty to develop to the maximum the productive forces in their region and to raise, in accordance with a plan, the social and cultural status of their citizens. This means that our people's committees are not simply responsible for the performance of certain limited tasks in the field of communal affairs, public health, etc., as is the case with the organs of local self-government in the states of bourgeois democracy, but that they have in their hands full power, and that they are in charge of the entire work of state construction in their territory—whether within the limits of their own local jurisdiction, setting their own tasks independently and carrying them out, or in the field of general state jurisdiction, in which case they carry out general tasks in line with the instructions and directives received from the higher organs of state authority. In both cases, the people's committees are in direct charge of the entire administrative apparatus in their territories, aside from exceptions specified by law.

Accordingly, our people's committees have their budgets and their plans. Their plans constitute a component part of the general state plan, thus insuring both the unity of our economy and the independent initiative of the individual people's committees.

In view of the enormous increase in the economic activities of the people's committees, about which I have already spoken, the new Law introduces a number of changes which reflect

the growth of our local economy and strengthen the economic basis of the people's committees, as well as of the people's local self-government. These changes are in the main as follows:

1. Provisions concerning the structure and economic activities of the people's committees are placed in a separate section of the Law in order to emphasize the importance of their role in the development of people's authority.

2. The prior right of the village and town people's committees to administer real estate and buildings is firmly established.

3. In addition to their right to have a budget of their own, the right of the people's committees to collect dues and to utilize, in line with the general provisions of the Law, the net income of the economic enterprises, managed by the people's committees, is fixed.

4. The people's committees are given the right to use their financial resources to establish their own enterprises in all fields of economic activity and they can be deprived of this right only by a decree of the Presidium of the People's Republic, or, in the case of the local people's committees, by a decision of the regional people's committee.

5. In determining the jurisdiction of the people's committees, the new Law gives a more precise definition of their rights, thus assuring an all-around development of their economic initiative; such as, the right to dispose of the income derived from properties belonging to the people as a whole but administered by them; to apportion the capital funds of their enterprises to various uses; to regulate local economic activities, etc. These rights can be changed only by law.

Although, in the main, these rights are contained in the old Law, they are concretely - elaborated in the new Law, and they guarantee a steady increase in the importance of the role played by the people's committees in the field of economic development.

With respect to the forms of organization in the economic sector, the new Law does not go into details. It leaves the people's committees and the People's Republics free to determine the kind of organization best suited to their needs.

All in all, the new Law concerning People's Committees reflects the results achieved so far in the development of local economy and opens up the perspective of its further growth,

DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION

It is particularly important that the new Law more precisely determines the jurisdiction of the people's committees. Local self-government would be reduced to nothing if the higher administrative organs were given the sole right to fix the jurisdiction of the local bodies. Even during the war, when there were no detailed provisions with respect to jurisdiction, our people's committees carried out their tasks independently and proved that they are able—with constant help from the higher organs—independently to fulfill the tasks assigned to them. With such experiences at our disposal, we tried even in the old Law to determine as precisely as possible the jurisdiction of the people's committees within which they could independently perform their functions under the general direction and control of the higher organs. The old Law established the principle that jurisdictions assigned to the people's committees constituted their right and their duty to perform their functions and that, therefore, the matters placed within their jurisdiction could be determined and changed only by law. This principle is retained in the new Law but in forms which we have developed on the basis of our past experiences.

In determining the matters to be placed within the jurisdiction of the people's committees, the new Law proceeds from the following principles:

1. Functions of the people's committees may be divided into those of general and those of local scope. All functions which are of general significance, because they safeguard the operation of the administrative apparatus of the State or the fulfilment of the general economic

plan of the State, are classified as “general,” even though they may be carried out locally. Such functions include, for example, the collection of vital statistics which are necessary to enable the State to carry out a number of general tasks (recruiting, population policies, etc.), and various activities in the field of agricultural improvement, on which depends the success of the general state policy designed to provide the population with adequate quantities of foodstuffs, etc. In connection with activities of this kind, it is natural that the higher organs of people’s authority and state administration should exercise a larger measure of control over the work of the people’s committees. The latter perform this work on the basis of orders and detailed instructions issued by the higher organs, although even in this field they have ample opportunity for developing their own initiative. These activities are not specified in the new Law. They are established by the higher administrative organs which are responsible for the execution of the tasks described as “general.”

On the other hand, the Law attempts to determine as precisely as possible those matters, falling within the scope of local jurisdiction, which are significant primarily in connection with the activities in the field of economic, social and cultural development. In this field, the Law gives the widest possible freedom of action to the people’s committees and they are not required to carry out the decisions and instructions of the various ministries. The principle of democratic centralism, however, is maintained through the leadership offered by the higher organs and through the general state plan and control.

2. Starting with such a division of functions, the new Law attempts to define as exactly as possible the activities of the people’s committees on each level of local jurisdiction in order to strengthen the independence of each individual people’s committee. New activities in the field of local jurisdiction can be established or changed only by law. In this manner, the relations among the various state organs are made more definite. This, in turn, undoubtedly tends to strengthen our state apparatus and helps in the struggle against bureaucratization and in the development of greater initiative from below.

3. The new Law defines more precisely the rights and duties of the people’s committees in connection with the functions placed within their jurisdiction. The Law specifies that the rights and duties of the people’s committees are as follows:

to issue generally binding regulations; to give orders, instructions and decisions; to organize enterprises and institutions; to institute measures in the field of administrative organization and operation; to see to it that the required material and financial means are realized in the economic plan and in the budget, insuring at the same time full compliance with the provisions of the Law [Article 26].

These rights of the local organs of people’s authority are exceptionally broad, and they are indeed a true expression of democracy and of genuine people’s self-government.

4. In harmony with the above-mentioned principle, the Law provides that, in matters of local jurisdiction, which are in the main specified in this Law, the people’s committees may issue regulations and undertake measures on their own initiative without waiting for the issuance of federal and republican regulations. This provision of the Law will stimulate initiative, especially on the part of the higher people’s committees, as actively as possible to place local relations on a sound basis and to develop all local sources which can serve to increase the economic, social and cultural status of their territories. Of course, this does not deprive either the federal or the republican organs of authority of the right to regulate by law any activity in the field of local jurisdiction for the purpose of guiding or determining the direction of the development of local functions.

5. Using in the main the principles contained in the old Law, the new Law defines the jurisdiction of the higher people's committees in relation to the lower, but many of these principles are more clearly stated. On the other hand, the Law specifies in principle the rights and duties of the higher people's committees and of the republican organs toward the lower people's committees. They

exercise general control over the work of the lower people's committees; issue general regulations designed to unify the execution of their functions; give instructions and directives for the fulfillment of their tasks; assist them in their organizing activities and give them technical help, as well as assist them in effective utilization and formation of cadres; supervise the legality of their work and assist them in developing their own initiative and making full use of the rights bestowed upon them by law [Article 41].

In addition, the new Law establishes the responsibility, along the so-called vertical line, of the lower organs of state administration to the higher organs. Furthermore, adhering to the principles of the former law, the Law specifies the right of the higher organs to annul or to stop the execution of the acts of the lower organs.

The provisions concerning jurisdiction contained in this legislative instrument are a powerful contribution toward the development of the local organs of our Socialist State.

It is necessary to add that the scope of local functions formulated in this Law is not immutable. There is no doubt that it will be steadily broadened and that the trend in the future will be in the direction of a complete disappearance of the differences between local and general jurisdictions. These changes will be brought about, on the one hand, by the development of the productive forces in our country, and, on the other hand, through the increase in the technical ability of our people's committees. There is no doubt that our people's committees can be entrusted with such broad functions precisely because they became prepared for such tasks during the war and especially after the war. And the results achieved so far show that, with continued improvement in the qualifications of our people's committees, the number of functions that they can independently perform can be steadily increased.

With this division of functions into those of general and local jurisdiction, we have not become ensnared in that old bourgeois theory of autonomous and delegated powers.

On the contrary, in our entire system of people's authority the principle is clearly expressed that the people's committees are the sole organs of state authority, that they do not have a dual character—the character of self-governing bodies and that of state organs—, because they are the organs of state authority built on the principle of self-government, and the entire system of state authority under the conditions prevailing in our People's Democracy is nothing else but a system of uniting the organs of self-government into a single state authority.

7. Further Tasks in Connection With the Strengthening of the People's Committees

Of course, further development and strengthening of the people's committees is not simply a question of the present Law. On the contrary, if not only the letter but also the spirit of this Law are to be fully applied in practice, it is necessary for our leading state organs, and above all for the organizations of the Communist Party and of the National Front, both in the political field and in matters of organization, to offer their maximum assistance in the struggle for the strengthening of the people's committees. In this connection, I shall limit myself here to a number of most timely tasks.

1. First of all, it is indispensably necessary to put our regional people's committees as quickly as possible on a firm basis, because they constitute today the principal lever for the further development of the apparatus of our people's committees and of our state apparatus as a whole.

In the absence of regional people's committees and without efforts to strengthen them, we cannot even imagine further decentralization of operating functions, which is indispensably necessary, not only to speed up and improve the work of our entire state apparatus and to educate our cadres to perform their tasks independently, but also to raise the quality of the work performed by the leading republican and federal organs.

The fear, which is apparent in certain ministries, that, through the transfer of some of the cadres from the ministries to the regional committees and the transfer of a series of functions from the jurisdiction of the ministries to that of the regional people's committees, the position of the leading republican organs will be weakened, is completely superfluous and groundless. On the contrary, in this manner they will be freed from unnecessary work and enabled to devote more attention to the problem of perfecting the methods of management.

2. It is necessary to put an end to the perpetual new divisions in the territories of the administrative units. It is understandable, of course, that frequent changes were inevitable in the beginning, because it was impossible for us to find the best solution in all cases. But, it should not be forgotten that every change disturbs the work of the executive and administrative apparatus and makes more difficult an improvement in its technical qualifications. The time has arrived now when we finally have enough experience to make the present divisions stable and to make any further changes only in case of established need and after a mature analysis of concrete conditions.

3. It is necessary with determination to follow the road of stabilizing the apparatus of the people's committees in the main on the basis of the reorganization scheme issued last year by the federal government. This scheme is not binding for all people's committees; it provides only the general framework, and the actual organization should be created in line with the requirements of each people's committee. And when we speak about concrete conditions, we have in mind not only the differences between the agricultural and industrial areas, between rich plains and mountainous regions, etc., but also the subjective conditions: the available cadres, the cultural level of the region, the degree of literacy, the general technical and political qualifications of the individuals occupying the positions of leadership, etc. Furthermore, it is necessary to take into account the fact that certain corrections are required even in the existing organizational framework. The nature of these corrections I shall not discuss here because they are not matters of principle but rather of technical organization. To this end, it is necessary to undertake a thorough elaboration of the statutes of the people's committees and at the same time systematically determine the place of the various officials in their apparatus. Regional people's

committees and the commissions for the development of people's authority should cooperate in the work of preparing the statutes of each individual people's committee and assist them to understand and carry out their tasks and strengthen and organize as correctly as possible their apparatus. It goes without saying that we are not in a position today to fill all the necessary posts in the apparatus of the people's committees, nor is this in most cases required, but a precise determination of individual responsibilities will alone appreciably contribute to the strengthening of the apparatus of the people's committees, even though one person has to perform several functions for a shorter or longer period of time. In this sense, work on the preparation of the people's committees' statutes is of great significance for the further development of our people's authority.

4. It is necessary to combine the administrative sectors as firmly as possible along vertical lines, not only in the sense of subordinating the lower organs to the higher and seeing to it that the directives of the higher organs are carried out, but also in the sense of making the higher organs more helpful to the lower. Within some of our ministries, the opinion has become widely accepted that the responsibility of a ministry toward a commission of a people's committee in the same field of work is limited to the need of carrying out through the commission the required measures of general state policy. This opinion, however, is erroneous. Our leading cadres must realize that they are also responsible for the efficiency of the organization, the composition of the working force, and for the technical qualifications of the personnel of the commissions of the people's committees in the same field of activity. For that reason, the ministries should at all times support these commissions in matters of organization and training and keep detailed records of their work. In this manner, we will make possible a steady and rapid increase in the ability of the people's committees effectively to meet their growing responsibilities and to improve their technical and professional qualifications.

5. I should like to devote some time to the question of the technical education of the cadres attached to our people's committees. This matter was exhaustively discussed during our Fifth Congress, but it cannot be said that enough has been done in that direction. It is not sufficient for us simply to show our enthusiasm over the fact that our people's committees and our leading officials are elected and subject to removal by the people. We will contribute nothing toward a more rapid development of Socialism and a more rapid increase in the standard of living of the masses of our people by first electing and then removing the key men in our people's committees simply because, no matter how willing they may be, they are not able to perform the tasks assigned to them. We would not be different from the small bourgeois phrase-makers and demagogues if we told the people that everything will be all right as soon as it becomes possible for them to elect anybody they please to positions of leadership. The important thing is that the key men should be *elected* and at the same time *capable* of performing the functions for which they are elected. That is why all republican and even federal ministries must pay particular attention to the technical training of the cadres attached to the people's committees by means of special courses, seminars, correspondence schools, as concrete technical information as possible with respect to all current questions, direct assistance through their own instructors, temporary seminars for concrete tasks facing our cadres, publications in the field of technical education, etc. In addition, the apparatus of the people's committees should be provided with a constantly increasing number of well-educated and professionally trained workers who will be able to give steady technical support day in and day out to the leaders of the people's committees and of their administrative branches.

In order to make the assistance rendered by the higher organs continuous and as good as

possible, it is indispensably necessary to create, or more effectively organize, in the individual ministries and regional people's committees, special departments, sections or groups, composed of experts who will go among the people's committees and materially assist them in their organizing activities and technical tasks. I wish to underline once more that, without intensive work of this kind, even the best and most democratic law providing for the election and removal of public officials will be meaningless; that is, democracy will remain only on paper, while the bureaucracy will rule.

6. In connection with this, I should like to underline an especially harmful practice of our people's committees, that is, the breakneck speed with which they are removing their leading cadres. These cadres are being changed so rapidly that the individuals have no time to take a good look around—not to speak of starting professionally to perform the tasks entrusted to them—and they are removed and transferred, often, to work of a totally different kind. Of course, I have no illusions that, in view of the enormous shortage of cadres, we can overnight eliminate this practice, but we can considerably limit its use. Our leaders should realize that cadres do not fall ready-made out of the sky, and that we lose a great deal when we transfer a person from work in which he has already acquired a certain amount of experience and knowledge to work of an entirely different character in which he has to start from scratch to find his way around. Let me put it this way: we should endeavor to achieve a certain degree of specialization among our cadres: that is, we should not, except in case of unusual need, shift our cadres from the field of administration or special work with which they have already become familiar. Similarly, we must stubbornly fight for continuity in the work of each individual administrative branch of all people's committees so as to make it unnecessary for each new commissioner to start practically from the beginning.

7. It is necessary to fight against illegality and wilfulness in the people's committees. These are still encountered. Our legality is popular; it is a revolutionary legality; a legality which defends the interests of our country's toilers. Anybody who violates that legality—irrespective of whose rights are being broken—causes harm to our people's authority and to our country's toilers. Maintenance of legality is not simply a question of established forms, but rather of the strength of the legal system of the State, the confidence of the masses in the organs of the State and its legal prescriptions, of developing strong habits of social behavior which become a part of the consciousness and enter into the blood of men, thus decreasing the need for intervention on the part of the State and reducing the need for expanding the enforcement apparatus of the State, etc. Accordingly, unconditional maintenance of legality must be the rule not only for every citizen of this country but also for all organs of state authority—from the highest to the lowest.

Of course, wilfulness is not always the result of deliberate intent. More frequently it is caused by ignorance and incompetence. However, we can no longer tolerate such ignorance in our people's committees. The responsible leaders and officials of the people's committees are unconditionally bound to learn all provisions of the law pertaining to their sphere of activity. So far as they are concerned, ignorance of the law cannot be an extenuating circumstance in case of errors committed by them. It is, therefore, not only necessary to organize the struggle for legality, not only to watch carefully and control the legality of the acts of the people's committees and their individual officials, but it is also necessary to wage a struggle for increasing the knowledge of what is or is not legal, to increase the understanding of the law among our people's committees. Legal education in our country is no longer necessary only to lawyers, judges and public prosecutors. The builders of Socialism, and especially the members of people's committees, must be familiar with the legal provisions of their Socialist country,

provisions within which they are performing their functions.

8. Closely related to this question is the question of eliminating carelessness in the work of our people's committees, which is not being attacked with 'sufficient vigor. We should not forget that the old Yugoslav administrative apparatus was by and large famous for its neglect of duties to be performed, and it should not be assumed that such habits have completely disappeared from our apparatus. On the contrary, this carelessness manifests itself in the conduct of daily operations and in the execution of assignments, as well as in the lack of discipline and punctuality among public officials, insufficient personal responsibility, etc. Combined with this we find, furthermore, a bureaucratic, soulless, and rude attitude toward the citizenry; absence of efforts to increase the cultural level of the leading officials and of the personnel of the people's committees and to improve the appearance of the buildings and premises of the people's committees, etc. Against all these defects it is necessary to declare war to the bitter end. The regional people's committees, in particular, must pay attention to this problem.

9. I should like separately to emphasize the fact that our efforts to secure the participation of the masses in the work of the people's committees are still inadequate, although much has been accomplished in this direction, and that the organizations of our Party and our People's Front sometimes forget that that is one of their main tasks. It is necessary to wage a constant and relentless struggle on all levels of people's authority to give substance to all of the existing forms designed to make possible direct participation of the people in the administration of the State, such as meetings of voters, citizens' councils, action committees, organs of people's inspection, councils of workers, etc., and, above all, the committees of the National Front, which offer the best medium for the cooperation of the toilers with the organs of people's authority.

10. It is necessary to underline the harmfulness of the tendency on the part of some Executive Committees to take into their own hands all of the functions of their people's committees and to transform the assembly of the people's committee into occasional sessions devoted to general conversation. This tendency we have not yet succeeded in eliminating. The assembly of the people's committee should be as active as possible in the preparation and elaboration of plans for the fulfillment of all current tasks, both of local and general jurisdiction.

11. It is necessary constantly to combat the tendency toward narrow local particularism, insubordination toward the higher organs within their jurisdiction, narrow-minded local attitude toward general state tasks, etc. All these errors and weaknesses often result in serious harm to the common cause.

12. Finally, I should like to emphasize once more that we must wage a most determined struggle against the bureaucratic and centralists attitude of the higher organs toward the lower. An end must be put to the practice of unlawfully taking certain functions away from the lower organs, of taking over without cause their institutions and enterprises, and to similar practices which are usually the result of an unjustified lack of confidence in the ability of the lower organs of people's authority. If the higher organs are convinced that the lower organs are not able to carry out the tasks assigned to them, they should take whatever steps may be required to enable the lower organs to perform their duties instead of shaking their fists at them. This is not a question of formal relations, but, I repeat, of arousing the creative initiative of the masses without which successful development of Socialism is not possible. In addition, our leading organs should give up the habit of making unilateral decisions and issuing orders which the lower organs have to carry out, without, as a rule, even consulting those responsible for putting their decisions into effect. From the lower organs they will obtain useful comments and suggestions which will be more correct and concrete and more in line with the prevailing

objective conditions.

Comrades, I think that the facts which I have presented show not only that the new Law concerning People's Committees is necessary but also that it represents an important achievement in the development of our People's Democracy. Although some things in it are still superficially treated, it constitutes a major contribution to the theory and practice dealing with the construction of Socialist democracy. By accepting this Law, we can take pride in it, because there are not many democratic acts of this kind in the world. Our enemies and slanderers may throw mud at our country, but this Law and other similar achievements, made on the road leading to Socialism, testify that our country, under the leadership of the Communist Party and with Comrade Tito at its head, is leading in the bold development of Socialist democracy as a true People's Democracy.