

**CALL FOR PROPOSALS OF CONTRIBUTIONS
FOR A THEMATIC ISSUE OF
SOCIOLOŠKI PREGLED no. 2 for 2018:
170 years after the first edition of the Manifesto of the Communist Party**

Editorial Board of the Sociological Review (referred to as SR further in the text), published by the Serbian Sociological Association, has planned No. 2 for 2018 to be a thematic issue dedicated to the 170th anniversary from the initial publication of the Manifesto of the Communist Party (referred to as MCP further in the text) in February 1848.

A **quantitative argument** for acknowledging this jubilee lies in the fact that since Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels formulated it, on a request of the Communist League after a congress held in November 1847 in London, and since they published it in German language on the eve of the first uprising of the working class in great industrial cities of France and Austria, with requests which exceeded a mere replacement of bourgeois fractions in power, MCP has become the most circulated, translated and influential strategic and programmatic document of any party and of any social movement in the world, that many millions of wage-earners across the globe identify with. Engels thought that it is possible, based on the numbers of editions and copies circulated in a country, to gauge both, the state of a large-scale industry development in a country, as well as organizational circumstances of the workers' movement and workers' aspirations in regard to throwing light on their own position in relation to the class of owners.

A **qualitative impetus** for celebrating 170 years from publishing the first edition of the MCP comes from a need to look for answers to a number of questions regarding relevance, epistemological status, activism/determinism, utopianism/totalitarianism and ramifications of a variety of interpretations and implementations of hypotheses about agents and means in achieving classless society, from the second decade of the XXI century perspective.

At the lower level of abstraction, the questions the title can more precisely be formulated as follows:

1. Are there, and of what kind, differences in mutual causal relations between articulation and publishing frequencies of different MCP editions and rising or declining trends of reformist or revolutionary activities of the proletariat in association with parts of radicalised old and new petite bourgeoisie in a struggle against landowning, banking, industrial and global transnational financial haute bourgeoisie and domestic comprador bourgeoisie on a semi-periphery and periphery of hierarchical world order of capitalist economy in the middle of XIX century and in the second decade of XXI century?
2. What are social-historical factors for a lasting interest, of both exploiting and ruling, and exploited and oppressed classes, in the MCP since its publishing to nowadays?
3. Would you agree, and why, with the basic historical-materialistic and dialectic hypothesis from the MCP stating that economic reproduction of social life, and

inevitable social structure of productive forces and production relations of every historical period based on it, creates a material base for political and intellectual history of that period, and that ideas become material force once they prevail among masses?

4. Why an elaborate explanation of the transition from primal, classless clan-based societies, common ownership of land to the class-based social formations is conspicuously missing from the MCP, and also earlier and later works of Marx and Engels, and what are the implications of this absence to predicting and planing a transition to a classless society of collective ownership of means of production in the anticipated context of highly developed production forces and automated production?
5. What lessons can be learnt from different interpretations and implementation of the thesis of inevitability of disintegration (decay, abolition) of the modern bourgeois private property over the past 170 years to these days?
6. Why do critics of allegedly deterministically and eschatologically formulated theses in the MCP often neglect an activist and alternatively formulated thesis that omnipresent and continuous, concealed or open, class struggle throughout the entire class pre-history of the humankind, would always end with a revolutionary re-composition of the entire society, or simultaneous demise of the conflicted classes?
7. How definitions of the bourgeoisie and its constituent fractions should be operationalised in the contemporary post-industrial, information, although by ways of reproduction still capitalist, society?
8. Has the bourgeoisie ceased to be a progressive class forced by market competition to permanently improve technical means for continual production costs lowering of exchange value, and accordingly, permanently change and revolutionise modes of production, or has it become a parasitic reactionary class with systemic conditions of self-reproduction that inhibit further development of production forces, the class which in the violent pursue for extra profit on the basis of conquering cheap sources of workforce, raw materials and markets across the planet (the process in a fashionable and class-neutral way named globalization by contemporary authors in the last quarter of XX century), destroy premises for the very survival on our planet through wars, pollution and depletion of non-renewable natural resources?
9. How, in contemporary post-industrial, information, though by the means of reproduction still capitalist, society, should definition of proletariat and its constituent fractions be operationalised?
10. Has the gap, during the last 170 years, between particular economic empirical awareness of various proletariat fractions, summarized in the request for increasing wages, on the one hand, and their potentially universal class awareness that liberation from the exploiting and oppressing class cannot be achieved without simultaneously liberating the complete society from exploitation, oppression and class struggle on the other hand, widen or narrowed?
11. What lessons can be learned from different interpretations and experiences of autocratic implementations of the MCP authors' thesis about the avant-garde ideational role of the communist party, among other numerous democratic opposition parties, as the most decisive integral part of the workers' movement? Can we, and how, possibly avoid, in the next wave of social revolution which currently is not within the sight, for communist organization of workers'

movement foreseen that as a theoretical self-awareness of a real movement only theoretically and in action lead in understanding of conditions, flow, and general results of proletarian movement as well as emphasizing interests of the proletariat as a whole, bureaucratization and transformation into an alienated monopolistic economic, political and ideological control of the party top nomenklatura over proletariat, workers' movement and its different organizations? Has the criticism of the MCP authors directed at socialists for their inclination towards practising armchair socialism, social quackery and patchwork reforms that do not threaten capitalist's profit, and for their reliance on "educated classes", been justified, or does such criticism prevent unity of all individuals, classes and social movements interested in a reform or a radical change of capitalist interrelations? What are the main obstacles to establishing the MCP authors' argument of liberation of the workers class achieved only through self-aware and self-organised workers class itself?

12. What are the factors influencing members of the old and the new petit-bourgeoisie, from both cities and villages, choice when it comes to deciding which, among main classes, they will align themselves with during periods of acute crises of capital accumulation and intensifying class struggle at local and global scale?
13. What lessons can be learned from different interpretations and implementations of the MCP authors' thesis on the workers' state or the dictatorship of proletariat role, internal organization and relations to the proletariat and bourgeoisie, considering Marx and Engels' explicit statement after experience gained during the two-months existence of the Paris Commune in 1871, that working class cannot simply take over a ready-made state machinery and put it in motion towards own goals, on the contrary, it has to establish directly democratic, self-managing form of political self-organization of the society that is suitable for the simultaneous economic emancipation of the working class?
14. Does determining of the main internal contradiction of reproduction of social life in the capitalist way as an antagonistic conflict between the social character of the production process and the private character of exploitation as in the case of appropriation of the unpaid surplus produced by free in a twofold way wage workers, remain correct despite the passage of time and changed circumstances? If the definition is true, does it suggest that the tendency of the average rate of profit to drop prevents evolutionary intrasystemic structural reform of all the existing variants of capitalism? Does impossibility of evolutionary structural reformation of capitalism suggest that the transition from capitalism to communism must be achieved, as a rule, through violent revolutionary means in reaction to violence and destructiveness of capitalistic exploitation and oppression?
15. Do numerous defeats of proletariat in the class struggle with bourgeoisie so far, in a struggle for control over extended reproduction process and for establishing a classless society of freely associated producers (and consumers), where freedom of each individual is a condition for unimpeded development of everyone's human abilities, represent the necessary and sufficient condition to discard the vision and the theory of social revolution presented in the MCP just as another unfeasible utopia? Bearing in mind that the authors of the MCP considered all the defeats of workers' movement in the class struggle against bourgeoisie as inevitable and instructive experience until "sufficient" economic progress and spiritual development of working masses are reached, providing a

fundamental transformation of society through social revolution instead of mere substitution of the dominant bourgeoisie fraction governing the state in a given moment, the question arises whether material, theoretical and organizational conditions for a successful social revolution and transition into a classless society will mature sufficiently before violent and exploiting productionist economic logic of profit accumulation, destroys the planet in a nuclear war or an environmental disaster?

16. What has been the effect of the MCP authors' answer, to the question of Vera Zasulich if rural communes with by the development of capitalism already eroded remnants of the common land ownership can become a starting point for the communist development, if the national bourgeois revolution in Russia becomes an outpost and signal of the social revolutionary action in the Europe, on Lenin, Tito, Mao, Bolivar, Ho Chi Minh, Castro, Che Guevara, Fanon, Cabral, Chavez and other leaders of social revolutions in countries with predominantly agricultural populations without economic, political and educational ideological foundations for the success of social revolution as defined in the MCP?
17. Is a statement of the MCP authors that European immigrants in the USA allowed for development of such a capitalist agricultural and industrial production in the country which will in a short time lead to a collapse of existing industrial monopoly of Great Britain and the rest of western Europe, applicable today to countries such as Brasil, Russia and China? What policy related implications would potential shift of monopolies of industrial productivity from the West to the East have for global social revolution after the turning point in 1989?
18. How did the crucial historical event of the breakup of Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, symbolised in the act of demolition of the wall between the Western and the Eastern Germany in 1989, and accelerating the process of finalizing restoration of truly existing capitalism and abolition of the right to work and the social and health security of the working class, whose interests are no longer represented by any parliamentary party in societies of former both self-named real existing socialism and self-named self-managerial market socialism, influence the appearance of the wave of anti-communist critique of the MCP as a totalitarian ideology? How did the intensification of the financial capital hyperaccumulation crisis influence the renewal of pro-communist reinterpretation and renewed relevance of the MCP as the theory of a self-aware, self-organized and self-managed social revolution, from the realistic critical viewpoint possible and desirable, although without relying on power and management monopoly of a single party leadership and without implicit and explicit eschatological belief in its positive result?
19. Is the main socially structured obstacle on the road to reaching, proclaimed in final combat cry of the MCP, "Proletarians of All Countries, Unite!?", which inspired assembly of the First International Association of Workers and then the Second, the Third and the Fourth International, the inaccuracy of the MCP authors' assumption that in a social revolution proletariat as a whole except for the chains has neither motherland nor property to lose, neglecting that in other places they themselves criticized the so-called working aristocracy of imperialist countries for accepting crumbs from the table of colonies and semi-colonies exploitation?
20. What is the relation between the slogan "Proletarians of All Countries, Unite!" and the MCP authors' argument that the workers' movement should initially

participate on the side of the national bourgeoisie in the struggle for winning independence of nation states like Poland, as a condition for sincere international co-operation and unification of proletariat regarding accomplishment of short-term and long-term common goals?

21. What is the current state of fulfilment of the 10 points action program in the area of ownership and labour legislation, economic, credit and fiscal policy of state administration, and education, proposed by the MCP authors, even though in later editions they themselves proclaimed it is outdated and subject to change depending on specific conditions of class struggle in particular countries?
22. What conclusions can we draw about possibility that the “boogeyman of communism” may start to circle again through Europe and the world, instead of the boogeyman of re-fascisation and re-colonization of the world by the world ruling class, financial oligarchy, with mediating help of the local comprador bourgeoisie at semi-periphery and periphery of the world system of capitalist economy, on basis of the contemporary socialist and communist literature reading, of different contemporary types of conservative, reactionary, anarchistic, reformist or revolutionary ideas of desirable society realisation, on the one hand, and observation (if possible with participation) of the real (in)activity of workers’ and other anti-capitalistic oriented social movements that are still looking for an adequate form of uniting, political co-ordination and organization of their activities, on the other hand?

I kindly invite all interested colleagues to **submit an abstract** of 300 to 500 words until **December 30, 2017** to the email vera.veritas@gmail.com. The deadline for the **answer** to submitted abstracts is **January 15, 2018**.

The deadline for the submission of a **full paper** containing up to 28,800 characters with spaces, is **March 15, 2018** at the <http://scindeks.ceon.rs/journaldetails.aspx?issn=0085-6320&lang=en>

Guest Editor No 2/2018

Professor Vera Vratuša-Žunjić, PhD, retired

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Sociology

vera.veritas@gmail.com

<https://f-bg.academia.edu/veravratusa>