

## Communist Party of Greece (marxist-leninist)

Vassilis Samaras

### **50 years from the 20th Congress of CPSU 40 years from the GPCR: A “current” political issue**

---

Published: 2006 [http://www.kkemi.gr/english/resolutions/samaras\\_50\\_40years.htm](http://www.kkemi.gr/english/resolutions/samaras_50_40years.htm)

Transcription, Editing and Markup: Sam Richards and Paul Saba

Copyright: This work is in the Public Domain under the [Creative Commons Common Deed](#). You can freely copy, distribute and display this work; as well as make derivative and commercial works. Please credit the Encyclopedia of Anti-Revisionism On-Line as your source, include the url to this work, and note any of the transcribers, editors & proofreaders above.

---

#### **50 years from the 20th Congress of CPSU, 40 years from the GPCR A current” political issue**

It has been 50 years since the 20th Congress of CPSU and 40 years since the waging of the GPCR in China. The first marked the overthrow of the revolutionary, communist direction in the Soviet Union, the reverse of the socialist construction, and the opening of the way for the complete capitalist restoration. It was the sealing of the negative development that was already being conducted in the Soviet Union, the negative forming of the balance of power in the soviet state, the CPSU, the soviet society and the negative, in final analysis, outcome of class struggle in the Soviet Union.

The latter marked the struggle of the Chinese communists, who, based on the experience of the development in the Soviet Union and everything that was taking place in China, tried to prevent a similar development. It was their glorious attempt with Mao Zedong to solve in a revolutionary, communist way the problems that had already been posed; to open new ways, to give new revolutionary impetus both in the field of the socialist building in China and overall to the communist movement.

They were two very significant developments that, although moving to diametrically opposite directions, concerned the same issue. It was the issue of the capitalist restoration in the former socialist countries, or, according our view, the issue of the problems posed by the transition from capitalism to socialism.

There are many aspects and various ways to deal with this issue. We deal with it as a political problem; as a "current" political issue and from the aspect posed today by the demands of class struggle. It also includes many aspects and many specific issues. In this text we cannot set them forth in a complete way. We will simply refer to them sententiously, because they comprise the framework in which the issue we will deal with, functions.

We'll deal with this issue from the aspect of the necessity to overthrow the consequences of the defeat; the people's frustration, inactiveness and defeatism. To overthrow the concept that capitalism is a one way street. It is also necessary to restore the envisagement for another society in people's consciousness and promote the socialist perspective as the only real way out for their struggle. For this envisagement plays a uniting and advancing role for the movement.

It is also necessary for the working class to be organized "as a class for itself" and in dialectical relation with the reconstruction of the communist movement on the ground of the current demands.

This reconstruction will be done firstly and mainly in the field of class struggle; on the ground of the current contradictions and tendencies that are born, of the forces that are being formed. If we don't participate actually and as vanguard in this struggle we cannot "answer" anything and nothing will be really built. On the other hand even this reconstruction cannot be completed and therefore the struggle cannot develop to the levels that are required without persuasive answers to the crucial questions that have been set forth.

This aspect includes both the necessity to defend the contribution of the communist movement and socialism and to explain the restoration of capitalism. We will deal with the latter here. Everybody has noticed that the system's forces and other "willing" persons are systematically waging a slandering campaign against the communist movement and socialism. Their concern isn't the past. This campaign aims to the present period. The capitalist system wants to "delete" history, but not because it wants to put it "corrected" in its library. It wants to use it - distorted - against the working class and the peoples today.

The system tries to "delete from history and the people's memory (many of their gains), because it wants (today) to abolish the rights of the workers that were based on those gains.

It was the struggle of the working communist movement that paved the way for the entrance of the masses in history's front stage and raised them to the subject of the overall development. The system wants to "delete" from history (this development) because it wants to bring back the peoples in the situation of being an inactive mass, unable to react against exploitation and oppression.

The connection of the masses struggle with the perspective of the socialist way out unified their struggle and gave to it the maximum advancing power. The system is trying to prevent this very

reconnection in order to prolong a situation where the resistance of the masses will be expressed divided, powerless and harmless for the system.

The struggle of the organized, working, communist, revolutionary movements reached the point [of overthrowing] (to overthrow) the rule of the system and seizing the power. It is precisely this catalytic fact the system's advocates want to "delete" from history, to "exorcise" this threat. They want to present the system as invulnerable and unassailable because they know quite well how vulnerable and assailable it is.

The working communist movement proceeded to building another society. It brought "utopia" to reality. It confirmed its existence with a series of gains in favour of the people. It proved in practice that there is an alternative to capitalism. This slandering campaign is striving to delete this very perspective because they want to present capitalism as a one way street and the people's struggle as a dead end.

The working communist movement was the greatest threat, emerging in history, against the peoples' oppressors, the ruling privileged classes. It is a spectre they try in vain to exorcise because it is their policy that gives it substance again.

That is why they rage against it.

That is why they relentlessly continue to "damn" and slander; Marx, for founding the connection of the working movement with the socialist-communist ideology, Lenin for leading the revolution that overthrew their rule, Stalin for establishing the first socialist state and Mao for leading the revolution in China and attempting to pave the way to the future with the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

### **The relentlessness of class struggle**

The issue we are concerned with here is the capitalist restoration in the former socialist countries. In other words, it is about the problems created by the attempt to build socialism and the way these problems were faced. Many things have been said about this, but we will deal with the views of the system's advocates. First of all, they claim that socialism "failed". They say it was "wrong" and "utopian" attempt from the very beginning. Socialism was a system that was proved "criminal". It is certain that for the system's advocates every activity against capitalism and imperialism is a "crime"; every activity against exploitation, oppression and imperialist interventions.

We will try to present some basic elements of our evaluation.

From a general point of view, we have to study the conditions of the negative outcome of class struggle in these countries.

It was a class struggle initiated within the frames of capitalism; it went on in the stage of the initial socialist transformations and during the whole consecutive transitional period. From this point of view, it's no use discussing "mistakes", the "non correct implementation of the theory", if it could "have been done otherwise" or even the "aspiration" which is nothing but an attempt to obscure things. The history and the class struggle within its frames have been conducted in a certain way and it cannot be "forgotten". There is also no point in studying them in terms of "ideal" models or other obsessions or even supposed theoretical and ideological prescriptions. Our "object" is socialism as it existed, the class struggle as it was materialized and the history as it was conducted. This "real" study gives us both the given facts and the evaluation criteria despite any obsession.

Our evaluation is based largely on our estimation for the development in the former Soviet Union. At the same we consider that we should study the overall development in every former socialist country.

This class struggle, to which we refer to, developed at first within the frames of a semi-feudal, semi-capitalist country like Russia in the beginning of the 20th century.

The working class, the poor peasantry, the soldiers and the sailors with the leadership of the Bolshevik party and based on the Leninist revolutionary strategy overthrew the system and seized the power.

The same social and political forces continued to be the bearers of class struggle that went on during the period that followed against the bourgeois and feudal forces that continued resisting.

Through this struggle the revolutionary forces stabilized the soviet socialist power and advanced to the initial socialist transformations of the economic, social and political structure. The social base of revolution was the working-agrarian alliance and the political leading force was the Bolshevik party. To these forces were added later the -according Stalin "working intellect"- the known "red experts".

It was a new social category whose members originated from the people and who, for the initial period, contributed decisively to the implementation of the initial socialist transformations and to facing serious problems of the soviet state. On the other hand, during the same period and as a result of that struggle and those transformations there was the ostracism, the elimination of the "old" bourgeoisie, and the economic, social and political forms through which it had survived until then.

Generally we could say that the class struggle was conducted successfully during this period also and that the socialist social and political forces fulfilled successfully the problems set by history.

Naturally there were problems, shortcomings and insufficiencies that revealed their negative consequences and effect during the right next period. The elimination of the "old" bourgeoisie didn't mean at all that the contradictions and the disputes of the socialist society had been eliminated. It didn't mean that the problems originated from these contradictions had been eliminated; it didn't mean the end of class struggle which simply was taking different forms.

This class struggle continued in the next stage; in terms of new contradictions and disputes and with new forces fighting through them with a new order of forces and new forms.

The new social contradiction existed from the previous period but it was hypotonic and its form had not developed. Later it would get intensified and acquire features of class contradiction. It is the contradiction where on one side there is the working class, the poor peasantry and the people's masses and on the other there is the intelligentsia ("working intellect"), who had been formed in a social stratum and demanded a specific role and privileges for them and in the end they demanded the rule.

### **The overthrow of the balance of power in the soviet society**

We need to clarify one thing. The existence of those contradictions and disputes of the socialist society did not originate from some "mistakes" of the leadership. They did not originate, as it has been said, from the economic backwardness of the first country in which socialism was attempted to be built. Their existence was generated by objective conditions of the historical development and they would exist - in various forms and scale- in any country socialism would be attempted. In this sense the existence of the social category of the "working intellect" wasn't a "mistake". Actually, these people (the "red experts") initially played a positive role in building socialism, before this role started reversing.

The problem was in the way this development was faced or in which conditions the shift of the "metacenter" of the soviet society from the working class to intelligentsia occurred.

We believe that the gradual "deactivation" of the working class in regards with the role it played until then was a basic negative development and a decisive factor for everything that happened afterwards. The working class during this whole period; before, during and after the revolution was the concrete social base and the basic mass and active factor for the advance of the revolutionary process and the socialist transformation later. It was not only the reference field and support of every decision but it was also the force that had a decisive role and word in their formation and promotion.

In process, though, this way of functioning started slackening. All the more the working class was deactivated regarding its political role, all the more the authority shifted from the working class to other organs and forces of the soviet society (party, state etc). It was this deactivation, this shift that put "hors de combat" the most fundamental, the most decisive factor of support of the revolutionary direction in the process of the socialist society's transformation.

There was a similar development in regards with the function and the role of the party. The Bolshevik party existed as a party that was built and functioned in an all-out dialectic relation with the working class and the people's masses in the most substantial way. Its internal political function was similar from the ground up. These were fundamental factors, based on which it managed to develop its potential to the highest level and play a decisive role in the revolutionary process.

From a certain point on this relation and function started slackening and therefore its role declined. We need to clarify some things because there are many misunderstandings regarding this issue. We think that the aforementioned were functions that concerned the whole of the party. Later, the conditions of a "separation" were formed. It was a separation between the broad base of the party and its leadership. It was a leadership that less and less functioned based on its party characteristic and all the more as state staff. Actually, we didn't have - as it has been said by many - the submission of the state to the party. It was the co-optation of the party (its leadership) by the state. This development negated the dialectic relation between class and party.

Still the picture is not complete. Based on objective given facts and the concrete conditions of the period there was a concentration of authority in the state. This was objective but it was also a problem. The state as an organism isn't something subsistent. It is built, exists and functions in regards and in service of social forces. The soviet state was built by the working class and functioned in regards with it. As the working class was deactivated, the tendency of shifting and concentrating authorities in the state mechanism was consolidating. As this process proceeded, the role of the intelligentsia was consolidated and the role and the character of the state changed. It was about an overall process of shifting the authority through the party to the state and through the state to the intelligentsia. It was a change in the character of the state. From a state of the working class it became the state of the social stratum of intelligentsia.

At the same time and objectively it contributed resolutely to another development. The state was the "meeting" field of the various parts of the intelligentsia which were being formed in the various sections and functions of the soviet society. They were the economic section, the state, the party leadership, the other various organs etc. In this field, largely of different origins (experience and concept) parts of the intelligentsia unified, merged and acquired a consciousness of common interests; they formed common concepts and in the end they got a common (revisionist) ideology.

The -existing- disputes even contradictions between the two basic wings of revisionism (and the emerging New Bourgeoisie) did not negate their unification on a class basis against the working class.

This development started acquiring substance during the '30s and it was consolidated during war; particularly when the war was about to end and the perspective of the great victory and the consolidation of the Soviet Union as a world superpower started getting shaped. This perspective affected in consolidating all the tendencies -chauvinist, Russian- that wanted to get rid of the commitments and the obstacles the communist ideology was putting to their aspirations. Thus there was a shift of the soviet society metacenter from the working class (working-agrarian alliance) to the new leading social stratum of the intelligentsia.

It was a stratum that had increasingly acquired a consciousness of common interests and by forming a particular, its own ideology (revisionist) it was organized in order to fight the revolutionary communist wing of CPSU.

The latter having Stalin in charge, reacted to this whole development, but the way they faced the issue as a whole was not sufficient to overthrow a direction already taken.

The revisionists made manoeuvres, avoided a frontal confrontation while Stalin was alive and waged their final attack after Stalin's death.

### **Conditions and reasons of the problem**

Regarding the conditions and the reasons for such a development, we might distinguish between the objective and the subjective ones, despite that such a distinction is not always "safe" or it may even include elements of subjectivism.

The passage from one, social, economic system to another was never and it will never be a "moment" in history. As it was proved in the historical development it may last even for centuries; from the slaveholding society to feudalism and from feudalism to capitalism. Even today there are serious survivals of feudal forms in many parts of earth and there are even - insignificant but existing- survivals of archaic society forms. Therefore the passage from capitalism to socialism could not (or cannot) be done at once. It will also last for a historical period although we cannot define how long.

The other basic condition of the problem is the fact that the socialist -communist, productive, economic, social etc relations have "to be built from scratch", as Stalin said.

This is an objective problem and it is linked with the way capitalism functions, which socialism succeeds after overthrowing it. It is a problem that capitalism didn't face or faced in

a smaller scale, when it succeeded feudalism. This originated from the different way of function of the feudal and the capitalist system. The bourgeoisie, even within the frames of the feudal system had the ability to form -up to a certain point- capitalist relation of production. Despite that, capitalism required a few centuries in order to prevail completely and then again not all over the planet. On the contrary, within the frames of capitalism it's impossible to create, in any scale, socialist relations of production, based on its functioning way and the role—directly active—of the bourgeoisie in the productive-economic process. It is obvious that the working class by seizing the power would not be able to transform immediately, totally and completely the relations of production and give them their "final" communist character.

In connection with the aforementioned, there is a respective in degree and character organizing of the working class. The working class is being organized within the frames of the capitalist system as a social and political force able to overthrow capitalism and take away the rule from the bourgeoisie; to smash the economic, social and political base of the bourgeoisie rule, to rise as a leading social and political force, to proceed to the initial basic socialist transformation of the economic and political structure. Only these transformations were not—and they couldn't be—in that level in order to express the full, overall rule of the working in the productive, economic section and in every form and expression of the economic and social life.

This relation of things determines the need for a transitional period. It is about a period, during which the relations of production can and should be transformed constantly in a communist direction. It is a process that can develop only in a dialectic relation with the correspondent development of the ability of the working class, its decisive role in every field and expression of the social life; from production to ... culture. This process can be neither short nor a "technical" political problem or an issue of scheduling. Largely it is a problem of class struggle which goes on during the historic period of transition from capitalism to socialism, before and after seizing (the) power.

These stood and stand for every attempt of socialist building in every country. We should also count the specific conditions in which this socialist building was attempted in Russia. It was the encirclement that created suffocating conditions, the threats it faced and the economic backwardness. The fact that the socialist building faced many times contradicting needs under great pressure. It was a situation that imposed choices other than ones they would have preferred under different circumstances and usually they didn't have enough "time to test" (and therefore to change) the various options.

### **Subjective conditions and limits of the issue**

From a subjective aspect the working communist movement was prepared to some extent to face the problems that would be set forth in a process. The movement was ready to face basically the issues that class struggle had "prepared" it within the frames of the capitalist system. That is the overthrow of the bourgeois capitalist rule. It was also the implementation later of the initial, basic transformation of socialist character and orientation. It was ready to face the bourgeoisie in these successive stages as it knew it and as it could "recognize" it in its effort to survive later.

It was not prepared, in the necessary degree, to face the problems that occurred later and during the transitional period. It was not prepared to face what emerged based on the transformation the movement implemented. In other words it was not prepared to "take on" (fight) its own creation.

Certainly there were theoretical views that prepared for the new problems that would occur. It was Marx's view that socialism would not be built based on a concrete model. It was the view of the continuance of class struggle during the transitional period. It was Lenin's view that the future forms could not be pre-determined etc.

These views objectively didn't have and couldn't have the full supervision and consequently the respective degree of studying the problems that would emerge in the following period. Similarly they couldn't lead to views with a respective degree of elaboration and assimilation by the movement and their substantial embodiment in the political program and its practice.

A basic problem that emerged in this way was facing the transitional period as a relevantly short "political" period. During this period the dictatorship of the proletariat regime could complete the socialist transformation and drive to communism.

This concept was corresponding - and it was sufficient - to face the problems of the first stage, the initial socialist transformation, but it was not corresponding to the next period. As it had been proved in history, the transitional period would last long and the ways and the forms necessary and useful during the first period turned into negative factors in the new changing conditions.

Specifically; the concept for a transitional period that would be a short "political" period fed a concept where the steps to communism could be more or less planned. We don't mean the necessity to determine goals, to plan the activity of various subjects, the 3-year and 5-year plans etc. We question the possibility to "plan history" and the concepts and practice that affected or were determined by such logic.

A basic expression of this logic was in the way, the role of the party, the state and in general of the "subjects" was faced during this course. If this history could be planned, this meant that some organs (subjects) can realize (plan-lead) this program. Thus the tendency of consolidating the role of the party, the state and the mechanism acquired a theoretical basis.

But these subjects (like everything else) were not "outside and above" of this historical process and the class struggle conducted within its frames. They were within it, they were affected by it and they were formed by this influence.

At the same time, it was not understood in time, substantially and in its whole dimension and consequences the fact that such a concept and a respective practice was declining objectively the role of the working class as the basic advancing power, as the "perpetrator" of that transformation. This concept was more assigning to the working class the role of supporting-implementing this planning, the transformation that was to be realized during that "political" transitional period. From this point of view such a concept contributed in the process of deactivation and stagnation of the working class with every negative consequence.

All the aforementioned and other we didn't refer to were the basic factors that affected in shifting the metacenter of the soviet society from the working class to the mechanism, the state and in final analysis to intelligentsia having as a result the negative development we are all aware of.

### **The struggle of the communists and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution**

All this development set forth another serious issue. How did the revolutionary communist forces react to this development and how did they face it? As far as we can understand, although there is a need to study all these issues, these problems were understood, at least up to a certain point. Particularly after WW2 there was an intense confrontation (dispute) within CPSU. Stalin intervened against the chauvinist-Russian tendencies; Zdanov intervened against erroneous evaluations of the international situation etc. A series of discussions started on many issues. The most significant discussion was the one on the "economic problems of socialism". It was a discussion that within its frames, every significant issue concerning the socialist building was set forth substantially. Stalin's views, supported by Zdanov (as long as he was alive), Molotov, Malenkov and Beria seemed to prevail typically in the decisions. These views were generally to a communist direction, without saying that there weren't objections and disputes on shortcomings, errors, contradictions and insufficiencies.

But the main issue in this case was something else. These views didn't have any real support. The working class and the party itself were left out of this discussion that was conducted in high cadres-leadership level and they were "absent" from the confrontation unfolded basically in the field of mechanism. Thus the revisionists, who prevailed in the mechanism, maneuverer towards Stalin's status, "agreed" typically with his views and after his death started their attack. The rest is more or less known.

The CCP with Mao Zedong and the Labor Party of Albania with Enver Hoxha opposed this shift in the Soviet Union, and also great parts of the communist forces across the world. We

can divide this confrontation in two stages. The first stage concerns the period until the GPCR. The latter is connected with the issues and the way the GPCR did set them forth.

During the first period the confrontation concerned mainly strategy issues of the communist movement, the issue of the "peaceful transition to socialism", the peaceful co-existence, and the Stalin issue.

There was no direct questioning of the Soviet Union's socialist character and the countries under its influence. What was questioned was Khrushchev's policy, particularly regarding the issue on how the socialist camp would face imperialism -taken as a given fact that this camp existed and had this character. The m-l current built on the basis of this confrontation formulated respective ideological and political features.

The issue was set forth on a completely different basis in the second stage. The same problems that emerged in the Soviet Union emerged in China as well, obviously with the Chinese specificities. There also were similar intense "internal" disputes in the party-state, leading level. This happened until the moment Mao, having the experience of the negative development in the Soviet Union, decided to "get" the whole issue "outside"; to set it forth to the working class, to the people's masses and the youth. It was a real, a great breakthrough. The waging of the GPCR paved the way for the most advanced and hopeful movement after 1917. The issues that concerned CPSU in 1950 were set forth openly to the working class and the people on a more advanced basis. They went further. They attempted to change things in broad scale in the functioning way of many sections; in economy, in the factories, in the rural area and education. New forms and relations were created, new horizons opened.

As it is well known, the GPCR was finally defeated. Why and how it was defeated is an issue that the communists should study and get the appropriate conclusions. We will make only a few remarks, although we believe that there is a need for further study.

In this case also, the Chinese revisionists manoeuvred, retreated tactically and finally managed to "withdraw" the problem from the field of the masses; they returned it to the party, the state and the mechanism. They managed to shift the confrontation field from the masses to the mechanisms where they were stronger. Why and how the revolutionary forces permitted such a shift and their responsibility regarding this, is one of the issues the movement has to deal with, always having as criterion the induction of useful conclusions.

The fact is that in China also, after Mao's demise, the revisionists with Deng Hsiao Ping managed to prevail and orientate the development in the direction of the bourgeois restoration.

The explosion of the GPCR, the issues it had set forth and the way it did it are very important. First of all, it proved the internal dynamism of the communist ideology. It is an ideology that was not content with whatever gains, it didn't compromise with the given facts

it had created. It is always seeking ways for the ceaseless advance of the revolutionary communist case, the case of the working class and the people.

Secondly, its defeat marked the end of a development stage of the working communist movement. We don't mean that the circle is full for the communist movement as many claimed, particularly after the '89-'91 collapse. We mean the end of a period of the movement with specific features and experience. From a general point of view and according to everything we aforementioned, we consider that we are still in the historical period of the passage of humanity from capitalism to socialism.

The third given fact, connected with the GPCR is that although its defeat marked the end of a stage or a "circle" but its existence, the issues and the way it had set them forth marked the opening of new circle. It is true that it wasn't understood so much, but only for a short time. It couldn't determine the development from then until today. The initial and the prime factor lie in the fact that it was defeated. Yet there is another dimension in the issue. It is the one concerning the m-l current.

This current was organized on the basis of confronting revisionism of the initial period and based on the ideological and political features of this confrontation. Regarding the second stage, it supported the Mao Zedong tendency and the GPCR without having really studied and substantially understood the issues it had set forth. It couldn't manage to include them in its political line, as "fuel" for a revolutionary development in the new conditions. It's no coincidence that after Mao's demise and the prevailing of revisionism in China also, many m-l organizations dissolved. The ones that stood, it was because of their relation with the people and their problems; to their relation with the tradition of the communist movement and the firm foundation of class implacability they had. Even for these forces the issue of their line's development on the basis of the current demands is still open.

### **Some basic conclusions**

First of all we are still in the historical period of transition from capitalism to socialism.

During this period and during the phase that was completed the working communist movement achieved numerous and significant things. It made accomplishments, paved ways and showed the "horizon" towards which the people should move. But it didn't reach the final victory. This can be explained. In a sense and in regards with the goals it set, the communist movement "fought against the centuries". From this point of view the communists can and should be both proud and optimistic. They should be proud because they belong to a movement that has so much to offer to the people's masses and humanity. They should be optimistic because they have a lot more to offer and a lot to achieve. The latter requires some preconditions. The initial and indispensable condition is the (torchbearer) vanguards participation in class struggle today. Nothing can be built and no

role can be achieved without it. A basis precondition is the in depth criticism and self-criticism of its course. This includes two levels.

First we should short out and throw away all ideological and political rubbish from the prevailing of the revisionists and reformist forces that has blocked the movement's move.

We should study history, reach the necessary conclusions from the course of the working communist movement and the attempt of the socialist building.

We should form, in the end, the ideological, political directions and the political line, based on the needs of current reality and in combination with the lessons provided by the critical study of history.

The revolution, the overthrow of the capitalist system and the bourgeoisie rule is the initial, necessary and indispensable condition for the passage to the socialist-communist society.

The initial socialist transformations are the necessary presumptions to express this overthrow in the economic, social and political field. At the same time they are not sufficient. These transformations correspond to the given level of development and organizing of the ability of the working class, as it has been formed through its struggle against the capitalist system.

These initial conditions (revolutionary overthrow and initial transformations) are the base for the opening of a transitional period of overall and more advanced transformations to a socialist-communist direction. It is not about a short "political" period but a long term historic period of an overall social transformation, no matter how long it will last.

This move is not made according to a model that the society should adapt to. We would face it as a development of the initial socialist transformation with every contradictory element it would include.

This historical move cannot come under some total planning, some "final" transitional program. We should not confuse this issue with the necessary political programs, plans and goals. It also means that there is no organ that could undertake this "planning" and the leadership of this course from the beginning to the end. This doesn't mean that there shouldn't be political organs. However, these political organs should be within this historical process and underlie its conditions; they don't determine it by functioning beyond and "above" it.

The long-term social character of the transformation means that it can largely be the work of a social class. Lenin said about the overthrow of the capitalist system that 'only a class can overthrow another class' and it is absolutely correct. This stands also in regards with the

overall transformation of society. Only a class whose existence, function and activity can cover every day, every moment and every structure of society can implement its overall transformation. Only a class like the working class can orientate this transformation to a socialist-communist direction.

This is based on its nature, its place in production that does not allow it to rise as an exploiting class without changing its nature and character.

At the same time it should be obvious that this society also, as any other (one) will be characterized by contradictions and disputes.

This means that this course will be simultaneously a class struggle process; between the working class and not simply the bourgeoisie (for as long it lasts as such) or the bourgeois remnants, but it also includes tendencies and forces "generated" by the socialist transformation during this whole course.

Here we will focus on only one issue despite the fact that there are many that should be faced. It is the issue of the organizing of the working class in regards with the problems it has to face; from the immediate problems to the overall perspective. What form and which features this organizing will have cannot be determined theoretically. But we should note two things.

The organizing form of the working class to a "class for itself" was formed basically within the frames of class struggle against capitalism and "expanded" during the stage of the initial basic socialist transformation. The organizing we refer to no matter how many of the previous elements it will maintain, will be on the basis of the problems and given facts of class struggle within the frames of the transitional socialist formation.

This organizing will concern every field of existence, function and activity of the working class and certainly it will concern the highest level, the political. The class struggle, in the frames of this period, will also emerge "concentrated" on the political field; it will also be conducted on the highest level, the political. This means that there is a necessity for a concrete political organizing of the vanguard of the working class, namely the necessity for the party. It will be a party that will be formed and organized on the base of the given facts of this class struggle and for as long as the working class needs it as its organ and in any form it needs it.

These are, in final analysis the fundamental conditions that determine the essence and the substance of the dictatorship of the proletariat for this period. In other words, the dictatorship of the proletariat can only be the concern of the ... proletariat.