

# THE ANTI-MARXIST CONTENT OF «SELF-ADMINISTRATIVE SOCIALISM»

by OMER HASHORVA

**The entire theory and practice of «self-administrative socialism», both in form and in content, is a falsification and open negation of the Marxist-Leninist theory of scientific socialism, a distortion of the true ideas of Marx and Lenin about socialism which revives the old anarchist ideas and theories of Proudhon and Bakunin, of the «Worker's Opposition» and other opportunists, presenting these old anti-Marxist and anti-socialist ideas as «something new in the workers' movement»**

AT THE 7TH CONGRESS OF THE PLA, COMRADE ENVER HOXHA STRESSED THAT YUGOSLAV REVISIONISM, WHICH IS ONE OF THE CHIEF CURRENTS OF MODERN REVISIONISM, REMAINS A CONSTANT DANGER, JUST AS BEFORE, BECAUSE IT OFFERS READY-MADE ANTI-MARXIST AND ANTI-SOCIALIST CONCEPTS AND PRACTICES TO ALL REVISIONISTS, OPPORTUNISTS AND OTHER RENEGADES OF EVERY KIND, WHO EMBARK ON THE ROAD OF BETRAYING MARXISM-LENINISM, THE REVOLUTION AND SOCIALISM. FIRST THE KHRUSHCHEVITES AND TOGLIATISTS AND THEN OTHER REVISIONISTS AND OPPORTUNISTS HAVE DRAWN AND ARE STILL DRAWING THEIR INSPIRATION FROM YUGOSLAV REVISIONISM. YUGOSLAV REVISIONISM STILL REMAINS, ALSO, A FAVOURITE WEAPON IN THE HANDS OF THE INTERNATIONAL IMPERIALIST BOURGEOISIE IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE REVOLUTION, SOCIALISM AND THE LIBERATION MOVEMENTS.

Therefore, while concentrating its struggle first of all against Soviet Khrushchevite revisionism, as the main and most dangerous trend of modern revisionism, at the same time, our Party has continued its principled struggle against Yugoslav revisionism, too,

OMER HASHORVA — *Pedagogue at the «V. I. Lenin» Party School.*

in order to expose its anti-Marxist and anti-socialist theories and practices, and this it will continue in the future. In particular, the Party and comrade Enver Hoxha have exposed and will continue to expose the demagoguery of the Yugoslav revisionists in connection with the so-called «self-administrative socialism», which is being

advertized with increasing vigour both by the Yugoslav revisionists themselves, as well as by the other modern revisionists and opportunists in order to disorganize the Marxist-Leninist forces and the genuine revolutionary forces of the world.

\* \* \*

Yugoslav revisionism was prepared as a special political and ideological agency of US and British imperialism back in the period of the Second World War. After the war, masquerading as «socialists» and «communists», the Yugoslav revisionists assumed the role of the «Trojan horse» and the «fifth column» in the ranks of the socialist countries and the international communist movement in

order to undermine and destroy socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat from within, by means of sabotage, espionage, and plots. However thanks to the vigilance and the firm, principled struggle waged by J. V. Stalin and the Inform Bureau, by the PLA and comrade Enver Hoxha, the Yugoslav revisionists were publicly exposed and unmasked as traitors to Marxism-Leninism and socialism, as an agency of imperialism.

After this, continuing their role as the political and ideological agency of imperialism, in conformity with the new conditions, the Yugoslav revisionists formulated and brought out a whole system of anti-Marxist revisionist views, as a means of diversion against Marxism-Leninism, socialism and the revolution. To this end, in order to fight and discredit true socialism, the Yugoslav revisionists began to advertize the construction in their country of their «specific socialism» which, dressed up in Marxist phraseology, they opposed to scientific socialism.

The essence of all the theorizing about «specific socialism» is the anti-Marxist idea that there cannot be just one socialism, but that in different countries and periods there can be various «kinds» of socialism. Deliberately misusing the correct Marxist-Leninist thesis of applying Marxism-Leninism in a creative manner to the specific conditions of each country and distorting this thesis, the Yugoslav revisionists allege that there are no universal laws for the construction of socialism common to all countries, that each country may build socialism according to its own desires and so on.

In fact, Marxism-Leninism teaches us that there is only one socialism. At all times and in every place, it is built on the basis of universal laws and principles, which are always the same and common to all countries, regardless of the specific conditions of each country. Such fundamental issues as ensuring the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party, the defence

and constant strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the hegemonic role of the working class, the liquidation of capitalist ownership and the establishment of socialist ownership over the means of production, the building of socialism on the basis of the consistent waging of the class struggle, the strengthening of the alliance of the working class and the cooperativist peasantry, the organization and management of the economy in a planned and centralized way on the basis of the principle of democratic centralism, etc., are laws and principles indispensable for all countries which embark on the road to socialism, are laws of a universal character which recognise no national boundaries. Naturally, despite the unity of principal features and laws, in the construction of socialism in different countries, it must be born in mind that the form, methods and rates of construction of socialism may differ in conformity with the concrete conditions of each country, but always acting on the basis of these laws and never negating them, as the Yugoslav revisionists are doing in fact.

At the beginning of the 50's, Yugoslav revisionists, concretizing their anti-Marxist idea of «specific socialism», declared to the world that they were renouncing the «state socialist system» which they had been implementing up till that time, because they had allegedly discovered a new kind of «socialism», the so-called «system of self-administrative socialism». In fact, the essence of the «self-administrative socialism» of the Yugoslav revisionists is the idea that allegedly socialism cannot be built by concentrating the means of production in the hands of the socialist state, creating the state property as the property of the entire people and as the highest form of socialist property, but by fragmenting the socialist state property into the property of separate groups of workers, who allegedly administer it directly themselves, while at the same time, giving up centralized and plan-

ned-state management of the economy, under the pretext that such a thing inhibits and restricts the democracy of the masses and allegedly leads inevitably to the development of bureaucracy of the socialist state. It is precisely this «kind of socialism», to which they have attached the label of «self-administrative socialism», that the Yugoslav revisionists present as «the best way to express the true socialist relations of production», as «the highest form of socialist ownership» and as «direct democracy in production», etc. The Yugoslav revisionists allege that this is the only kind of socialism truly based on the authentic ideas and teachings of Marx and Lenin, while they label as «Stalinist dogmatic socialism», as «state bureaucratic socialism», and so on, that socialism which is genuinely based and built on the foundation of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, on what Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin really taught.

The entire theory and practice of «self-administrative socialism», both in form and in content, is a falsification and open negation of the Marxist-Leninist theory of scientific socialism, a distortion of the true ideas of Marx and Lenin about socialism which revives the old anarchist ideas and theories of Proudhon and Bakunin, of the «Workers' Opposition» and other opportunists, presenting these old anti-Marxist and anti-socialist ideas as «something new in the workers' movement».

Marx and Lenin consistently defended the idea that the socialist state, the dictatorship of the proletariat, must concentrate all the main means of production in its own hands, transforming them into state property, into the property of the entire people, which is the highest form of socialist property, which it manages and administers on behalf and in the interests of all the working people in a centralized and planned manner. They combatted the Proudhonist views on «the workers' self-administration» and the «workers' factories», condemning them as anar-

chist ideas. In the Manifesto of the Communist Party, Marx and Engels, emphasized that «The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, that is, of the proletariat organized as a ruling class...» (K. Marx – F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. I, 1975 ed. p. 42). Similarly, Lenin waged a stern struggle against the anarcho-sindicalist views of the anti-party group, the «Workers' Opposition», which were expressed in the first years of Soviet power. This group, like the Yugoslav revisionists today, supported the idea of handing over factories to the workers, and of production being organized and directed not by the Soviet state under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, but by a so-called «congress of producers», as a representative of individual groups of working people. In criticizing these views, V. I. Lenin stressed that «from the theoretical standpoint, such views are fundamentally wrong, being in complete opposition to Marxism and communism» (V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 32, p. 283).

Thus, the theoretical arguments in support of «self-administrative socialism» are not Marxist. On the contrary, they constitute a variant of the ideas of syndicalists and anarchists raised to an official line and a dominant ideology in a country where the revisionists are in power, as is the case with Yugoslavia. And in fact, the Yugoslav revisionists are the greatest champions of anarchism in the world today.

In overt opposition to Marxism-Leninism, the theoreticians of «self-administrative socialism» preach that in this kind of «socialism» the role of the communist party must be merely ideological. The Party must not be the leadership in the economy, the state and the organizations of the masses and neither must it be involved in the question of cadres. The Yugoslav revisionists try to support their open

negation of the leading role of the communist party in the building of socialism, its transformation into a mere «ideological» and «orientating factor», with the argument that allegedly leadership by the party is incompatible with the truly decisive role of the producer masses, who, according to the Yugoslav revisionists, must exercise their political influence directly and not through the communist party, because otherwise the role of the party becomes a «bureaucratic despotism», which opposes the building of socialism.

These views are in open and flagrant opposition to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, for, as experience shows, it is impossible to build genuine socialism without the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party. V. I. Lenin stressed, «If the unity, strength, and the influence of the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat is weakened in the slightest, this wavering can result in nothing but the restoration of the power and property of capitalists and landowners» (V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 32, pp. 285-286).

Leadership by the Marxist-Leninist party does not hinder the decisive role of the working class. On the contrary, it is only under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party that the working class can become a conscious organized force, a decisive force, both in the revolution and in the construction of socialism. On the other hand, as comrade Enver Hoxha stresses, «... to negate the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party means to leave the working class without its leading staff, to totally disarm the working class in the interests of the bourgeoisie, to betray the working class» (Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 14, p. 262). Life itself has confirmed that it is not the ensuring of the leading role of the communist party in the state, in the economy, in the organizations of the masses, but the undermining and weakening of this role that leads inevitably to the development of

bureaucracy and degeneration of the party, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the whole socialist order. The negative experience of Yugoslavia itself, the Soviet Union, and the other former socialist countries confirms this completely. Tito himself has admitted that «the LCY has been reduced to an amorphous, apolitical organization». As a result of this, it has followed a policy disastrous to the life of the peoples of Yugoslavia. On the other hand, the positive experience of the socialist construction of our country shows clearly that the preservation and continued strengthening of the leading role of the party in all directions and fields has been and remains the main factor in the successful construction of socialism in Albania. It is true that the masses play the decisive role in the revolution and the construction of socialism, but always, in every instance, under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party.

Likewise, the preachings of the Yugoslav revisionists that allegedly «socialism and the state, socialism and state ownership, are incompatible notions», in which «the dominant role of the state in the management of the economy is only for a short time», for a «transitional», phase, which depends on «the interests of the moment», such as the narrow economic bases or the major economic difficulties, with the elimination of which the necessity for the leading and organizing role of the socialist state in the economy is also eliminated, are thoroughly anti-Marxist. Marx and Lenin teach us and the experience of the socialist construction confirms, not only that the socialist state must be maintained and constantly strengthened throughout the whole historical period of the transition from capitalism to communism, but also that its role as the organizer and manager of the state property in a centralized and planned manner must be strengthened, too. Any deviation from this fundamental principle leads to anarchist and liberal positions,

to the destruction of the dictatorship of the proletariat and degeneration of the socialist society.

During the entire period of the existence of the classes and of the class struggle, when elements of «bourgeois right without the bourgeoisie» are preserved and operate in the field of payment for work, the state ownership, as the ownership of the entire people, is the highest and leading form of the social ownership. This is precisely what makes possible and real the equal rights of the masses of the working people over the means of production, as well as the appropriation of the products, on the basis of the quantity and quality of the work done by each member of the socialist society. This equality also makes possible the establishment of genuinely socialist relations in production among the working people. On the other hand, the concentration of the means of production in the hands of the proletarian state, that is, in the hands of the working class organized as the ruling class, enables the latter to act as a hegemonic class in the entire life of the country and in all directions and fields of society. On the contrary, the fragmentation of the social property and the creation of group property, along with negation of the leading role of the state, leads, as has occurred in Yugoslavia, to splitting the working class into particular groups opposed to one another, among which competition develops, in which each group seeks to defend its own interests at the expense of the interests of the whole society and the other groups of working people. Under these conditions, the working class in Yugoslavia no longer acts as a united class in the context of the entire country, but has long since lost its role as the leading and directing class in the present-day Yugoslav society. By losing its party and state power, the working class has been transformed from a leading class in power into a class that is oppressed and exploited by the new bourgeoisie, which has concentrated all state po-

wer in its own hand and uses it as a weapon against the working class and the working masses.

In fact, the anti-state ideology of the Yugoslav revisionists is intended, on the one hand, to arouse confusion and disorientation in the ranks of the true Marxist-Leninists and revolutionaries in connection with the key problem of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine which is the question of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and, on the other hand, to conceal the degeneration of the League of the Communists of Yugoslavia into a bourgeois party, as well as the capitalist and exploiting real character of the present Yugoslav state, which, has not withered away, as the Yugoslav revisionists claim, but has been constantly strengthened as a weapon in the hands of the new Yugoslav bourgeoisie for the oppression and the exploitation of the working masses and the peoples of Yugoslavia. The aim of the Yugoslav revisionists, says comrade Enver Hoxha, is to disguise their anti-socialist and anti-Marxist «rightist» standpoints, through «leftist» slogans, such as those of workers' self-administration which they need in order to disguise the development of a special type of capitalism.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

But what sort of relations does the so-called «system of self-administrative socialism» represent in fact?

Today the Yugoslav economy, included within the «system of self-administration», appears as a collection of separate enterprises, independent of one another, which have been given complete freedom of action. These enterprises have the right to decide for themselves the volume and structure of their production, to invest capital wherever they like, to buy and sell means of production, to engage workers and to dismiss them when they are no longer required, to present their products in an independent man-

ner on the foreign and home markets, with complete freedom to set their prices according to supply and demand on the market. As well as this, each enterprise produces those things in those quantities which are profitable to it, regardless of what product the society needs. The main purpose of production is profit, while the pay rates in different enterprises vary on the basis of the profit that each enterprise makes, and there is no universal standard to assess the pay of all workers according to the quantity and quality of the work done, which is the only correct principle for the distribution of the product to each individual in socialism. Thus, the relations of production which emerge on the basis of the existence of group property, are in essence, capitalist relations, relations of oppression and exploitation, although they are presented by the Yugoslav revisionists as allegedly socialist relationships.

«The economic relationships of every society,» says F. Engels, «present themselves, first of all, as **interests**» (K. Marx — F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. I, 1958 ed., p. 590). Thus, if we proceed in the evaluation of the relations in production which exist in Yugoslavia from the basis of the class criterion, that is, in whose interests this property is used and whom it serves, then it emerges that the property allegedly self administered by the separate groups of working people is a disguised form of capitalist property, and the relations of production based on it are also of a capitalist nature. This truth is clearly expressed in the appropriation of income, one aspect of which is the ratio between the workers' pay and that of managerial staff of the enterprises under self-administration a ratio which, as Tito himself admits, is one to twenty and even up to one to forty, in Yugoslavia. This means that regardless of the fact that the whole group of the working people is recognized as owning the enterprise, in fact the real owner is only the small group

of its managerial staff, because, just like the capitalist owners in the other bourgeois countries, they appropriate the unpaid labour of the working people, not only in the form of very high salaries, but also in the form of supplementary bonuses and the numerous privileges they enjoy. Thus, for example, the managerial and engineering-technical staff in the self-administered enterprises take more than 90 per cent of the bonuses distributed by the enterprises, use the means of production as they like in their own interests, and ensure large honoraries from foreign firms, with which the self-administered enterprises cooperate. The directors of self-administered enterprises have even deposited part of the large capital sums they acquire in various foreign banks. It is precisely these directors, together with the cadres of the other leading organs of the republics and the Federation, who receive even higher salaries and enjoy even greater bonuses and privileges, who constitute that new bourgeois class which lives on the unpaid labour of the working people and makes the law in Yugoslavia. Under these conditions, the relations between this new bourgeois class of bureaucrats and technocrats, on the one hand, and the masses of working people, on the other, are relations of oppression and exploitation, capitalist relations.

The Yugoslav revisionists endeavour to present «the self-administrative socialism» as the «acme of the direct democracy of the producers», which allegedly places «man in the centre of its attention», and as the «true form of the dictatorship of the proletariat». Criticizing the views on the «democracy of production» defended by Bukharin, Lenin stressed that this concept is theoretically erroneous, because, in the final analysis, any democracy serves production and is determined by production. Therefore, Lenin considered the attempt to separate «democracy of production» from any other democracy to be absurd. «Democracy of production,» he stress-

ed, «is a term which gives the opportunity for distorted interpretations. It can be understood as the negation of the dictatorship and the unified management. It can be understood as a postponement of normal democracy or as a departure from it» (V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 32, p. 80). And the Yugoslav revisionists understand «democracy of production» in precisely this way and use it for such purposes. On the other hand, it is absurd to negate the socialist state while allegedly accepting the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of «direct democracy», as the Yugoslav revisionists do. The socialist state and the dictatorship of the proletariat are identical notions. Therefore, to negate one and to accept the other, in fact, means to be against the dictatorship of the proletariat. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin always spoke about the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, about the working class organized as a ruling class, that is, organized in the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is absurd to postulate that the working class can secure the broadest and most complete democracy without the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin stressed, that democracy, is a form of state, therefore even socialist democracy cannot exist except by means of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Negation of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat is negation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and hence of democracy for the masses of working people.

In fact, although «direct democracy» for the working people is proclaimed, the constitution of Yugoslavia itself, as well as the law «on the united work», of the year 1976, proclaims in law that the leader of the enterprise and its activity is not the working class, but the director, who is absolutely free and independent in discharging his functions. The director has full authority to annul the decisions of the so-called «workers'

council», while the workers have no legal right either to choose or to demand the replacement of the director of the enterprise. Formally, «the workers' council» is proclaimed as the organ which represents and defends the interests of the working people and which enjoys a series of competences regarding the management and organization of production, but in fact the fundamental problems of self-administered enterprises, for example, the distribution of income, bonuses, the setting of wage rates, the engagement and dismissal of workers, etc. are decided by the director alone. «The workers' council», is a completely formal organ, which the Yugoslav revisionists need only in order to trumpet that in the «self-administrative system» the working class allegedly enjoys real «democracy», whereas, in fact, the «workers' council» defends and sanctions not the interests of the workers, but the will of the director, because the representatives on these «councils», being corrupted materially, politically, and ideologically, have been transformed into members of the stratum of the «workers' aristocracy» and «workers' bureaucracy», which is employed by the revisionist state power as an ideological and political agency to deceive and confuse the working class.

The fact that the directors of the enterprises and of the other central organs secure incomes that allow them to lead a life of bourgeois luxury, the fact that, owing to competition, enterprises close down and workers are thrown out on the streets, the fact that the workers are urged to chase profits, and so on, clearly indicate not the democratic character of the «self-administrative socialist system» but the lack of democracy, the existence of relations of oppression and exploitation which stem from the very basis of this so-called «socialist» system, which, in fact, is capitalist.

In Yugoslavia private ownership over the means of production exists, not only in its disguised form, as «pro-

perty administered by groups of workers», but even in its usual form and on a large scale. Private property is recognized and defended by law. Thus, the Yugoslav revisionists have issued a special law on the encouragement of private enterprises, which recognizes the right of «every citizen to found enterprises» and «to employ labour». Many among these owners, who are legally entitled to employ up to five workers, in fact, employ more than that, and secure incomes amounting to several million dinars. Thus, in Yugoslavia the private capitalist sector has become very widespread. Its development is encouraged by the state and is even defended juridically by the Yugoslav constitution, in which it is expressly stated that «private employers have the same economic and social position, the same rights and obligations as the working people in the economic and social organizations.

Yugoslav agriculture is completely dominated by small private property, which covers about 90 per cent of the arable land. The right to buy and sell land is recognized, and wage labour is used extensively in agriculture. This situation in the Yugoslav capitalist agriculture is a result of the anti-Marxist course which the Yugoslav revisionists follow towards the countryside. At first, under the pressure of the masses and in order to dupe them, the Yugoslav revisionists took some preliminary steps for the collectivization of their countryside, although, in fact, those had a thoroughly demagogic character. The Yugoslav countryside has never known even the beginnings of any socialist reform, because the so-called «zadruga» were a fraud. In fact, right from the start, the holdings of the rich peasants, the kulaks, were not touched, under the pretext that «the kulak is useful for socialism» and that the accumulations made by the kulak economies were allegedly indispensable for the construction of the so-called «self-administrative socialism» in Yugoslavia. Later,

however, the Yugoslav revisionists openly rejected the Leninist road of collectivization, labelling it as a form of «expropriation» and «impoverishment» of the peasants. Thus, even the few «zadruga» set up were destroyed on the pretext that they had not proved their superiority over the individual forms and that allegedly their establishment was a result of the «pressure of the Stalinist bureaucratic system». Nowadays, in the Yugoslav countryside there are a few agricultural cooperatives of the capitalist type, which have a purely commercial character, because their whole function is reduced to the collective use of agricultural machinery and the collective sale of agricultural products.

\*  
\*     \*

In order to disguise the reestablishment of capitalism in Yugoslavia, the Yugoslav revisionists present «the workers' self-administration» as a «new road» to the construction of the true socialist society. In reality, as comrade Enver Hoxha emphasized at the 7th Congress, «Titoite 'self-administration' has proved to be an eclectic bourgeois doctrine which has led to permanent political and ideological confusion, to weak and disproportionate economic development, to great social differentiation, to squabbles among nationalities, and the degeneration of spiritual life in Yugoslavia» (Enver Hoxha, Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA, p. 223).

The present-day reality shows that an economic-social system with all the features of capitalism prevails in Yugoslavia where anarchy and all-round stagnation reign in production and in the whole of social life. In the Yugoslav capitalist state, today, democratic centralism and the role of unified leadership by the state have been completely eliminated. A pronounced sectional, local, and individual anarchist spirit prevails everywhere. In this capitalist state all sorts

of crime are flourishing, especially theft, speculation, fraud, etc., by means of which many cadres, who have become bourgeois, have made themselves multi-millionaires. In the economic and social life of Yugoslavia today those same consequences and phenomena which are characteristic of every capitalist country are appearing, such as the anarchic and spontaneous, development of production, the disproportionate development of the various republics and branches of the economy, the continuous rise in prices and the fall in the standard of living of the working masses, and fierce competition among enterprises, which results in the shutting down every year of more than 500 of the weaker enterprises. Industry has been concentrated mainly in Slovenia and Croatia and in part of Serbia. The income per head of population in these republics is two and a half times higher than in Kosova, Macedonia, and Montenegro. Kosova remains one of the most backward regions of Yugoslavia, with a very low standard of living and pronounced backwardness in its economic and cultural development.

One of the phenomena typical of the reestablishment of capitalism in Yugoslavia is that of the crises, which are continually hitting the Yugoslav economy, just as in the other capitalist and revisionist countries. Thus, during the past 15 years, the Yugoslav economy has been hit three times by economic-financial crises, in the years 1961-1962, 1968-1969 and again over the last few years. The crises of the capitalist world are felt with their full force in Yugoslavia, too, because the economy of that country has become a constituent part of the world capitalist economic system and, consequently, it is obliged to experience all the commercial and financial troubles of the capitalist world and submit to all the business fluctuations that the big monopolies impose on their weaker partners. The Yugoslav revisionists themselves are obliged to admit from their own mouths: «our econo-

mic and social system contains in itself chronic instability of reproduction».

As a result of the anti-Marxist and anti-socialist policy pursued by the Yugoslav revisionists, the capital of the monopolies of the USA, F.G.R., France, Britain, Italy, etc., has penetrated extensively into Yugoslavia. Up to date, Yugoslavia has received 11 billion dollars in loans, which constitute the economic basis of Yugoslav revisionism. These large loans show that Yugoslavia does not have an independent economy of its own. They are also a clear and indisputable indication to refute the absurdities of opportunists who pretend that Yugoslavia is allegedly building socialism relying on its own efforts. The Yugoslav revisionists, themselves, have encouraged the penetration of foreign capital by issuing laws which facilitate foreign capital investments, abolishing the state monopoly on foreign trade, and so on. In this manner, the Yugoslav economy has been made completely dependent on foreign monopolies, which have captured the key positions in the Yugoslav economy and exploit its national riches and the labour power, thus securing large profits. The numerous credits received from the USA, which the Yugoslav revisionists try to present as though they serve the construction of socialism have a markedly enslaving character. However, to pretend that imperialism might help in the construction of socialism is an absurdity, just as «the development of Yugoslavia on the basis of self-reliance» is an even greater absurdity, when it has received more than 7 billion dollars in credits of an out-and-out enslaving character from the USA alone.

An index of the state of the Yugoslav economy is the balance of payments for the year 1976, which it closed with a loss of 18 billion dinars. The various enterprises see continual price rises as the only way out of this situation. Thus, in the years 1965-1970 the prices of mass consumption

goods went up by 35 per cent, while in the period from 1971 to 1973 they went up a further 61 per cent, and this rapid rise has continued in the recent past. During the first 8 months of the year 1977, food prices rose 18.4 per cent, while charges for services increased 13 per cent in the first 6 months of that year. Thus the people's cost of living increased 14.6 per cent in the first 8 months of 1977.

The phenomenon of unemployment is also one of the typical manifestations of the Yugoslav capitalist order. Being unable to conceal this phenomenon, the Yugoslav revisionists themselves are obliged to admit that there is mass unemployment in Yugoslavia, amounting to about one million people out of work. But, at the same time, in self-justification, they bring forward «theoretical arguments» that allegedly this unemployment results from the «modernization» of production and the «increase of the productivity of labour». Such theories are contrary to the theory and practice of the construction of genuine socialism, because one of the superiorities of the socialist order over the capitalist order is the fact that the former abolishes unemployment, this grave an inevitable ulcer of the capitalist order, once and for all. However, the unemployment in Yugoslavia has its source in the capitalist system which exists there, which cannot survive in Yugoslavia or anywhere else without the army of the unemployed, which the bourgeoisie needs as a means to exploit the labour force to the maximum by distributing it and the means of production on the basis of the action of the law of value, wherever the greatest profit is to be made. The Yugoslav bourgeoisie also uses the army of the unemployed as a means of pressure on those workers who do have jobs.

Linked with the unemployment in Yugoslavia there is another phenomenon, also with grave social consequences, namely, the mass emigration of the creative living forces. The Yu-

goslav revisionists have even given this ugly capitalist phenomenon legal sanction by approving the law on the right of Yugoslav citizens to emigrate. As a result, about 1 million 300 thousand workers, technicians and specialists have had to leave their families and their homeland to sell the strength of their muscles and brains to the German, French, Belgian, Austrian and other capitalists. The characteristic thing is that 54.5 per cent of the emigrant workers are young, under thirty years of age. This selling of workers, this traffic in human beings, is one of the ugliest aspects of the reality of the capitalist society in Yugoslavia today.

The degeneration of Yugoslavia into a capitalist country has also brought as a consequence also the sharpening of the class contradictions between the workers and the new Yugoslav bourgeoisie. On many occasions, the workers of the Yugoslav enterprises, the students and youth have risen in strikes and protests against oppression and exploitation, for the improvement of working and living conditions, against the personal enrichment and corruption of the directors of the self administered enterprises, and so on. The participants in these movements have expressed not only economic demands but also political protests, calling for «the abolition of economic and social differences», «the elimination of private enterprises», the wiping out of «political and moral corruption» and so on.

Our Party predicted long ago that revisionism would give rise in Yugoslavia to feelings of great state chauvinism within the Yugoslav Federation and towards other nations, because capitalism oppresses the peoples, exploits them and rules them by the whip. The anarchist federalism itself and the so called «new structure» which the Yugoslav revisionists have established incites conflicts between nationalities and between republics. And the truth is that in Yugoslavia, which is a federation made up of

six republics and a number of nationalities, due to the reestablishment of capitalism and the action of its savage laws, the national question has long been a very acute problem and has brought about a deep crisis. As comrade Enver Hoxha has stressed, the political scene in Yugoslavia is dominated by the «Great Serb» and the «Great Croat» clans, between which a bitter struggle for power and hegemony is going on. This struggle has become more and more acute and on many occasions has flared up openly. This is what happened in 1967 when Tito managed to eliminate the representative of the «Great Serbs», Rankovich. This is also what happened during the years 1971 to 1973, when Tito again crushed the efforts of other pro-Serbian leaders of republics to gain hegemony, etc.

Faced with the profound general national crisis, the Yugoslav leadership is using both violence and demagoguery. It has tried to present the battles for power between various bourgeois nationalist group as opposition to the interests of the working class and socialism in Yugoslavia, with the aim of avoiding any revolutionary outburst of the working class and the working masses and to win them over, in order to use them as a tool of its own hegemonic interests. To this end, this leadership has made an alleged «selfcriticism», pledging, on behalf of «socialism», that it will eliminate any «distortion» and will close the «roads» to all negative manifestations and phenomena. For the same demagogic purposes, the Yugoslav revisionists employ slogans of an alleged return to the positions of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the strengthening of the positions of the working class, of the struggle against the «class differentiation», «national inequality», against nationalism, chauvinism, separatism, etc.

However, the severe contradictions and clashes over the national question in Yugoslavia are neither accidental nor temporary. They have

their basis in the anti-Marxist ideology and policy of the Yugoslav leadership, in the very nature of the capitalist social order which has been established in Yugoslavia and the action of the savage laws of this order. Therefore, they cannot be resolved either with reforms or with demagoguery, as the Yugoslav revisionists are trying to resolve them. Their reforms for the creation of the so-called «collective presidency», etc., are intended to create the impression of the reestablishment of national equality among the peoples of Yugoslavia, while their promises to assist the backward republic have altered nothing in the Yugoslav reality. It is absurd to think that the bourgeoisie of Croatia, Serbia, etc., with strong and consolidated economic, political, ideological, and military positions, can ever voluntarily reconcile themselves to the establishment of national and social equality or to contribute voluntarily to the development of the backward regions and republics.

The tendencies of the different bourgeois groups to break away from the centre of the federation, the struggle and open conflicts for power among the most powerful groups of the Yugoslav revisionist bourgeoisie, are unavoidable fellow-travellers of the economic and social order that exists in Yugoslavia, because they originate from its capitalist nature. The LCY and its revisionist leadership are themselves the representatives and defenders of the interests of the new bourgeois class. They themselves are the bearers and transmitters of nationalism and chauvinism, of the enmity among nations and to blame for the backwardness of some of them. Therefore, the national question in Yugoslavia cannot be solved by means of reforms and promises within the framework of the capitalist order. The national problem, as Marxism-Leninism teaches us, can be solved only in the conditions of genuine socialism and only on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist principles on the national question. The hegemonic and

chauvinist policy followed by the Yugoslav revisionists, the national feuds and national oppression, the unequal development of the various peoples of the Yugoslav Federation, and other facts, clearly demonstrate the falsity of the views of various revisionists and opportunists who are trying to present Yugoslavia as a model of the solution of the national question, allegedly on the basis of the Marxist-Leninist principles.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

The present situation in Yugoslavia completely confirms the correctness of the predictions of the Party of Labour of Albania, which long ago foresaw where the anti-Marxist and anti-socialist line of the Yugoslav revisionist leadership would lead Yugoslavia. As comrade Enver Hoxha said at the 7th Congress of the PLA, standing loyal to the interests of the revolution and socialism and the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, «our Party will fight in the future, as it has always done, to expose the deceptive nature of the Yugoslav variety of revisionism and the danger it presents» (Enver Hoxha, Report to the 7th Congress of the PLA, p. 224).