

## Socialism in Several Countries and the Yugoslav Question

December 1996

*[The International Committee for Restoration of the Soviet Union organised an international seminar on 'Stalin Today'. It was held in Moscow on November 5th and 6th 1994. The seminar had the support of Nina Andreyeva of the All-union Communist Party (Bolshevik) and Victor Anpilov of the Russian Communist Workers Party. Representatives of the Komsomol, the Congress of Soviet Women and the Bolshevik Young Guard of Russia also attended the seminar. A number of communist groups from all over the world presented their papers. Moni Guha of Proletarian Path, India also presented a paper in absentia. We reproduce it here.]*

### Introduction

Socialism in one country was never a cherished goal of the communists nor considered a model condition for the building of socialism. If socialism in one country was not an end in itself, if socialism achieves victory, singly, country by country, at intervals, how then, will the unity of the people of all nations and countries be achieved in such a transitional period?

Lenin thought a great deal over this question. In order to clearly understand the question of modern revisionism in general and Yugoslav revisionism in particular one should be acquainted with Lenin's thought in this respect. Hence, instead of directly dealing with the Yugoslav question, I have dealt here with Lenin's thought over the question of relation among the socialist countries of various nations which Stalin implemented concretely in a new concrete condition.

Perhaps this will help the readers in independently arriving at a correct decision on the Yugoslav question.

### 1. The concept "country" and Proletarian Internationalism

Socialism, of course, will not remain confined within a single country forever. A time will surely come when socialism will be a fact first in more than one country, then in several countries and eventually in all countries. What will be the basis of mutual relations among the socialist countries, how will the socialist countries effect the unity of the peoples of all individual socialist countries? This is a question of concrete application of proletarian internationalism in contrast with bourgeois nationalism. It is necessary to deal with the concept "country" and its relation with the working class in this connection. The *Communist Manifesto* emphasized that the "Country" about which bourgeois spokesmen are so fond of prating, does not exist as far as the proletariat is concerned. The arena where the proletariat wages struggle is within the boundaries of the national state created and ruled by the bourgeoisie. That is why the struggle of the proletariat, "in semblance" - but not actually, is limited within the boundary of a specific national state, though the proletariat has, in every country, one and the same interest, one and the same

enemy, one and the same war to wage to end capitalism and one and the same aim, to establish socialism. Only a tiny section, the bourgeoisie, has created for itself the boundary because "though all members of contemporary bourgeoisie have one and the same interest so far as they constitute a specific class contraposed to another class, nevertheless in their relations with one another they have conflicting interests. These antagonisms arise from the economic structure of the bourgeois system - which goes by the name "Country" "Fatherland" etc. so long as the proletariat is not class-conscious the national class state of the bourgeoisie is considered by them as their fatherland. Even the proletariat when it becomes conscious of itself as the class and seizes political power and establishes itself as the ruling class, it establishes that power within a specific boundary. Only in that sense, though by no means in the bourgeois sense of the term (manifesto) the proletariat does retain the national complexion of the state. The process of internationalization, which is already perceptible under capitalism i.e. in the world system of capitalist economy "will efface these distinctions and contrasts even more the ending of class, opposition within the nation will end the mutual hostilities of nations (manifesto)" and virtually will obliterate the boundaries and frontiers of nations and there will emerge a single nation of humanity.

On this basis Lenin, while building socialism in one country, envisaged that world socialism can only be built up on the basis of an international dictatorship of the proletariat based on a **WORLD FEDERATION OF SOCIALIST REPUBLICS** under the leadership of **A SINGLE WORLD COMMUNIST PARTY** opposed to the integrated world capitalist economy regulated by international capital.

That would be the crux of proletarian internationalism in practice when many socialist countries emerge - according to Lenin.

The overthrow of the Tsarist autonomy not only unleashed a social revolution but a series of national revolutions in the course of which the Tsarist empire disintegrated into diverse national entities. After the October revolution they were united in a federation. Lenin never regarded the atomized states as useful and advantageous for the socialist unity of the whole world. Proletarian internationalism demands unity of the people on an international scale uninterrupted by disintegrative pulls of separate nationalism. According to Lenin the large centralized state of capitalists is an immense historical step forward from the dispersal of political power in feudal times to the future socialist unity of the whole world. That is why the Bolshevik Party, while calling the vast Tsarist Empire "a prison house of nations" urged not the disintegration of the nations into atomised independent states but their unity *on the basis of Voluntary Union* with the right of secession. This voluntary union is the union of the peoples on the basis of federation.

Lenin said that "federation is a transitional form to complete unity of the working people of the different nations" in his colonial theses. It meant that federation does not denote complete unity but a step forward towards complete unity. Federation is a voluntary union of different sovereign states, based on bourgeois conception of equality and independence of each state voluntarily limiting its sovereignty in the common interests of all the federated states as a whole to an extent necessary to help all of them to advance

quickly in the struggle against the common enemy - international capital. Secondly, federation is a mutual agreement of sovereign states, it is a "union of equals" and as such, one state may not always and under all circumstances, agree with others. In that case the concerned sovereign state may leave the federation and secede. Hence according to Lenin, federation cannot and does not denote "complete unity" - which is the aim of socialism - yet it is a welcome step forward to complete unity.

Why this transitional step towards "complete unity" instead of having one sovereign state of the socialist countries?

According to Lenin, as the people in general - not the advanced section of the working class - the communists - of different socialist states still, after the revolution, harbour national sentiments, feelings, apprehensions and even hatred against other nations, especially against the erstwhile oppressing nation, different socialist states can only federate voluntarily on the basis of bourgeois equality, independence and sovereignty with the right of secession. Lenin spoke of this "federation of world socialist states, as a transitional stage to complete unity" of the people of different nations in his "colonial thesis." Complete unity of the people of different nations of the socialist states can only be achieved in the process of socialist-reconstruction, of society's socialization, abolition of exploitation of man by man and abolition of all classes and material and superstructural bases of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalism.

All this will take a long time. This period will witness the emergence of one socialist state after another. Communism's historical destiny leads to the complete unity of the people of the whole world - with no state boundaries, no state - the "International shall be the human race". The federated socialist states must work out to this end a policy to deal with the aforesaid feelings of the people and prepare the material, superstructural and organisational grounds for complete unity.

In this connection, it must clearly and without any ambiguity be understood that behind the state apparatus of the federated socialist states, the internationally democratically centralized communist party's national sections remain as guiding cores, which in theory and practice are proletarian internationalists and maintain complete unity on all issues.

It expresses the single will of the world proletariat. This will according to Lenin, is one and indivisible, and there is no place for divisive voices once decisions are taken after free and thorough discussions. When in 1903, voices were raised by the Bundist and others for federal structure of the party, Lenin held that there was only ONE VALID CLASS WILL FOR THE WORKERS OF ALL NATIONS and as such federalism cannot be tolerated, in the proletarian party. Lenin said: "We must act as a single centralized fighting organization, we must have behind us the entire proletariat WITHOUT DISTINCTION OF NATIONALITY AND LANGUAGE."

Herein lies the fundamental difference between the socialist states composed of the people and the communist party composed of the advanced section of the proletariat. The

former is in the process of complete unity while the latter is already in complete unity (not in absolute sense).

Lenin not only envisaged but also made the federation of many Soviet states a reality in the Soviet Union, first was the RSFSR and afterwards USSR. At the eighth party congress in March, 1919, Lenin drew a clear-cut distinction between the principle of state organization and party organization. After federalism has been approved as the method of uniting new Soviet States with the RSFSR, the party in a resolution warned that "this in no way, implies that the Russian Communist party, in turn, must be organised as a federation of INDEPENDENT communist parties. There must be one centralised communist party with ONE CENTRAL COMMITTEE directing the ENTIRE work of the party in all parts of the RSFSR." The resolution further said: "At the present time Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia and Byelorussia exist as separate Soviet Republics. For the present moment these are the forms in which the state has to exist." But "ALL DECISIONS OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY AND DIRECTING ORGANS ARE UNCONDITIONALLY BINDING UPON ALL PARTS OF THE PARTY REGARDLESS OF THEIR NATIONAL COMPOSITION. The central committee of the Ukraine, Latvia and Lithuania parties are accorded the rights of regional committees of the party and ARE ENTIRELY SUBORDINATED TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE of the RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY."

From the above we see that taking into full account the sentiments, feelings etc, of the peoples of Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia and Byelorussia, Lenin and the Bolshevik Party did not press for federating these separate Soviet states and they remained not only independent and sovereign but also separate. Nevertheless, Lenin did not allow the communist parties of these states to remain 'independent' and 'Sovereign'. Did Lenin act as a "Great-nation chauvinist?" On the contrary, this example alone should point out clearly the fundamental difference of attitude towards the general people and the vanguard of the people - the communists - of any country. This was how proletarian internationalism was concretely practiced by Lenin. The Ukraine, Latvia and Lithuania parties neither did raise "their eyebrows nor did they raise the question of" "small nation" and "big nation", nor the question of bourgeois "equality" and "independence".

Though in March 1919, Lenin agreed to the existence of separate states in December 1919, he urged Ukraine to federate with the R.S.F.S.R. so as to provide the "toilers of the whole world with an example of a really firm union of workers and peasants of different nations struggling for Soviet power and the CREATION OF A WORLD FEDERATED SOCIALIST REPUBLIC". This time the Ukrainian people readily agreed to federate with the RSFSR.

In December, 1922, again Stalin, when discussing the treaty that would soon create the USSR said, that the "New union States have taken another decisive step towards the amalgamation of the toilers of the whole world into A WORLD SOCIALIST REPUBLIC".

Similarly, the programme of the Communist International in 1928 advanced the slogan of "A FEDERATION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS of advanced countries and colonies THAT HAVE FALLEN AWAY OR ARE FALLING AWAY FROM THE IMPERIALIST SYSTEM." "The various states", the Comintern continued, "WILL JOIN THE GROWING FEDERATION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS AND THUS ENTER THE GENERAL SYSTEM OF WORLD PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP". The programme also visualized the federation of Soviet Republics uniting the whole of mankind under the hegemony of the international proletariat ORGANISED AS A STATE.

The rules adopted at the Sixth Congress, of the Communist International, in 1928 - reiterated that the 'Communist International' the international workers 'ASSOCIATION' - is the Union of Communist parties in various countries, IT IS A WORLD COMMUNIST PARTY. (Imprecor: Vol. 8, No. 84, Nov. 29, 1928).

How can the above-mentioned aim of the world federation of the socialist republics "as a transitional stage to complete unity" of the people of all nations be realised in life? Lenin drawing upon the experience of the Soviet movement enriched the Marxist doctrine of the proletarian party in conformity with the needs of the epoch of proletarian revolution and set up the Third (Communist) International in March, 1919. The most important features of the organisational principles of the Communist International were evolved by Lenin so that proletarian internationalism could be expressed most concretely in day-to-day life and with the aim of the smooth working of the WORLD FEDERATION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS. These principles were: democratic centralism in each party to ensure (a) unity of will worth action on the part of the national contingents of the communist parties (b) Internationalism, INCLUDING INTERNATIONAL DISCIPLINE, i.e., democratic centralism in the international sphere of the party expressing monolithism and oneness of the aim and action of the international proletariat and (c) the designation of the constituents of the Communist International was changed to signify and emphasize that they were not national communist parties, but national contingents of the WORLD PARTY Condition 17 of the 21 conditions for the affiliation stated:

"Each party desirous of joining the Communist International should bear the following name: Communist Party of such and such a country - section of the Third International. The question of renaming of a party was not only a formal one but a political question of great importance. The condition No. 16 said: "All the resolutions of the Executive Committee are binding for all parties forming the communist international". But at the same time, the communist international said in the same condition No. 16: "At the same time, the Communist International and the Executive Committee are naturally bound in every form of their activity to consider the variety of conditions under which the different parties have to work and struggle and "GENERALLY BINDING RESOLUTIONS SHOULD BE PASSED ONLY ON SUCH QUESTIONS UPON WHICH SUCH RESOLUTIONS ARE POSSIBLE".

Consequently, proletarian internationalism did no longer remain an abstract and empty high-sounding catch-phrase like that of the Second International. It was made concrete and really revolutionary. Submission to the international discipline of international democratic centralism of the E.C.C.I., subordinating the interests of individual sections of the communist party was the soul of proletarian internationalism. Behind the World Federation of Socialist Republic of different countries, the Communist International remaining as the guiding core would unite the people of different socialist countries through the transitional stage to complete unity.

## 2. More on Proletarian Internationalism:

Lenin defined in most concrete terms how Marxist-Leninists should view bourgeois conception of equality, independence and state sovereignty of the socialist countries, in their interrelations and how proletarian internationalism is to be practiced, in his celebrated preliminary theses on national and colonial questions known as "colonial theses" placed at the Second Congress of the Communist International. It was Josip Broz Tito of Yugoslavia, who in his letter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B) on April 13, 1948 wrote:

"No matter how much each of us loves the land of socialism the U.S.S.R., he can in no case love his country less which is also developing socialism".

Here the love of a socialist country of the foreign land was counterposed with love and loyalty to one's own socialist country implying that socialism was not international but national. The very line implied independent building of socialism. He voiced the sentiments and wishes of the bourgeois nationalists inside the communist movement of the world and especially of the socialist countries.

Let us see how Lenin saw the interrelations of the socialist countries, we quote a few relevant theses from Lenin's Colonial Theses below: "(7) Federation (federation of different socialist states is a transitional form to the complete unity of the working people of different nations... "(8) In this respect, it is the task of the Communist International to further develop and also to study and test by experience these new federations which are arising on the basis of Soviet system and Soviet movement. In recognizing that federation is a transitional form to complete unity, it is necessary to strive for ever closer federal unity bearing in mind first that the Soviet republics surrounded as they are by the imperialist powers of the whole world which from the military standpoint are immeasurably stronger – cannot possibly continue to exist without closest alliance. Second, THAT A CLOSE ECONOMIC ALLIANCE BETWEEN THE SOVIET REPUBLICS IS NECESSARY, otherwise the productive forces, which have been ruined by imperialism cannot be restored and the wellbeing of the people cannot be ensured. Third, THAT THERE IS A TENDENCY TOWARDS THE CREATION OF A SINGLE WORLD ECONOMY REGULATED BY THE PROLETARIAT OF ALL NATIONS AS AN INTEGRATED WHOLE AND ACCORDING TO A COMMON PLAN. This tendency has already revealed itself quite clearly under capitalism AND IS BOUND TO BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND CONSUMMATED UNDER SOCIALISM. "(9)

Recognition of internationalism in words and its replacement in deed by petty- bourgeois nationalism and pacifism in all propaganda, agitation and practical work is very common not only among parties of the Second International but also among those which have withdrawn from it and often among parties which now call themselves communists. The urgency of the struggle against this evil, against the most deep rooted petty-bourgeois national prejudices looms even larger with the mounting exigencies of the task of CONVERTING THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT FROM A NATIONAL DICTATORSHIP (i.e. existing in a single country and incapable of determining world politics) INTO AN INTERNATIONAL ONE (i.e., A DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT INVOLVING AT LEAST SEVERAL ADVANCED COUNTRIES and capable of exercising a decisive influence upon world politics as a whole). Petty-bourgeois nationalism proclaims internationalism as the mere recognition of equality of nations and nothing more. Quite apart from the fact this recognition is purely verbal, petty-bourgeois nationalism preserves national self-interest intact, whereas proletarian internationalism demands, first, that the interests of the proletarian struggle in any country should be subordinated to the interests of the struggle on a world scale, and second, that a nation which is achieving victory over the bourgeoisie should be able and willing to make the greatest national sacrifice for the overthrow of international capital."

In the same theses Lenin also said: "The common fight will clearly show that there must be a close military and economic alliance. For otherwise the capitalists will crush and strangle us separately."

### 3. Socialism in Several Countries:

As long as the Soviet Union was the only socialist country the question of proletarian internationalism and interrelation among socialist states as enunciated by Lenin in his colonial theses was more a theoretical one without any scope for application except in the USSR. But the situation became a completely different one after 1945 with the emergence of people's democracies at first in Eastern and Central Europe and then in Asia. THE ERA OF SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY CHANGED INTO AN ERA OF SOCIALISM IN SEVERAL COUNTRIES, and with this change the very approach to the question of proletarian internationalism changed in its scope and depth and more so due to the dissolution of the Communist International in 1943. Had there been the Communist International and the communist parties of the world as sections of the International and under the international discipline of world democratic centralism as was before 1943, such deep complications would not have arisen. The understanding of the root of modern revisionism and Leninism in the concrete historical period lies in the understanding of the CHANGE. The objective basis of "CONVERTING THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT FROM A NATIONAL DICTATORSHIP INTO AN INTERNATIONAL ONE" as Lenin envisaged in his Colonial Theses emerged with the emergence of socialism in several countries together with "the deep rooted petty-bourgeois national prejudices "looming ever larger" as Lenin had foreseen.

Herein lies the socio-political roots of proletarian internationalism in the era of socialism in several countries, on the one hand and of modern revisionism, on the other. The activities of Stalin in the post-1945 period and the activities in opposition to Stalin in the communist movement should be judged by the task of converting towards or not converting the national dictatorship of one country into an international one in the era of socialism in several countries. This fundamental and dominating issue was straight and clear.

What was the dominating central issue before the proletarians of all countries and the international communist movement, especially for the newly emerged socialist countries, when the historical situation was thus changed? The dominating central issue was no longer the building of socialism in one country, singly and independently under the dictatorship of the proletariat of a single country - but the conversion of the dictatorship of the proletariat of the single country into an international one for restoration of the ruined productive forces of all the socialist countries for ensuring the wellbeing of the people, for pointedly confronting the imperialist powers militarily, economically, politically and diplomatically. These tasks cannot be fulfilled without the closest possible alliance.

Modern revisionism and Marxism-Leninism, in this concrete historical period, can only be determined and distinguished by this standard.

For the realization of this historic mission, the following tasks were urgent:

- (a) Revival and re-construction of the Communist International as the guiding centre for leading the international communist movement and building socialism internationally as a world socialist system so that a decisive influence could be exerted in world politics and economics as a whole.
- (b) Formation of an international economic organization involving all socialist countries so that the process of a common plan on the basis of closer unity for an integrated socialist economy regulated collectively by the socialist countries could be started.
- (c) Through the working of this process, at a certain stage of the development a situation will emerge when the federation of the socialist countries and international dictatorship of the proletariat will be a reality as Lenin and the Communist International had envisaged.

#### 4. The formation of the Cominform

Though with the emergence of people's democratic regimes in several countries an objective basis for the creation of a federation of all socialist countries and the international dictatorship of the proletariat was there, the subjective condition for such a thing was lagging far behind because of (a) the dissolution of the Communist International and the cause of dissolution as stated by the Executive Committee of the Communist International (b) independence and sovereignty of the communist parties; (c) growth of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalism inside the communist parties,

including the Communist Party of the Soviet Union due to the very nature of the patriotic war of independence and freedom against fascism and for the restoration of bourgeois democratic rights; (d) Non-Leninist application of the united-front tactics in the anti-fascist united-front with the Social Democrats. So, Stalin had to take a very cautious step towards the revival and reconstruction of the Communist International. Instead of directly reviving and reconstituting the Communist International Stalin proposed the formation of a co-ordinating centre of a few communist parties. Thus the Communist Information Bureau or Cominform was formed in September, 1947. Andrei Zhdanov, on behalf of the CPSU (B), in his opening speech said among other things:

"In these four years that have elapsed since the dissolution of the Comintern, the communist parties have grown considerably in strength and influence in nearly all the countries of Europe and Asia.

"But the present position of the communist parties has its draw backs. Some comrades understood the dissolution of the Comintern to imply elimination of all ties, of all contracts between the fraternal communist parties, BUT EXPERIENCE HAS SHOWN THAT SUCH MUTUAL ISOLATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES is wrong harmful and in point of fact UNNATURAL. (We draw the attention of the readers to the word "UNNATURAL"). The communist movement develops within the national framework, but there are tasks and interests common to the parties of various countries. We RATHER GET A CURIOUS STATE OF AFFAIRS There can be no doubt that if this situation were to continue IT WOULD BE FRAUGHT WITH THE MOST SERIOUS CONSEQUENCES TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORK OF THE FRATERNAL PARTIES. The need for mutual consultation and voluntary co-ordination of action between individual parties has become practically urgent at the present juncture when continued isolation may lead to a slackening of mutual understanding and at times EVEN TO SERIOUS BLUNDERS."

A resolution was passed in the first meeting of the newly formed Cominform stating: "The meeting considered that the absence of contact between parties attending the meeting, in the present situation, a serious shortcoming. Experience has shown that such dissociation amongst communist parties is wrong and harmful. The need for an exchange of experience and voluntary co-ordination of the various parties is particularly urgent at the present time, when the post-warinted and the DISSOCIATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES MAY BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE WORKING CLASS".

This was how the opening speech of Zhdanov and the resolution of the Cominform criticized in unmistakable terms the adverse effect of the dissolution of Communist International in 1943.

It may be noted that Yugoslavia and its communist party also joined in this meeting and supported the resolution of the Cominform. It may also be noted that in the meeting of the Cominform the Yugoslav party criticized the French and Italian communist parties for their reformist mistakes and both the parties accepted the criticism of the Yugoslav party in Bolshevik manner. Tito and Yugoslav did not at that time consider its criticism as

interference in the internal affairs of other parties. This also showed that the Cominform was not a mere post office to receive and dispatch information from and to its constituents.

The organ of the Cominform *For the Lasting Peace*, virtually became the organ of the international communist movement guiding and co-ordinating again the activities of the world communists. Once again the communists of the world took steps to be really proletarian internationalists.

### 5. The Yugoslav Question

The Yugoslav question is to be studied in this background. After a bout of correspondence between the CPSU (B) and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, when it became clear that the Yugoslav party is not willing to rectify itself and when on June 28, 1948 the Yugoslav party did not attend the meeting of the Cominform – held in Rumania, in spite of prior notice, it was expelled from the ranks of Cominform and the world communist movement for its persistence in its anti-Marxist-Leninist stand and its adoption of bourgeois nationalist standpoint on the question of ideology, politics and organisation, renouncing and denouncing proletarian internationalism and international discipline of democratic centralism.

At a time when the question of building socialism internationally became imperative and urgent the communist party of Yugoslavia not only raised the question of building socialism independently and singly on the basis of self-reliance but also raised the question of the right of Cominform in interfering into the affairs of Yugoslavia thus advocating the "national road" to communism. This was the main and fundamental issue and this paper has dealt with this issue in detail quoting from Lenin's *Colonial thesis* and other works. This time, we will quote some more relevant passages on 'non-interference in internal affairs of other countries' and how Lenin has dealt with it calling it social-democratic practice. On this question Lenin said:

"Comrade Ramsay says: 'Please let us British communists decide this question for ourselves'. What would the international be like if every little group came and said: 'some of us are in favour of one thing and some of us are against, leave it to us to decide the question ourselves'? What would be the use, of having an International, a congress and all this discussion".

We must say in general, what are the right tactics to be pursued. Elsewhere, in the same speech:

"But we cannot say that this question only concerns Britain. **THAT WOULD BE COPYING THE WORST HABITS OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL.**" (Lenin: "Role of Communist Party" Vol. 31, Emphasis added).

And further, "The method of the old International (the Second International) was to refer such questions to be decided by the separate parties in the countries concerned. **THAT**

WAS FUNDAMENTALLY WRONG. It is quite possible that we are not fully aware of the conditions prevailing in this or that party, BUT WHAT WE ARE DEALING WITH HERE is the principle underlying the tactics of the communist party. This is very important and we, in the name of the Third International, MUST CLEARLY STATE HERE THE COMMUNIST POINT OF VIEW". (Lenin: Affiliation to British Labour Party". Vol. 31, Emphasis added).

That is the point. The world party of communists must deal with the "principle underlying the tactics of the communist party" and "must clearly state the communist point of view". Otherwise, proletarian internationalism would either be a hollow one or adulterated with bourgeois nationalism.

We have dealt with the fundamental question of Yugoslav issue. The issues dealing with the expulsion of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia were many but mainly centred around the central ones of the CPY denying the sharpening of class struggle in the period of building socialism, of pursuing a conciliatory policy to the kulaks by allowing private plots of land and hiring of labour, of refusing to nationalise the land, of proposing a liquidationist attitude to the party by wishing to submerge it within the broad mass of people's front, of proposing the revisionist doctrine of 'national roads to socialism' and for refusing to accept fraternal criticism from the Information Bureau and its constituent parties. All these things will be found in the correspondence between the CPSU (B) and the CPY and in the resolutions of the Cominform but the ideological and political implication of these changes will not be understood if the fundamental issue in the period of socialism in several countries, as envisaged by Lenin is not understood. After the fundamental issue is understood one can independently judge:

Who was right and Marxist-Leninist – Cominform under the leadership of Stalin or Yugoslavia under the leadership of Tito.