

Yugoslav Revisionism and the Role of the CPSU and CPC

“... Mankind is shorter by a head, and
the greatest head of our time at that,
Local lights and lesser minds, if not the
humbugs, will now have a free hand...
Well, we must see it through. What else
are we here for?”

“And we are not near losing courage yet”

**F. Engels to Sorge on the death of
Karl Marx, 15th March, 1883.**

FOREWORD

It is over one hundred and thirty years since Marx and Engels in the **Communist Manifesto** uttered the stirring words: ‘Workers of the World Unite’. This call has never used to inspire the Communists of the world and these words expressed their profound conviction. In the same (**Communist Manifesto**) it was said that ‘the working class have no country’ that ‘national difference and antagonism between people are daily and more vanishing’ and that ‘supremacy of the proletariat will cause them to vanish still faster.’

In reality, the world working class and the labouring people are witnessing the contrary facts. The war between Kampuchea and Vietnam, the border clashes between China and Vietnam and between China and the Soviet Union, the quarrel between Yugoslavia and Albania on the question of Albanian minority in Yugoslavia, the quarrel between Albania and China, the quarrel between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia over Macedonia, the quarrel between China and outer Mongolia etc., are being witnessed by the world people.

International revisionism has now regained for international capital almost entire former socialist camp nations. The degeneration of the socialist Soviet Union into a new variant of capitalist society, the collapse of international communist movement into revisionism, the successful vulgarization and distortion of Marxism-Leninism with left phrase mongering on the one hand in the name of ‘creative Marxism’ on the other the refined forms of class collaboration and opportunism renouncing and denouncing the Marxist-Leninist theory of ‘two camps’ in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, have raised extremely complex theoretical, programmatic and organizational problems. Revisionism is the perversion of Marxism-Leninism to suit the need of the exploiting classes, to the elimination of which Marxism-Leninism is directed. Revisionism emerged with the emergence of Marxism. Thus, it is a long history. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin fought revisionism of their times.

The communist revolutionaries, must ask themselves why such ugly and tragic things like Vietnam-Kampuchean war and other things as shown above, are happening today? Refusal to be critical and self-critical concerning all these burning and tragic problems in the international communist movements exposes the opportunist bankruptcy of the communists. **The Communist Information Service** will deal with modern revisionism and its origin, especially since the death

of Joseph Stalin, since when the distorted interpretation of the world events and their causes were being put forward by the modern revisionists in the name of fighting modern revisionism.

It is our task, the task of the **Communist Information Service**, to prepare the forces and to train the proletariat in the interim period. In order that the great aim of destroying capitalist system is achieved, the army of the proletariat must be formed its commanders chosen, its armoury stocked and its fighters trained for battle. Such training requires that the Commanders and army should have a clear understanding of the process by which the great Communist Parties came to be destroyed as revolutionary parties of the working class by modern revisionism.

The Communist Information Service will be directed towards all militant forces who recognize the primacy of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice in the unfolding of revolutionary struggle.

The Communist Information Service, in the year of Stalin (December 21st 1978 to December 21st 1979) intends to publish a series of booklets. The present booklet **Yugoslav revisionism and the role of the CPSU and CPC**, is the first one of the series as the revised attitude towards Yugoslav revisionism by the international communist movement was the beginning of modern revisionism on international scale. This booklet has established with documents and commentaries that since the death of Stalin, both the Communist Parties of China and Soviet Union, as the accepted and recognized leaders of the international communist movement, conspired together, against Marxism-Leninism and Stalin _ the symbol of proletarian internationalism, and thus rehabilitated Yugoslav revisionism in the international communist movement. All the booklets of the **Origins of Modern Revisionism** series will be well documented, so that the readers may arrive at the correct conclusion themselves.

The Communist Information Service appeals to all interested persons, circles, groups and others to help the publications by suggestions, documents and relevant facts. It hopes that the readers will appreciate its endeavour and freely participate to enrich the series.

Stalin's 99th birth day
21st December, 1978

Moni Guha
Editor-in-chief
The Communist Information Service

[The words in the third bracket within the quotation are ours all through]

Looking Retrospectively

Thirty years ago, in 1948, the Communist Inform-bureau (Cominform), under the leadership of Stalin had exposed Titoite Yugoslavia for its bourgeois nationalism and hostility to socialist camp. All the Communist Parties of the world including the Communist Party of China supported the Cominform 1948 resolution and measures.

Twenty-three years ago, seven years after 1948, that is, in 1955, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, headed by Khrushchev, in consultation and agreement with the Communist Party of China, had made rapprochement with Titoite Yugoslavia and signed a joint declaration, known as 'Belgrade declaration'. The 'declaration' renounced and denounced the Cominform resolutions of June 1948 and November 1949 as well as Stalin. It re-declared Yugoslavia as socialist country and Yugoslav Party as Marxist- Leninist Party and rehabilitated Yugoslav or modern revisionism as Marxism-Leninism in the international communist movement. **That was the beginning of the ascendancy of the bourgeois nationalism replacing proletarian internationalism in the international communist movement.**

Twenty-two years ago, in 1956, under the initiative and leadership of the C P S U and C P C, the Cominform was dissolved and the November 1949 resolution was withdrawn declaring it as 'wrong'.

Two years after, in 1958, both the Soviet Union and China again denounced Titoite Yugoslavia and Yugoslav Party as bourgeois nationalist and modern revisionist and declared the June 1948 Cominform resolution on Yugoslavia as "basically correct".

Eighteen years ago, in 1960, the statement made by 81 Communist Parties, unanimously branded Yugoslav revisionists as traitors to Marxism-Leninism and agent and spy of imperialism and thus virtually reverted to the position of November 1949 Cominform resolution which the CPSU and CPC expunged from the records of the Cominform resolution declaring it as 'wrong' in June 1956.

Fifteen years ago, in 1963, when, Khrushchev again went to Yugoslavia for the second round of rapprochement with the Titoite revisionism, violating the 81 Communist Parties' statement of 1960, the Communist Party of China, in September 1963, in an open letter to the central committee of the CPSU condemned Khrushchev in unmistakable terms for currying favour with US imperialism through its agent 'Tito-Clique' the 'arch-enemy of socialism.'

Fifteen years after Khrushchev's visit to Titoite Yugoslavia and denunciation by the CPC how tragic it was that Tito could take a jubilant and victorious trip both to Moscow and Peking in 1977 and be welcomed in both capitals as an 'elder statesman of the world communist movements'!

Twenty years ago, in 1958, the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China, in its second session, endorsed the decision of the Party's Central Committee, of not sending a fraternal delegation to the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav Party, as the party was not a Marxist-Leninist Party. The second session in its resolution said "It is the unanimous opinion of the Congress that a resolute struggle must be waged against modern revisionism [Titoite revisionism]* which has emerged in the international communist movement. It is the sacred duty of our party towards the international working class to work together with the fraternal parties for the complete defeat of modern revisionism politically and theoretically and for safeguarding of Marxism-Leninism and the unity of the international communist movement on the basis of Marxist- Leninist ideology". (Resolution adopted on May 23, 1958. Quoted from '**In refutation of modern Revisionism**' published by the Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1958).

The same Communist Party of China headed by Hua-Kuo-Feng and Teng Siao-ping, has sent the following message of greetings to the eleventh Congress of the Yugoslav Party on June, 1978:

“On behalf of all members of the C P C and the Chinese people, the CPC’s CC sends its warmest greetings to the 11th Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, and through it, to all members of the league and Yugoslav people.

“The LCY, headed by comrade Tito, outstanding leader of nationalities of Yugoslavia HAS UNIVERSAL TRUTH OF MARXISM-LENINISM TO THE CONCRETE PRACTICE OF YUGOSLAVIA unswervingly leading the people of the whole country IN A PERSISTENT REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE OVER DECADES, IT HAS WON CONTINUOUS VICTORIES IN THE CAUSE OF SOCIALISM.

“In world war two the Yugoslav Communist Party mobilized the masses, organized the armed force to fight fascist aggressor and founded a peoples’ Yugoslavia after making heavy sacrifices. After liberation, by developing glorious revolutionary traditions and PERSEVERING INDEPENDENCE AND INITIATIVE, THE LCY HAS ESTABLISHED A SOCIALIST SELF-MANAGEMENT SYSTEM [See Explanatory Note 1] SUITABLE TO THE CONDITION AT HOME raised the SOCIALIST INITIATIVE of the working class and other working people and promoted rapid development of the national economy. The league immensely treasures and gallantly defends Yugoslav independence and sovereignty. Acting on the proposal of comrade Tito and LCY, Yugoslavia has built an all peoples’ defence system and is prepared at all times to repulse any aggressor. The LCY firmly adheres to the foreign policy of non-alignment RESOLUTELY COMBAT IMPERIALISM AND HEGEMONISM, safeguards unity among non-aligned and other developing nations and support the people of various countries in their struggle to strive for and defend national independence and oppose aggression. It has thus won appreciation and acclaim from the people of various countries.

“CHINA AND YUGOSLAVIA SHARED COMMON EXPERIENCE IN HISTORY and after victory in revolution BOTH PRESERVED IN THE POLICY OF BUILDING SOCIALISM INDEPENDENTLY [See Explanatory note 2] and with initiative. **In recent years the relations of friendship and co-operation between two countries have grown steadily.** President Tito’s successful visit to our country last year and talks held between Chairman Hue Kuo-Feng and president Tito HAVE BROUGHT THEIR RELATIONSHIP OF FRIENDSHIP AND CO-OPERATION BETWEEN CHINA AND YUGOSLAVIA TO A NEW STAGE TO ALL ROUND DEVELOPMENT. We are deeply convinced that the revolutionary friendship and co-operation BETWEEN TWO PARTIES, two countries and two peoples in their future joint struggle will definitely develop further and strengthened. [All bold and capital letters supplied]

“May the 11th Congress of the LCY be crowned with every success”. (‘New China News Agency Broadcast’, June 19, 1978).

When Khrushchev went to Yugoslavia in 1963, the CPC, in its open letter questioned Khrushchev, “Has Tito ‘removed his errors’? Or, does Khrushchev regard Tito as his teacher?” The open letter concluded, “Khrushchev is warmly fraternizing with Tito-clique not because it

has corrected any of its errors, but he is following Tito's footsteps", (Third Comment– **Is Yugoslavia a socialist country?**).

May we ask the CPC the same question, which it asked Khrushchev in 1963? May we conclude similarly what the CPC concluded about Khrushchev?

It is better, we recapitulate the history of **the 'whys' and 'hows' of the relations between Titoite Yugoslavia** and the socialist countries under the leaderships of the CPC and CPSU, so that we may correctly understand the right and wrong.

The formation of the Cominform and Yugoslav Question

The Communist Inform-bureau was formed with nine Communist and Workers' Parties of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, France, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Rumania, Soviet Union and Yugoslavia in September 1947. Andre Zhdanov, on behalf of the CPSU (B), in his opening speech said among other things, "In this four years that have elapsed since the dissolution of the Comintern, [The Third International] the Communist Parties have grown considerably in strength and influence in nearly all the countries of Europe and Asia. ...

"But the present position of the Communist Parties has its drawbacks. Some comrades understood the dissolution of the Comintern to imply the elimination of all ties, of all contacts between the fraternal Communist Parties. **BUT EXPERIENCE HAS SHOWN THAT SUCH MUTUAL ISOLATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES IS WRONG, HARMFUL AND IN POINT OF FACT unnatural.** The communist movement develops within national frameworks, but there are tasks and interest common to the parties of various countries. We get rather a curious state of affairs: The Socialists, who stopped at nothing to prove that the Comintern dictated directives from Moscow to the Communists of all countries, have restored their international; yet the communists even refrain from meeting one another, let alone consulting with one another on questions of mutual interest to them, from fear of slanderous talk of their enemies regarding the 'hand of Moscow'... There can be no doubt that if the situation were to continue **IT WOULD BE FRAUGHT WITH MOST SERIOUS CONSEQUENCES TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORK OF THE FRATERNAL PARTIES.** The need for mutual consultation and **VOLUNTARY CO-ORDINATION OF ACTION** between individual parties **HAS BECOME PARTICULARLY URGENT** at this present Juncture when continued isolation may lead to a slackening of mutual understanding and **AT TIMES EVEN TO SERIOUS BLUNDERS.**"

A resolution was passed in the first meeting of the Cominform stating:

"The meeting considers that the absence of contact between parties attending the meeting is, in the present situation, a serious shortcoming. **Experience has shown that such disassociation amongst Communist Parties is wrong and harmful.** The need for an exchange of experience and **voluntary co-ordination of action** of the various parties is particularly urgent at the present time, when the post-war international situation has become more complicated and **THE DISASSOCIATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES MAY BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE WORKING CLASS.**"

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

The Cominform was not a mere post office to receive and dispatch information from and to its constituents. “All know that at the time of the organization of the Inform-bureau of nine Communist Parties” wrote the central committee of the CPSU (B), to the central committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, in a letter on May 22, 1948, “all Communist Parties started from this indisputable position that every party should submit a report to the Inform-bureau, just as every Party has the right to criticize other Parties.... The conference of the nine Communist Parties initiated the principle that each Party has the right to criticize other Party.”

This decision of the Cominform was internationalist one burying the Social Democratic theory and practice of ‘non-interference in the internal affairs’ and the policy of ‘building socialism independently’.

The organ of the Cominform **For the lasting peace...** virtually became the organ of the international Communist movement guiding and co-ordinating the activities of the world communists. Once again the communists of all countries **really** became internationalists.

Welcoming the formation of the Cominform Mao Tse-Tung wrote, “The Communist and Workers’ Parties of nine European countries have established their Inform-bureau and issued a call to the people of the world to rise against the imperialist plan of enslavement. This call to battle has inspired the oppressed people of the world, charted the course of the struggle and strengthened their confidence to victory. It has thrown world reaction into panic and confusion... (**‘Present situation and our tasks’**, December 22, 1947, see, **Selected Works**, vol. IV).

In a meeting of the Cominform the Yugoslav and other Parties criticised the French and Italian Parties for their mistakes and both Parties accepted the criticism of other parties just in Bolshevik manner. Meanwhile development in Yugoslav party became the subject of criticism by other Parties. In a letter to Tito **et al** on March 27, 1948, the central committee of the CPSU wrote:

“... (b) We are disturbed by the present condition of the CPY. We are amazed by the fact that the CPY, the leading-party and still is not completely legalized and still has a semi-legal status. Decision of the Party organs is never published in the press, neither are the reports of Party assemblies.

“Democracy is not evident within CPY itself. The Central Committee, in its majority, was not elected but co-opted. Criticism and self-criticism within the Party does not exist or only barely exists. **It is characteristic that the personnel secretary of the Party is also the Minister of Security.** According to the theory of Marxism, the Party should control all state organs in the country including the Ministry of state security while Yugoslavia we have just the opposite: the Ministry of state security actually controlling the Party. This probably explains the fact that initiative among the Party masses in Yugoslavia is not on an adequate level.

“It is understandable that we cannot consider such a communist organization to be Marxist - Leninist, Bolshevik.

“The spirit of the policy of class struggle is not felt in the CPY. An increase in the capitalist elements in villages and cities is in full swing, and the leadership of the Party is taking no measure to check these capitalist elements. The CPY is being hoodwinked by the degenerate and opportunist theory of peaceful absorption of capitalist elements by a socialist system, borrowed from Bernstein, Vollmar and Bukharin.

“According to the theory of Marxism - Leninism, the Party is the leading force in the country, has its specific program and cannot merge with the non-Party masses. In Yugoslavia, on the contrary, the peoples’ front is considered the chief leading force and there was an attempt to get the Party submerged within the front. In his speech, at the second conference of the peoples’ front, comrade Tito said, “Does the CPY has any other program but that of the peoples’ front? No, the CPY has no other program. The program of the peoples’ front is its program.”

“It thus appears that in Yugoslavia this amazing theory of Party organization is considered a new theory. Actually, it is far from new. In Russia, forty years ago, a part of the Menshevik proposed that the Marxist Party be dissolved into non-Party workers mass organization and that the second should supplant the first, the other part of the Mensheviks proposed that the Marxist Party be dissolved into non-Party mass organization of workers and peasants with the latter organization supplanting the former. As is known, Lenin described these Mensheviks as malicious opportunists and liquidators of the Party.

“(c) We cannot understand why the English spy Velebit still remains in the Ministry of foreign affairs as the first Assistant Minister. The Yugoslav comrades know that Velebit is an English spy. They also know that the representative of the Soviet Government consider Velebit a spy. Nevertheless Velebit remains in the position of first Assistant Foreign Minister of Yugoslavia. As is known, bourgeois Government think it permissible to have spies of great imperialist states on their staffs with a view to insuring their good will and would even agree to place their peoples under the tutelage of these states for this purpose. We consider this practice as entirely impermissible for Marxists.

“These are facts which are causing the dissatisfaction of the Soviet Government and the Central Committee of the CPSU and which are endangering relations between USSR and Yugoslavia...”

In another letter the Central Committee of the CPSU (B) wrote on May 4, 1948:

“Tito and Kardelj in their letter proposed that the CPSU should send representatives to Yugoslavia to study the Soviet-Yugoslav differences. We feel this course would be incorrect SINCE IT IS NOT A MATTER OF VERIFYING INDIVIDUAL FACTS BUT OF DIFFERENCES OF PRINCIPLES.

“As is known, the question of Soviet- Yugoslav differences has already been the property of the CC of nine Communist Parties who have their Cominform. It should be highly irregular to exclude them from this matter. Therefore, we propose that this question be discussed at the next session of the Cominform.”

In reply to the above letter of the CC, CPSU the CC, CPY wrote to the CC, CPSU (B) on May 17, 1948 as under:

“We do not flee from criticism about question of principle, but in this matter we feel at such a disadvantage that it is impossible for us to agree to have this matter decided by Cominform.

In another letter dated May 20, 1948, the CPY wrote to the CPSU refusing to attend the projected Cominform meeting **challenging the Cominform’ s right to pass judgement upon Yugoslav Communist Party and in the internal affairs of Yugoslavia**. This was for the first time the bourgeois nationalist theory of interference and non-interference in the internal affairs of a Communist Party and a Socialist country and the theory of ‘building socialism independently’ raised by a Communist Party trampling underfoot the theory and practice of proletarian internationalism declaring a socialist country and the Communist Party as the sole property of the country concerned instead of the property of the world proletariat, for all practical purposes.

The CC of the CPSU (B) in reply to the letter of May 28, 1948 wrote the following to the CC, CPY on May 22, 1948:

“Your letter of May 17, 1948 and May 20, 1948 signed by comrades Tito and Kardelj have been received. The CPSU considers that in these letters the leaders of the CPY have gone a step further in aggravating their crude mistakes in matters of principle, the harmfulness and the danger of which the CPSU indicated in its letter of May 4, 1948.

“Comrades Tito and Kardelj both write that, they feel “...so at a disadvantage that it is impossible for us to agree to have this matter decided now by the Inform-bureau.” Further they allowed themselves the allusion that the Yugoslav leaders had allegedly been placed in that position by the CPSU. The CC of the CPSU considers that there is not a scrap of truth in this assertion. There is no inequality for the Yugoslav Communist Party nor can there be in Inform-bureau of nine Communist Parties. All know that at the time of the organisation of the Inform-bureau of nine Communist Parties. All Communist Parties started from the indisputable position that every Party should submit a report to the Inform-bureau just as every Party has the right to criticize other Parties. The conference of nine Parties started from this point when, at its meeting on September 1947, it listened to the reports of the central committees of all Parties initiated in principle that each Party has the right to criticize the other Party. The Italian and French comrades did not dispute the right of other Parties to criticize their mistakes and they accepted harshness of criticism in Bolshevik manner.

“It is a known fact that the Italian and French comrades did not oppose the right of other parties to criticise their mistakes. They have, on the contrary, borne the brunt of Bolshevik criticism and benefited from its conclusion. Moreover, the Yugoslav comrades took advantage of the opportunity to criticize the mistakes of the Italian and French comrades and did not consider that by so doing they were infringing on the equality of the parties.

“Why are the Yugoslav comrades making this radical change, and demanding the liquidation of precedents already established in the Inform-bureau! Because they believe that the Yugoslav

Party and its leadership ought to be placed in a privileged position and that the statute of the Inform-bureau does not apply to them that, having the privilege of criticising other parties they should not themselves submit to the criticism of the other parties. However, if we may say so, belief of this kind have nothing in common with equality. In fact, this is nothing but a request from the Yugoslav leaders for a privileged position for the CPY in the Cominform, a position which does not exist and cannot exist for any Party. We have taken and continue to take this stand, for without it the work of the Inform-bureau could not continue. Each Communist Party is obliged to submit report to the Inform-bureau each Communist Party has the right to criticize any Communist Party. The refusal of Yugoslavia to submit reports on their action to the Cominform and to hear criticism from other Communist parties means violation of the equality of parties.

“2. Comrades Tito and Kardelj claim that the CC of the CPY refuses to attend the meeting of the Inform-bureau to discuss the question on the Yugoslav Communist Party. If this is their final decision then it means that they have nothing to tell to the Inform-bureau in their defence, and they are tacitly admitting their guilt and are afraid to appear before their fraternal Communist Parties. Moreover, refusal to report to the Inform-bureau means that the CPY has taken the path of cutting itself off from United Socialist Peoples’ front of peoples’ democracies headed by the Soviet Union and that it is now preparing the Yugoslav Party and the people for betrayal of the united front of the peoples’ democracy and the USSR. SINCE THE INFORM-BUREAU IS THE BASIC PARTY ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED FRONT, such a policy leads to the betrayal of the work done for the international solidarity of workers and to the adoption of an attitude of nationalism which is hostile to the cause of the working class.

“Irrespective of whether the representatives of the CC of the CPY attend the meeting of the Inform-bureau the CPSU insists upon the discussion of the situation in the CPY at the next meeting of the Inform-bureau.

“In view of the request of Czechoslovak and Hungarian comrades that the meeting of Inform-bureau take place in the second half of June, the CPSU expresses its agreement with the proposal.”

More than one month had elapsed between the receipt of the above letter by the CPY and the session of the Cominform in June, the CC of the CPY did neither give any reply to the above letter nor attend the Cominform meeting in which the situation in the Yugoslav Party was discussed.

On June 28, 1948, the Cominform at its meeting held in Rumania, expelled the Communist Party of Yugoslavia from the ranks of the Cominform and world Communists because it persisted in its anti-Marxist-Leninist stand and adopted the bourgeois nationalist stand both on the question of ideology, politics and organization renouncing and denouncing proletarian internationalism and internationalist discipline of democratic centralism.

The issues dealing with the expulsion of the CPY were many, but mainly centred around the crucial ones of the CPY denying the sharpening of class struggles in the period of building socialism; of pursuing a conciliatory policy to the Kulaks by allowing private plot of land and the hiring of labour ; of refusing to nationalise the land ; of proposing a liquidationist attitude to the

Party by wishing to submerge it within the broad mass of the peoples' front, of proposing the revisionist doctrine of "national roads to socialism" and for refusing to accept fraternal criticism from the Inform-bureau and its constituent parties. (For the excerpted text of the resolution, see Appendix, Document No 1.)

In 1948, immediately after the exposure of bourgeois nationalism of Tito clique by the Cominform, Liu Shao-Chi, member of the politburo and the standing committee of the central committee of the Communist Party of China, made an outstanding contribution to this struggle against the bourgeois nationalism, especially the Titoite revisionism, with his pamphlet **Internationalism and Nationalism**. In this pamphlet Liu effectively exposed the class basis of Titoite revisionism. He exposed the essence of this reactionary line as a betrayal of the oppressed people. Based on his polemics against Titoite revisionism Liu-Shao-Chi had, in his pamphlet a clear understanding, of the danger which the national bourgeois class in socialist countries poses to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus, the Communist Party of China gave its unstained support to the 1948 June resolution of the Cominform and also made an outstanding ideological contribution to the fight against modern revisionism.

The Conspiracy of Tito Clique

Tito and the Tito clique were conspiring against the Soviet Union and the international Communist movement since long time back, from the days of Spanish Civil War of 1936 and International Brigade, which was revealed subsequently. (Consult: **From Trotsky to Tito** by James Klugmann, published by Lawrence and Wishart, London in 1951 and **Peoples' Democracies** by Wilfred G. Burchett, published by World Unity Press, Australia in 1951)

We give below only the facts of Titoite conspiracy since its expulsion from the Cominform:

By late 1948, full-scale civil war raged in Greece. The guerrilla war led by the Communist Party of Greece was betrayed by Tito clique, who closed the Yugoslav borders to the Soviet military supplies, that were already hard put to reach the land-locked guerrilla forces.

Below we quote from the "Third Comment" '**Is Yugoslavia a Socialist country?**' of the CPC, written in 1963. There are altogether 11 charges against the Titoite clique out of which we quote only those which were of the period between 1949 and 1955. It writes:

"The Tito clique has invariably played the role of a lackey of US imperialism in the major international events of the past ten years or more.

"1. The revolution in Greece: On July 10, 1949, Tito closed the borders between Yugoslavia and Greece against the Greek peoples' guerrillas. At the same time, he allowed the Greek fascist royalist troops to pass through the Yugoslav territory in order to attack the guerrillas from the rear. In this way Tito clique helped the US-British imperialists to strangle the Greek peoples' revolution.

"2. The Korean War: In a statement issued on September 6, 1950, Edvard Kardelj, who was the foreign Minister brazenly slandered Korean peoples' just war of resistance to aggression and

defended US imperialism. On December 1, speaking at UN-security council, the representative of the Tito clique attacked China for its “active interference in the Korean War”. The Tito clique also voted in the United Nations for the embargo on China and Korea.

“3. The Vietnamese Peoples’ war of liberation: On the eve of Geneva conference on indo-China in April 1954, the Tito clique violently slandered the just struggle of the Vietnamese people...

“4. Subversion against Albania: The Tito clique has been carrying on subversive activities and armed provocation against Albania for a long time. It has engineered four major cases of treason in 1944, 1948, 1956 and 1960. Its armed provocation on the Yugoslav – Albania border numbered more than 470 from 1948 to 1958 ...”

Why the Tito clique rendered all these help to Anglo-American imperialism? Was it because the Cominform “unjustly” expelled the CPY from the ranks of world communists in 1948? Of course, some spineless liberals in the communist ranks argue that Tito was pushed to the lap of imperialism due to the erroneous and ‘dogmatic’ policy of Stalin and Cominform as if integrity was a commodity for buying and selling! Let us see how far this argument was tenable.

It is well-known today that the Tito clique was conspiring with the bourgeois nationalist elements of East European countries under the direction of Anglo-American imperialism, since long back, to encircle and isolate the Soviet Union and to create a Balkan Federation. It was revealed during the trials of the Titoites of Bulgaria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia in 1949 and 1950.

Traicho Kostov, the Titoite Secretary of the central committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, revealed after his arrest in 1949 that, **during and after the Second World War** one of the cardinal aims of US and British imperialism was to bring about an “East European Federation” hostile to the Soviet Union and dependent militarily, economically and politically upon the Western imperialist powers.

“I admit that in May 1942... I was won over by the Department Chief of the Bulgarian political police Geshev to collaborate with him in favour of British Intelligence and that until my arrest in June 1949 I carried out the instructions of the British...

“Kardelj informed me in strict confidence that during the war British and American had supplied the Yugoslav partisans with arms and munitions on condition that at the end of the war Tito ... would not allow the USSR to establish its influence not only in Yugoslavia but in the Balkans as well...

“Kardelj remarked that Tito and entire Yugoslav leadership considered the best way to accomplish this aim was the immediate accession of Bulgaria to Yugoslavia, utilizing for that purpose the widely popular idea among the peoples of Bulgaria and Yugoslavia for the federation of the Southern Slavs ... Kardelj replied that in the opinion of Tito and the rest of Yugoslav leaders, Bulgaria should join the Yugoslav federation as her seventh Republic. The Bulgarian army, continued Kardelj, would be under the supreme command of Tito...”

“Kardelj asked me to do everything possible to convince the leadership of the Bulgarian Communist Party to agree to the Yugoslav proposal and not to inform the Soviet Union”. (-- Quoted from the written depositions of the defendant Traicho Kostov Djunev in: **The trial of Traicho Kostov and his group**, Sofia, 1949.)

Almost similar was the case of Laszlo Rajk of Hungary.

How these people came under the grip of the Tito clique? The defeated and vanquished Governments of Eastern Europe handed all their confidential files of intelligence to the Anglo-American intelligence while fleeing from their countries. When the Anglo-American power found it difficult to give shape to their sinister plan of Balkan federation hostile to the Soviet Union, they came to an understanding with Tito. They hoped to realise their plan through Tito. Randolph Churchill, the son of Winston Churchill had contacted Tito and was living in Tito’s partisan head quarter long before Soviet could physically contact Tito. On January 5, 1944, Churchill wrote to Stalin “My son Randolph is flying in parachute to Tito with Brigadier MacLean, the head of our Mission” [Military Mission to Yugoslavia with a view to aid Yugoslavia militarily]. On January 12, 1944 Churchill wrote to Tito, “I thank you very much for your kind message about my health from yourself and the heroic patriot and partisan army of Yugoslavia. From Major Ashkin, who is a friend of mine, I learnt all about your valiant efforts. It is my most earnest desire to give you all aid in human power by sea supplies, by air support and by commandos helping you in island-fighting. Brigadier MacLean is also a friend of mine and a colleague in the House of Commons. With him at your headquarters will soon be serving my son Major Randolph Churchill who is also a member of the Parliament...” (Quoted from **Correspondence between Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt during the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45**, Vol. I, published by Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1957)

Kostov said, in his written deposition as we have quoted earlier, that “during the war the British and American had supplied the Yugoslav partisans with arms and munitions on condition that at the end of the war Tito... would not allow the USSR to establish its influence not only in Yugoslavia but in the Balkans as well....”

Kostov thought, after liberation of his country and after his release that the records were destroyed and his past was clear. He was a most honoured member of the Party. So, there was nothing to worry about. But two months after the liberation of the country Kostov was invited to lunch with the chief of the British Military Mission, General Oxley. The General withdrew after coffee and left Kostov alone with Colonel Bailey who shocked him by his revelation that Geshev had been a British agent and Kostov’s declaration of 1942 and his report on the activities of the Communist Party were in safe British keeping and Colonel Bailey was sure Kostov was an honourable man who would redeem his bond. Kostov was too ambitious and individualist. He must maintain his high post in the Party and administration even betraying the country and cause. So, he agreed to work for Bailey. The matter did not end there. Two weeks after his agreement with Bailey, Kardelj met Kostov late in one night in November 1944 and asked him to work for Balkan federation. Kardelj told Kostov that he knew Kostov’s long and recent history of complicity. Kostov had to capitulate again.

The British intelligence gave copies of “declaration” documents of all the people of Eastern Europe who were in the communists and workers’ parties to Tito and the Tito clique could make use of these people against the Soviet Union, Peoples’ Democracies and Socialism. Kostov admitted all these things in his written deposition, which we have summarised.

Such was the depth of the conspiracy of Anglo-American imperialism, which they tried to execute through their loyal and trusted agent – the Tito clique. Only when all these were revealed, the Cominform in its 1949 November resolution declared the Tito clique as confirmed foe of socialism and agent of imperialisms and all formal state to state relations so far existed after June 1948 expulsion were cut off by the socialist countries. (See the excerpts of November 1949 Cominform resolution “**Communist Party of Yugoslavia in the power of murderers and spies**” in Appendix, Document No 2. In this connection we would request the readers to read together with this resolution, ‘**Is Yugoslavia a socialist country?**’ written by the CPC in 1963 as “Third Comment” and then conclude whether the 1949 November resolution was “incorrect” and whether the withdrawal of the 1949 Cominform resolution was correct.)

With a view to woo the Tito clique as well as the Khrushchev clique the CPC said about the 1949 November resolution of the Cominform that “ The second resolution concerning the Yugoslav Communist Party adopted by the Inform-bureau of the communist and workers’ parties in 1949, however, WAS INCORRECT AND IT WAS LATER WITHDRAWN [in 1956] by the Communist Parties which took part in the Inform-bureau meeting” (-- Quoted from the resolution of the second session of the Eighth National Congress of the CPC in 1958; published **In refutation of modern revisionism**).

Stalin’s Death and After

The Communist Party of Yugoslavia, headed by Tito clique, was the first ruling Communist Party to be taken over by modern revisionism following the Fulton speech of Churchill, after the second world war, where Churchill declares the Soviet Union as “Enemy No. 1”. The national bourgeois elements in the Party captured power and went to work to establish capitalism in Yugoslavia by making a deal with US imperialism. Titoite revisionism was a great threat to the unity of international communist movement based on proletarian internationalism and increased moral, material and ideological support to the national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples. There was an urgent need to fight against the Social Democratic theory and practice of ‘non-interference in internal affairs’ and ‘building socialism independently’ upholding the international character of the socialist revolution and socialist construction as well as the international responsibility and obligation to the world proletariat. For this reason, it was of great importance that the international communists thoroughly expose the class basis of the reactionary, capitulationist line within the Marxist-Leninist movement. Stalin led the Cominform in this struggle against Titoite revisionism and the 1949 November resolution of the Cominform urged the communists of all countries to heighten this struggle as well as the consciousness of the ranks. But, after Stalin’s death, instead of fighting against Yugoslav revisionism of the Tito clique, statements on Yugoslavia emanating from the Soviet Union became noticeably milder during the year 1954.

In February 1953, Tito's government became a Party to an alliance between Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey thus partially fulfilling Tito's long cherished dream of 'Balkan federation'. This treaty became known as 'Balkan pact' which is in force even today, though no 'official' connection was established between Yugoslavia and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Greece and Turkey were the members of NATO.

By 1950 and even before that Yugoslavia had obtained a series of loans from the United States, France and Great Britain and was building 'socialism' with U.S. and United Nation's dollars.

That the Tito clique (1) betrayed the Greek revolution, (2) took an anti- Marxist- Leninist agricultural and industrial policy; (3) went against North Korea and Vietnam; (4) conspired against Albania; (5) conspired for an "East European Federation" hostile to the Soviet Union and socialism in complicity with Anglo-American imperialism; (6) made 'Balkan pact' with two NATO member countries -- Greece and Turkey and (7) was building 'socialism' with US dollar, were all well known to the Soviet Union and China by 1955, as all those happened before 1955. In spite of all these, the Soviet Communist Party, headed by Khrushchev, IN CONSULTATION AND AGREEMENT WITH THE CPC, during 1954, gradually increased embassy-staff at Moscow and Belgrade and then charge d'affaires were replaced by ambassadors reciprocally. This process of rapprochement with Yugoslavia gathered momentum and it culminated in 1955 with the dramatic announcement that the Soviet Party Secretary Khrushchev and Premier Bulganin contemplated a state visit to Belgrade. The projected visit took place on May 26, 1955 and marked a virtual capitulation to Titoite revisionism.

Speaking at Belgrade airport Khrushchev confessed to errors on the Soviet side and blamed the 1948 break on the 'intrigues' and 'fabrications' of Levrenti Beria, the Soviet Security Chief from 1938 to 1953 till he was shot dead. The Belgrade airport statement of Khrushchev was not only an apology but also a complete denunciation of June 1948 and November 1949 Cominform resolutions and endorsement of Yugoslav revisionism and complicity with Anglo-American imperialisms.

The 1948 break, as we have seen, cannot be as a result of anybody's 'intrigues' and "fabrication", as the break was made **on the question of principles of Marxist-Leninist practice**. The 1949 November resolution of the Cominform also cannot be anybody's "intrigue" and "fabrication" as all those were established facts. (For the excerpted Belgrade airport speech of Khrushchev see, Appendix, Document No 3.).

On June 2, 1955, a joint Soviet-Yugoslav Declaration, which became known as 'Belgrade Declaration' marked the final acceptance of Titoite revisionism by Khrushchev. The 'Declaration' in essence, was a call to unite all the forces of the world - Capitalists and Communists - within the framework of United Nations dominated by US imperialism, **RENOUNCING FOR THE FIRST TIME THE TWO WORLD THEORY AND THE TWO IRRECONCILABLE CAMPS OF IMPERIALISM AND SOCIALISM**. It denied the most fundamental features of the world situation viz., counter posing of the two different political and economic systems and of the two camps that arose from the two different social systems. The declaration was a total vindication of the position held by Titoite Yugoslavia since 1948, and it was an abject surrender to the bourgeois Social Democratic theory and practice of 'non-

interference' in the internal affairs, EVEN ON IDEOLOGICAL ISSUES and building of socialism independently. The Declaration was in essence the forerunner of the programme of the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav Party in 1958. Strangely enough, the Declaration was not only not opposed but was jointly prepared by Khrushchev and Tito, while the programme of the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslavia Party, which was in essence same as the Joint declaration, was opposed both by the Soviet Union and China! (For the excerpted text of 'Belgrade Declaration' see Appendix, Document No. 4.)

Complicity of the CPC with Soviet-Yugoslav Revisionism

What was the stand of the Communist Party of China on the question of rapprochement with Yugoslav revisionism? What was its stand so far the 1948 June Cominform resolution was concerned, which the CPC supported in 1948, but also made outstanding contribution against revisionism through Liu Shao- Chi's pamphlet '**Internationalism and Nationalism**'. Let us hear from the CPC's documents.

"In 1954, when Khrushchev proposed to improve relations with Yugoslavia" wrote the Editorial Department of **Peoples' Daily** and **Red Flag** in the 'Third Comment'. "**We agreed to treat it as a fraternal socialist country FOR THE PURPOSE OF WINNING IT BACK TO THE PATH OF SOCIALISM WATCHING HOW THE TITO CLIQUE WOULD DEVELOP**".

Attention, please, Comrade reader! Though in fact, Yugoslavia was not a socialist country, the CPC "agreed to treat it as a fraternal socialist country"! Why this show of Gandhi's magnanimity? Why this "trial and error" gamble of the experimentalists? For the purpose of wining it back [by changing heart through Gandhi's therapy?] to the path of socialism? Is it not a tactical line, compromising the principle? Can the class basis of revisionism be changed without the uncompromising struggle against the very class basis? Lenin advised the Marxist-Leninist to consider "a policy based on principle" as "the only correct policy". He further said, "If you must unite, Marx wrote to the Party leaders, then enter into agreements to satisfy the practical aims of the movement, BUT DO NOT ALLOW ANY BARGAINING OVER THE PRINCIPLE, DO NOT MAKE THEORETICAL CONCESSIONS". (**What Is To Be Done?**)

In fact the Khrushchev leadership and the CPC did never accept the Yugoslav question and Yugoslav revisionism as the question of principle of Marxism- Leninism. They did never accept Tito clique as the loyal and trusted agent of imperialism. Like hopeless Liberals they thought that Tito went over to imperialism due to mishandling of Stalin and they are to mend those mistakes - playing the role of saviours.

We also give below a quotation of the relevant portion from the Resolution on the Moscow meeting of representatives of the Communists and Workers' parties, adopted on May 23, 1958, in the second session of the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China, in which the history of the development of rapprochement (rather, capitulation) with Yugoslav revisionism had been narrated since 1954. The relevant portion of the said resolution said, "Since 1954, the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, headed by comrade N. S. Khrushchev, initiated improvement of relation with Yugoslavia and has adopted a series of measures to this end. THIS WAS ENTIRELY NECESSARY AND CORRECT. [Why "this was

necessary” was not said]. **This initiative of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had the approval of all socialist countries and the Communist Parties of various countries.** WE ALSO, TOOK SIMILAR STEPS TO THOSE OF THE SOVIET UNION and established relation between China and Yugoslavia and BETWEEN THE CHINESE AND YUGOSLAV PARTIES. Starting from the desire of unity, [unity with whom ?] the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and some other Communist Parties concerned MADE NECESSARY SELF-CRITICISM OF PAST DEFECTS IN THEIR RELATIONS WITH YUGOSLAVIA ” (- Quoted from **In refutation of modern revisionism**; Foreign Languages Press, Peking, 1958.)

Both the Soviet Union and China re-declared Yugoslavia a socialist country and Yugoslav Party, a Marxist -Leninist Party and rehabilitated Yugoslavia and Yugoslav Party in the ranks of world Communists. It meant the rehabilitation of modern revisionism in the international communist movement.

The rapprochement with Yugoslavia in 1955 meant that (a) the Cominform resolution of June 1948 and November 1949 were “wrong ” and “incorrect”; (b) the anti- Titoite treason trials of Slansky, Rajk, Kostov etc. were ‘fabricated’ and ‘got up’; (c) Titoite Yugoslavia and Yugoslav Party did not commit any wrong in betraying the Greek peoples’ revolution in 1949; (d) Titoite subversion against Albania can be excused; (e) the building of ‘socialism’ by the Tito clique with US dollar and (f) ‘Balkan Pact’ made by Tito clique were permissible. It also meant that ‘Tito clique’ (transformed in to ‘Comrade Tito’) and ‘Comrade Tito’ was a great Marxist-Leninist while devil Stalin was a ‘great nation chauvinist’. It also meant the repudiation of Liu Shao-Chi’s outstanding Marxist -Leninist pamphlet **Internationalism and Nationalism**.

It can also be safely concluded from the steps and measures taken by the CPC and CPSU that the slanderous campaign against Stalin did not begin at the twentieth Congress of the CPSU in 1956. It began right from 1954. Otherwise, how both the CPC and CPSU could convince “ all socialist countries and communist parties of various countries” and get their ‘approval’ against 1948 and 1949 Cominform resolution in rehabilitating Tito clique and Titoite Yugoslavia? How can “some other Communist Parties concerned made necessary self-criticism of past defects”?

On July 17, 1956, after the twentieth Congress of the CPSU in February 1956, the Cominform was dissolved, thus completely disorganising and disarraying the world communist movement and depriving the world communists from whatever international organisation in embryonic form they had, while at the same time taking initiative in the formation of the international organisation of the ruling classes of the oppressed countries, euphemistically called the “Third World”, bringing the ruling classes of these countries in the forefront of anti-imperialist “struggle” - such as Bandung with a view to divert the national liberation movement in to the channel of bourgeois nationalism.

The Hungarian Counter revolution and the Role of ‘Com. Tito’

What was the role of CPC’s and CPSU’s ‘comrade Tito’ in the Hungarian counter revolution? Before answering this question let us see how and why it was engineered and what part was played by Khrushchev and China.

We know that Khrushchev went to Belgrade in 1955 and made rapprochement with the Tito clique. Protocol demanded a return visit to Moscow by Tito. Accordingly, Tito made his return visit to Moscow in June 1956, after being quite sure that he had won all the points. It was about five months before the Hungarian counter-revolution. After his arrival, Tito demanded among other things, the removal of the ‘Stalinists’ from the key Government and Party posts of the peoples’ Democratic countries, who were still opposing the line of capitulation to Tito clique and Titoite revisionism. In spite of the best efforts and high-pressures Tito-Khrushchev combination could not remove the ‘Stalinists’ from the key Government and the Party posts in Albania, Poland and Hungary. According to the ‘Third Comment’ of the CPC “the Tito clique had been carrying on subversive activities and armed provocation against socialist Albania for a long time. It has engineered four major cases of treason in 1944, 1948, 1958 and 1960. Its armed provocation on the Yugoslav-Albania border numbered more than 470 from 1948 to 1968”. But Albania withstood. Conspiracy against comrade Berman, the leader of the Polish Party and a staunch Stalinist, in complicity with Gomulka, led to the Poznan riots in 1956. We like to concentrate here on Hungarian events.

In April 1955, the Hungarian Party headed by comrade Rakosi, removed the arch- revisionist and Titoite Imre Nagy, from the post of Premiership of the Hungarian Government and Andres Hegedus, a loyal Marxist-Leninist was made Premier. This naturally enraged Tito and embarrassed Khrushchev.

We quote below the relevant portion from Tito’s notorious Pula speech, which he delivered on November 11, 1956, during the Hungarian counter-revolution. Tito said, “when we were in Moscow, [in June 1956], we talked, of course, also about Poland and Hungary and other countries. We said that Rakosi regime and Rakosi himself were completely incapable of leading Hungarian state and bringing about internal unity and that, on the contrary, they could bring only grave consequence. ... However, they [Khrushchev and others of the Soviet Party] made the mistakes in not allowing the elimination of Gero and other followers of Rakosi. ... Their conditions, for agreeing to Rakosi’s departure was that Gero should stay. This was a mistake because Gero was not, at all, different from Rakosi ...PEOPLE IN HUNGARY WERE ABSOLUTELY OPPOSED TO STALINIST ELEMENTS STILL IN POWER. THEY DEMANDED THEIR ELIMINATION AND TRANSITION TO THE ROAD TOWARDS DEMOCRATISATION.”

It is crystal clear from the above speech that Khrushchev and Tito were, at the time of Tito’s Moscow visit, making and unmaking “Kings” in the Peoples’ Democratic countries, conspiring jointly. And these people accused Stalin of interference in the internal affairs of the Peoples’ Democratic countries!

As Imre Nagy was unseated from the position of premiership and as Rakosi and Gero could not be eliminated through the ‘good office’ of Khrushchev, a counter-revolution in Hungary was needed by Tito to overthrow the Rakosi-Gero ‘Stalinist regime’. In his Pula speech Tito characterised the Hungarian counter-revolution as resistance by ‘progressives’ and posed whether the ‘course of Yugoslavia’ or the ‘course of Stalinism’ would win!

And what was the stand of the CPC so far the Pula speech of Tito was concerned?

The Soviet Communist Party organ **Pravda** wrote an article on November 23, 1956, in reply to Tito's Pula speech. It was conciliatory in tone and carefully avoided any reference to making and unmarking of 'Kings' in Hungary. Following Pravda's article, the CPC, in its article **once more on the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat**, in December, 1956, obediently followed the conciliatory line of the CPSU wooing Tito and exonerating him from all the charges of conspiracy and ring leadership of Hungarian counter-revolution, addressing Tito as 'comrade Tito' even after the Hungarian events! It wrote: "That the Yugoslav comrades should feel a SPECIAL DISLIKE FOR STALIN IS UNDERSTANDABLE.... We also agree with **some of the views** expressed by Tito in his speech [Pula speech]". Can sycophancy go any further? Lenin once said that revisionists talked about dialectics merely because they wanted to 'emasculate the revolutionary spirit of Marxism with sophistries' (**The Proletarian revolution and Kautsky, the renegade**). That was what exactly the article **Once more on the historical experience** ... of the CPC had done. In everything, if analysed dialectically, there will be some correct points, if taken isolatedly. Only the hopeless liberals and sophists, in such cases, settle the struggle between right and wrong through compromise as the CPC article done Marxist-Leninists, sort out things and then find out the interconnection and determine which is - as a whole - **basically** correct and which is **basically** incorrect and take stand accordingly. There is no place of sophistry in dialectics. Just compare this article of 1956 with the 'Third Comment' of 1963. In the 'Third Comment' the CPC wrote:

"5. The counter revolutionary rebellion in Hungary, the Tito clique played a shameful role of an interventionist provocateur in the Hungarian counter revolutionary rebellion in October, 1956. After the outbreak of the rebellion, Tito published a letter supporting the counter revolutionary measure of the traitor Nagy.... In a speech on November 11, [Pula speech on which the 1956 article said "we also agree with some of the views"] Tito characterised the counter-revolutionary rebellion as resistance by "progressive" and impudently questioned whether the "Course of Yugoslavia" or the "Course of Stalinism" would win". It is sheer opportunism, metaphysics and sophistry, if according to the needs and use, one side of the **whole thing** is over-emphasised, de-emphasising the other side, ignoring the whole thing **at a time** and without determining what is basic and what is not.

After the Hungarian counter-revolution which produced some bitterness over the issue of Imre Nagy between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia - mere sycophancy could not satisfy Tito. Tito demanded cash returns. Belgrade refused diplomatic recognition to the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) since its formal inception in 1955. Tito had to be reassured by the purge in June 1957 of Molotov, Kaganovitch and other 'Stalinists' and only after that Yugoslavia reciprocated by according formal recognition to East Germany in October 1957 and also gave word that the Yugoslav Party will attend the world "get together" to be held in Moscow in November 1957, on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of October revolution. The Communist Party of China appealed to the communists of the world to rally round Khrushchev against the "anti-Party group" of Molotov and Kaganovitch, against "the dogmatists"!

In spite of Tito's leading role in engineering the Hungarian counter-revolution, the Soviet Communist Party in agreement with the Communist Party of China allowed the Yugoslav counter-revolutionary Party to attend the 64 Party "get together" and 12 ruling parties' meeting of the Socialist countries as Marxist-Leninist Party and socialist country!

RIP VAN WINKLE WAKES UP ONLY TO MUDDLE

In 1957, Yugoslavia attended the 64-Party “get together” [we call it “get together” instead of “conference” as its decisions were not binding to anybody.] Though Yugoslavia was signatory to the ‘Peace Manifesto’ of the 64-Parties, she refused to sign the 12 socialist countries’ statement. Why Yugoslavia refused to sign the 12 ruling Party statement? Yugoslavia argued, it did not believe in two world theory - the world of socialist camp and the world of imperialist camp. To Yugoslavia, both were military blocs-- NATO and Warsaw Pact blocs. Besides these two worlds, according to Yugoslavia, THERE WAS ANOTHER WORLD AND ANOTHER FORCE - THE THIRD WORLD AND THE THIRD FORCE OF THE NON-ALIGNED, NEUTRAL COUNTRIES WITH A THIRD PATH. According to Yugoslavia, the two military blocs pursued a policy of military strength while Yugoslavia pursued a policy of “positive co-existence” with both worlds. Yugoslavia belonged to this non-aligned ‘Third World’. That was why Yugoslavia did not sign the 12 ruling Party statement.

IN FACT, TITO WAS THE MAN, WHO BORROWED THE IDEA OF THE THREE WORLDS AND THE THIRD WORLD from the French bourgeoisie in the international communist movement repudiating all class analysis of the present-day society. It was Tito who united Nehru-Nasser-Tito in exploring a ‘third path’ and Bandung was the by- product of this concept which has now become a permanent organization of the non-aligned countries, blessed by both US imperialism and Soviet neo-imperialism.

In spite of all these developments the relation between the socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia remained more or less cordial for the next five months. On the eve of the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav Party, scheduled for the latter part of April 1958, Yugoslav League of Communists circulated a draft programme to world’s major Communist Parties for discussion and comments, sometime during the March 1958. The Soviet Party suggested some changes and amendments hoping that the Yugoslav Party would reconcile. But the Yugoslav Party did not agree to budge an inch. So on April 5, 1958, the Soviet Party declared that it would not send fraternal delegation to Yugoslav Party Congress. The Communist Party of China also declared similarly. Things began to develop rapidly. On April 9, 1958, a long critique of the draft programme of Yugoslavia was published in CPSU’s theoretical journal **Kommunist**, in which the hope was expressed that by ‘comradely criticism’ Yugoslav Party might be led to recognise the ‘numerous errors’ of the programme and to correct them. Following Soviet criticism, the Communist Party of China on May 5, 1958, in its **Peoples’ Daily** published a virulent assault on the draft programme of Yugoslav Party. In this article the **entire Yugoslav programme** was called ‘anti-Marxist Leninist’ and its authors and supporters were characterised as “out and out revisionists”. FOR THE FIRST TIME [SINCE LIU-SHAO-CHI’S **Internationalism and nationalism** of 1948], THE ARTICLE ADMITTED THAT THE COMINFORM RESOLUTION OF 1948 WAS “BASICALLY CORRECT”. It did not, however, criticise its own mistakes for rehabilitating Tito clique and for renouncing the 1948 Cominform resolution, while it forced the constituents of the Cominform to criticise themselves for the “defects of the past” in regard to the relations with Yugoslavia. On the contrary, it persisted in its mistakes and took a recourse to deceive the Party ranks, people and itself by a face -saving bourgeois method by saying “but there were defects and mistakes in the method adopted at that time by the Information Bureau in dealing with the question” without, of course, mentioning

concretely “the defects and mistakes in the methods” (See, Appendix, Document No. 5. experts from the **Peoples’ Daily** article).

China broke off diplomatic ties with Yugoslavia in September 1958, following the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union cut off all, the then, existing credit arrangements with Yugoslavia on May 27, 1958 and China hailed it. Then, how could there be “defects and mistakes in the methods adopted at that time by the Information Bureau in dealing with the question?” The Communist Party of China had no reply.

Finally, in 1960, in 81-Communist Party “get together” Yugoslavia and Yugoslav Party were branded as enemy of socialism and friend of imperialism and the Tito clique as spies and agent of US imperialism. The 81-Party statement in 1960 said exactly what was said in 1949 November resolution of the Cominform. Yet, there was no self-criticism, no admission that they committed mistakes in rehabilitating the Tito clique and Titoite revisionism, no attempt was made to find out why these mistakes were committed, what was the class basis of these mistakes. Nor did they restore the November 1949 Cominform resolution, which was withdrawn in 1956 declaring it as “wrong”.

The 81-Party statement declared that “The Communist Parties have unanimously condemned the Yugoslav variety of international opportunism, a variety of modern revisionist “theories” in concentrated form.”

It further said, “After betraying Marxism-Leninism which they termed obsolete, the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia opposed the anti-Leninist revisionist programme to the Declaration of 1957, to set the LCY against international communist movement as a whole...”

“... [The leaders of the LCY were] dependent on the so called aid from US and other imperialists and thereby exposed the Yugoslav people to the danger of losing revolutionary gains achieved through a heroic struggle...”

It further said, “THE YUGOSLAV REVISIONISTS CARRY ON SUBVERSIVE WORK AGAINST THE SOCIALIST CAMP...THEY ENGAGE IN ACTIVITIES WHICH PREJUDICE UNITY OF ALL PEACE LOVING FORCES AND COUNTRIES.”

Compare this statement with the resolution of November 1949, of the Cominform as well as with the message of greetings by the CPC to the Eleventh Congress of the Yugoslav Party.

That the Yugoslav Party “carry subversive work” is well known to the people of India, who were connected with the communist movement of India. Randive, Bhowani Sen and others and the United CPI headed by them were the worst victims of this “subversion” in 1947-48.

In March 1962, the **Red Flag**, the theoretical organ of the CPC, published an article, written by one Wu Chiang under the heading “Our age and Edward Kardelj’s dialectics” in reviewing Kardelj’s pamphlet **Socialism and War**. Among other things, the article accused Kardelj of being “a highly paid lackey of imperialism”. “Kardelj is, after all, an old hand at serving imperialism.” The article further said, “Yugoslavia’s modern revisionists have proposed a so-

called 'positive co-existence' TO THE EXCLUSION OF CLASS STRUGGLE AND REVOLUTION. Among them "positive co-existence" **is the absolute, supreme category** of contemporary international politics, which is above and beyond struggle and all revolution TO WHICH THE INTERESTS OF ALL REVOLUTIONS MUST BE SUBORDINATED. Such co-existence means **complete, unconditional** (emphasis in original) INTERNATIONAL CLASS CO-OPERATION AND CO-OPERATION AMONG NATIONS. There is neither any international class struggle (or, if there is struggle it consists in ideological struggle only and not on in any political struggle), NOR ANY STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION AGAINST IMPERIALIST ENSLAVEMENT. Also when they talk about struggle, they distort the conception till it is beyond recognition ... SUCH ABSOLUTISM EVEN FORCIBLY (AND THEREFORE ABSURDLY) REGARDS ALL STRUGGLES AS CAPABLE OF DESTROYING PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE"

By which magic wand, then, the 180 degree right about turn of the Communist Party of China has taken place? A socialist country may have diplomatic and trade relations even with a fascist country. But what about the Party-to-Party relations and the contents of the message of greetings by the CPC to the 11th Congress of the Yugoslav Party?

In 1963, in the 'Third Comment' – '**Is Yugoslavia a socialist country?**', the CPC just justified the following sub-headings:

- (1) "The development of private capital in Yugoslav cities"
- (2) "Yugoslav country side swamped by capitalism"
- (3) "The degeneration of socialist economy owned by the whole people into a capitalist economy"
- (4) "A dependency of imperialism"
- (5) "A counter-revolutionary special detachment of US imperialism"
- and (6) "The degeneration of the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie."

Can a country become socialist with the above attributes? Can the ruling Party of that country become a Marxist Leninist Party?

The same "Third Comment" said:

"This is not only a question of ascertaining the nature of Yugoslav State, but it also involves the question of which road the socialist countries should follow: whether they should follow the road of October Revolution and carry the socialist revolution through to the end or follow the road of Yugoslavia and restore capitalism. In addition, it involves the question how to appraise the Tito clique: **Whether it is a fraternal Party and a force against imperialism or a renegade from the international communist movement and a lackey of imperialism.**"

Eating away everything the CPC and China has taken the pro-Tito clique stand on the one hand and anti-Albanian stand on the other.

Every honest communist in the world has the responsibility to be critical and self-critical concerning the problem of international communist movement.

“Frankly admitting a mistake, disclosing the reasons for it, analysing the condition which led to it, and carefully discussing the means of correcting it -- this is the sign of a serious Party: this is the way it performs its duties, this is the way it educates and trains the **class** and then the **masses**.” (Lenin: ‘**Left wing’ Communism, an infantile disorder**; emphasis in original).

APPENDIX

Document No 1.

Resolution of the Information Bureau ‘Concerning the situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia’, June 28, 1948 [Excerpted].

“The Information Bureau... after discussing the situation in the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and announcing that the representatives of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia had refused to attend the meeting of the Information Bureau, unanimously reached the following conclusions:

“1. The Information Bureau notes that the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia has recently pursued an incorrect line on the main question, of domestic and foreign policy, a line which represents a departure from Marxism Leninism....

“3. In domestic policy, the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia are departing from the position of the working class and are breaking with the Marxist theory of classes and class struggle. They deny that there is a growth of capitalist elements in their country and consequently, a sharpening of class struggle in the countryside. This denial is the direct result of the opportunist tenet that the class struggle does not become sharper during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, as Marxism-Leninism teaches but dies down, as was affirmed by opportunists of the Bukharin type, who propagated the theory of the peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism.

“The Yugoslav leaders are pursuing an incorrect policy in the countryside by ignoring the class differentiation in the countryside and by regarding the individual peasantry as a single entity, contrary to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of classes and class struggle, contrary to the Lenin’s well known thesis that small individual farming gives birth continually, daily, hourly, spontaneously and on a mass scale to capitalism and the bourgeoisie. Moreover, the political situation in the Yugoslav countryside gives no grounds for smugness and complacency. In the condition obtaining in Yugoslavia, where individual peasant farming predominates, where the land is not nationalized, where there is private property in land, where land can be bought and sold, where much of the land is concentrated in the hands of the Kulaks and where hired labour is employed, there can be no question of educating the Party in the spirit of glossing over the class struggle and reconciling class contradictions without by so doing disarming the Party itself in the face of difficulties connected with the construction of socialism.

“On the question of the leading role of the working class, the leaders of Yugoslav Communist Party, by affirming that the peasantry is the “most stable foundation of Yugoslav state” are departing from the Marxist Leninist path and are taking the path of populist, Kulak Party. Lenin taught that the proletariat as the “only class in contemporary society which is the revolutionary to

the end.... must be the leader in the struggle of the entire people for a thorough democratic transformation, in the struggle of all working people and the exploited against the oppressors and exploiters.”

“As far as the peasantry is concerned it may be that the majority, that is, the poor and medium peasants, are already in alliance with the working class, with the working class having the leading role in this alliance.

“The attitude of the Yugoslav leaders disregards these theses of Marxism-Leninism.

“As can be seen this attitude reflects views appropriate to petty bourgeois nationalism, but not to Marxist-Leninists.

“4. The Information Bureau considers that the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia is revising Marxist-Leninist teaching about the Party. According to the theory of Marxism-Leninism the Party is the principal guiding and leading force in the country, which has its own, specific program and does not dissolve itself among the non-Party masses. The Party is the highest form of organisation and most important weapon of the working class.... [For the rest, see CPSU’s letter to the CPY, which has been given earlier]

“5. The Information Bureau considers that the criticism made by the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B) and the central committee of other Communist Parties who in this way rendered fraternal assistance to the Yugoslav Communist Party, of the mistakes of the central committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, provides the Communist Party of Yugoslavia with all the conditions necessary to speedily correct the mistakes committed.

“However, instead of honestly accepting this criticism and taking the Bolshevik path of correcting these mistakes, the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, suffering from boundless ambition, arrogance and conceit, met this criticism with belligerence and hostility. They took the anti-Party path of indiscriminately denying all their mistakes, violated the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism regarding the attitude of a political party to its mistakes and thus aggravated the anti-party mistakes...

[Regarding 6 & 7 see CPSU’s letter quoted earlier]

“8. In view of this, the Information Bureau expresses complete agreement with the appraisal of the situation in the Yugoslav Communist Party, with the criticism of the mistakes of the central committee of the Party, with the political analysis of these mistakes contained in the letters from the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B) to the central committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia between March and May 1948.

“The Information Bureau unanimously concludes that by their anti-Party and anti-Soviet views ‘incompatible with Marxism-Leninism’, by their whole attitude and their refusal to attend the meeting of the Information Bureau the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia have placed themselves in opposition to the Communist Parties affiliated with the Information Bureau, have taken the path of seceding from the United Socialist front against imperialism, have taken

the path of betraying the cause of international solidarity of the working people and have taken up a position of nationalism.

“The Information Bureau condemns this anti-Party policy and attitude of the central committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia.

“The Information Bureau considers that, in view of all this, the central committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia has placed itself and Yugoslav Party outside the family of the fraternal Communist Parties, outside the United Communist Front and consequently outside the ranks of the Information Bureau.

“The Information Bureau considers that the basis of these mistakes made by the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia lies in the undoubted fact that nationalist elements, which previously existed in disguised form, managed in the course of the past five or six months to reach a dominant position in the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and that consequently the leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party has broken with internationalist traditions of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and has taken the road of nationalism.

“The Yugoslav leaders evidently do not understand or probably, pretend that they do not understand, that such a nationalist line can only lead to Yugoslavia’s degeneration into an ordinary bourgeois republic, to the loss of independence, and to its transformation into a colony of the imperialist countries.....

Document No 2.

Cominform Resolution of November 1949.

Communist Party of Yugoslavia is the power of murderers and spies.

The Information Bureau, consisting of representatives of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, Rumanian workers’ Party, Working peoples’ Party of Hungary, United Workers’ Party of Poland, Communist Party of the Soviet Union (B), Communist Party of French, Czechoslovakia and Italy, having considered the question ‘Yugoslav Communist Party in the power of murderers and spies’ unanimously reached the following conclusions:

“Whereas, in 1948 meeting of the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties noted the changeover of the Tito-Rankovic clique from democracy and socialism to bourgeois nationalism, during the period that has elapsed since the meeting of the Information Bureau, this clique has travelled all the way from bourgeois nationalism to fascism and outright betrayal of the national interests of Yugoslavia.

“Recent events show that the Yugoslav Government is completely dependent on foreign imperialist circles and has become an instrument of their aggressive policy, which resulted in the liquidation of independence of the Yugoslav Republic. The central committee of the Party and the Government of Yugoslavia have merged completely with the imperialist circles against the

entire camp of Socialism and Democracy; against the Communist Parties of the world; against the New Democracies and the USSR.

“The Belgrade clique of hired spies and murderers made a flagrant deal with imperialist reaction and entered its service, as the Budapest trial of Rajk-Brankov made perfectly clear. This trial showed that the present Yugoslav rulers, having fled from the camp of Democracy and Socialism to the camp of capitalism and reaction, have become direct accomplices of the instigators of new war, and by their treacherous deeds, are ingratiating themselves with the imperialists and know-towing to them.

“The changeover of the Tito clique to fascism was not fortuitous. It was affected on the order of their masters, the Anglo-American imperialists, whose mercenaries, it is now clear, this clique has been today.

“The Yugoslav traitors, obeying the will of the imperialists, undertook to form in the People’s Democracies political gangs consisting of reactionaries, nationalists, clerical and fascist elements and, relying on these gangs to bring about counter revolutionary coups in these countries, wrest them from the Soviet Union and the entire Socialist camp and subordinate them to forces of imperialism. The Tito clique transformed Belgrade into an American centre for espionage and anti-communist propaganda.

“When all genuine friends of peace, democracy and Socialism see in the USSR, a powerful fortress of Socialism, a faithful and steadfast defender of freedom and independence of nations and the principal bulwark of peace, the Tito-Rankovic clique, having attained power under the mask of friendship with the USSR, began on the orders of the Anglo-American imperialists, a campaign of slander and provocation against the Soviet Union, utilising the most vile calumnies borrowed from the arsenal of Hitler.

“The transformation of Tito-Rankovic clique into a direct agency of imperialism and accomplices of the warmongers, culminated in the lining up of the Yugoslav Government with the imperialist bloc at UNO, where Kardelj, Djilas and Bablers joined in a united front with American reactionaries on vital matters of international policy.

“In the sphere of home policy, the chief outcome of the activity of the traitor Tito- Rankovic clique is the actual liquidation of the Peoples’ Democratic system in Yugoslavia.

“Due to the counter-revolutionary policy of the Tito-Rankovic clique which usurped power in the Party and in the State, the anti communist police state, fascist type regime has also installed in Yugoslavia. The social basis of this regime consists of Kulaks in the country- side and capitalist elements in the towns.

“In fact, power in Yugoslavia is in the hands of anti-popular reactionary elements. Active members of the old bourgeois parties, Kulaks and other enemies of Peoples’ Democracy are active in central and local Government bodies.

“The top fascist rulers rely on enormously swollen military police apparatus, with the aid of which they oppress the peoples of Yugoslavia. They have turned the country into a military camp, wiped out all democratic rights of the working people and trample on any free expression of opinion.

“The Yugoslav rulers demagogically and insolently deceive the people alleging that they are building socialism in Yugoslavia.

“But it is clear to every Marxist that there cannot be talk of building socialism in Yugoslavia when the Tito clique has broken with the Soviet Union, with the entire camp of Socialism and Democracy, thereby depriving Yugoslavia of the main bulwark for building socialism and when it has subordinated the country economically and politically to Anglo American imperialists.

“The state sector in the economy of Yugoslavia has ceased to be peoples’ property, since state power is in the hands of enemies of the people.

“The Tito-Rankovic clique has created wide possibilities for the penetration of foreign capital into the economy of the country and has placed the economy under the control of capitalist monopolies.

“Anglo-American industrial-financial circles investing their capital in Yugoslav economy, are transforming Yugoslavia into an agrarian raw materials adjunct of foreign capital.

“The ever-growing slavish dependence of Yugoslavia on imperialism leads to intensified exploitation of the working class and to a several worsening of its country.

“The policy of Yugoslav rulers in the country bears a Kulak-capitalist character.

“... The Information Bureau of the communist and workers’ parties considers, therefore, that the struggle against the Tito clique - hired spies and murderers - is the international duty of all communists and workers’ parties.

“...The Information Bureau considers one of the most important tasks of the communist and workers’ parties to be an all-round heightening of revolutionary vigilance in Party ranks; exposing and rooting out bourgeois nationalist elements and agents of imperialism, no matter under what flag they conceal themselves.

“The Information Bureau recognises the need for more ideological work in the communist and workers’ Parties; more work to train communists in the spirit of loyalty to proletarian internationalism; irreconcilability to any departure from the principles of Marxism-Leninism and in the spirit of loyalty to Peoples’ Democracy and Socialism”.

Document No 3.

Statement given by the first secretary of the Soviet Party, N. S. Khrushchev, on his arrival at Belgrade Air Port on May 26, 1955 (Excerpted).

Dear Comrade Tito, members of the Government and leaders of the Yugoslav Communist League, dear comrades and citizens:

In the name of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the Government of the USSR and the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and in the name of the Soviet people, I cordially greet you and the workers of the glorious capital of Yugoslavia, Belgrade and all the brotherly peoples of Yugoslavia.

The Soviet delegation has come to your country to determine, together with the Yugoslav delegation, the roads for further developments and consolidation of friendship and co-operation between our peoples, to consider our joint task in the struggle of our countries for prosperity, for reduction of tension, for strengthening peace in general and the security of the peoples.

“... As we know, the best relations developed during those years between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, between our States and our Parties. However, later these good relations were destroyed.

WE SINCERELY REGRET WHAT HAPPENED AND RESOLUTELY REJECT THE THINGS THAT OCCURRED ONE AFTER THE OTHER DURING THAT PERIOD. ON OUR PART, WE ASCRIBE WITHOUT HESITATION THE AGGRAVATION TO THE PROVOCATIVE ROLE THAT BERA, ABAKUMOV AND OTHERS -RECENTLY EXPOSED AS ENEMIES OF THE PEOPLE - PLAYED IN THE RELATIONS BETWEEN YUGOSLAVIA AND THE USSR.

WE STUDIED ASSIDUOUSLY THE MATERIALS ON WHICH THE SERIOUS ACCUSATIONS AND OFFENCES DIRECTED AT THAT TIME AGAINST THE LEADERS OF YUGOSLAVIA HAD BEEN BASED. THE FACTS SHOW THAT THESE MATERIALS WERE FABRICATED BY ENEMIES OF THE PEOPLE, DETESTABLE AGENTS OF IMPERIALISM WHO BY DECEPTIVE METHODS PUSHED THEIR WAY INTO THE RANKS OF OUR PARTY....

“...Today, when certain results have already been achieved in the field of normalization of our relations, the Soviet delegation expresses the conviction that the forthcoming negotiations will lead to the development and consolidation of political, economic and cultural cooperation among our peoples. All the conditions exist for such cooperation - centuries old historic friendship between the people of our countries, the glorious traditions of the revolutionary movement, THE INDISPENSABLE ECONOMIC BASE AND JOINT IDEALS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACEFUL ADVANCEMENT AND HAPPINESS OF WORKING PEOPLE...

“THE DESIRE OF YUGOSLAVIA TO MAINTAIN RELATIONS WITH ALL STATES BOTH IN THE WEST AND IN THE EAST [meaning “Balkan Pact” with NATO countries - Greece and Turkey as well as with America] HAS MET WITH COMPLETE UNDERSTANDING ON OUR PART. We consider that the strengthening of friendship and ties between our countries will contribute to consolidation of peace in general. ...

“...As representatives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Party created by Great Lenin, we consider it desirable to have mutual confidence established between our Parties. THE STRONGEST TIES ARE CREATED AMONG THE PEOPLES OF THOSE COUNTRIES WHERE THE LEADING FORCES ARE PARTIES THAT BASE THEIR ACTIVITIES ON THE TEACHINGS OF MARXISM-LENINISM. Parties governed by the teachings of Marxism-Leninism achieve mutual understanding because the struggle for the interests of the working class, the working peasantry and the working peoples is their only aim. The best sons and daughters of these nations have spilt their blood for the final victory of socialism and fighting against internal and foreign enemies, HAVE THROWN OFF THE YOKE OF CAPITALISM, winning their freedom and independence. GOING ALONG NEW SOCIALIST ROADS, THE PEOPLES OF THESE COUNTRIES are consolidating their forces under conditions of real and firm friendship...

“We would not be doing our duty to our people and the working people of the whole world if we did not do EVERYTHING POSSIBLE TO ESTABLISH MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION AND THE YUGOSLAV COMMUNIST LEAGUE, ON THE BASIS OF TEACHINGS OF MARXISM-LENINISM.”...

DOCUMENT NO 4.

Joint Soviet Yugoslav Declaration – Belgrade, June 2, 1955, [Excerpts]

“In their consideration of question dealt with in the course of the talks and with a view to the strengthening of confidence and co-operation among nations, the two governments have started from the following principles:

“The indivisibility of peace upon which collective security can alone rest, respect for the sovereignty, independence, integrity and for equality among states in their mutual relations and in their relations with other states,

“Recognition and development of peaceful co-existence among nations, regardless of ideological differences or differences of social order which presuppose the co-operation of all states in the field of international relations in general, and more particularly in the field of economic and cultural relations...

“COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLE OF MUTUAL RESPECT FOR, AND NON-INTERFERENCE IN, INTERNAL AFFAIRS FOR ANY REASON WHATSOEVER, WHETHER OF AN ECONOMIC, POLITICAL or **ideological nature**, because questions of internal organization, or difference in social systems and of different forms of SOCIALIST DEVELOPMENT ARE **solely** THE CONCERN OF THE INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES.

“... Assistance through appropriate United Nations bodies, as well as in other forms, WHICH ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONS, both to the NATIONAL ECONOMIES and the economically under developed areas in the interest of the peoples of those areas AND OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORLD ECONOMY.

“...BOTH GOVERNMENTS HAVE BASED THEIR POLICY ON THE PRINCIPLES SET FORTH IN THE CHARTER OF UNITED NATIONS...

“...Both Governments welcome the results of Bandung conference [of Afro-Asian countries] as a significant contribution to the idea of INTERNATIONAL CO- OPERATION, as a support of the peoples of Asia and Africa towards strengthening of THEIR political and economic independence and consider that all this contributes to the strengthening of world peace”.

DOCUMENT NO 5.

Modern Revisionism Must Be Repudiated

Peoples' Daily, Editorial of May 5, 1958. (Excerpts)

“... The Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia which ended recently has adopted a “Draft programme of the League of communists of Yugoslavia” which is an anti-Marxist Leninist, out and out revisionist programme. To sum it up briefly, the draft programme substitutes sophistry for revolutionary materialist dialectics in methods of thinking; politically it substitutes the reactionary theory of the state standing above classes for the Marxist-Leninist theory of the State; and reactionary bourgeois nationalism for revolutionary proletarian internationalism; in political economy, it defends monopoly capital and tries to obscure the fundamental differences between the capitalist and socialist systems.... The draft programme brands all the basic principles of revolutionary theory established by Marx and Engels and developed by Lenin and other great Marxists as ‘dogmatism’ and the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia call themselves “irreconcilable enemies of dogmatism”....

“...They describe the two fundamentally different world political economical systems, the socialist camp and the imperialist camp as “division of the world into two antagonistic military blocs”. They represent themselves as standing outside the ‘two blocs’ of socialism and imperialism that is, standing in a so-called position beyond the blocs. They hold that the US dominated United Nations can “bring about greater and greater unification of the world”, that the economic co-operation of all countries of the world including the imperialist countries is “an integral part of the socialist road to the development of world economy”....

“... There are only two methods to which the bourgeois has resorted to undermine the workers’ movement - suppression by brute force and deceit. In the present new international situation ... the programme put forward by the Yugoslav revisionists fits in exactly with the need of the imperialists and particularly the American imperialists.

“It is quite obvious that the series of anti-Marxist Leninist and out and out revisionist views assembled in the Draft Programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia must be openly and uncompromisingly criticised and repudiated. If theoretical criticism of the revisionism of Bernstein and Kautsky and their ilk, by the Marxists of late 19th and early 20th centuries was inevitable, then it is even more necessary for us to repudiate neo- Bernsteinism now. This is because modern revisionism is set forth as a comprehensive and systematic programme by the leading group of a Party that wields state power; because modern revisionism is aimed at

splitting international communist movement and undermining the solidarity of the socialist countries, and is directly harmful to the fundamental interest of the Yugoslav people.

“WE CONSIDER AS BASICALLY CORRECT THE CRITICISM MADE IN JUNE 1948 BY THE INFORMATION BUREAU OF COMMUNIST PARTIES IN ITS RESOLUTION, ‘CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF YUGOSLAVIA’ IN REGARD TO THE MISTAKES OF THE YUGOSLAV COMMUNIST PARTY IN DEPARTING FROM THE PRINCIPLES OF MARXISM-LENINISM AND SINKING INTO BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM, but there were defects and mistakes in the method adopted at that meeting by the Information Bureau in dealing with the question....

“... Around the time of Hungarian events, they tried to disrupt the unity of the countries in the socialist camp on the pretext of so-called “opposition to Stalinism” during the Hungarian events they supported the renegade Nagy a clique, and in the recent Congress they have gone further and put forward a systematic and comprehensive revisionist programme...

Document No. 6

Between 1948 and 1953 (up to the murder of Stalin) exposure of developments in Yugoslavia was maintained in the Cominform newspaper “**For a Lasting Peace ...**” Since this period has been covered in obscurity, we are giving some quotes from the Cominform newspaper:

1. “...the logic of economic law is stronger than the ignorant reasoning of the ‘theoreticians’ Tito and Kardelj. Economic laws are inexorably forcing Yugoslavia’s economy into the main stream of the capitalist system of economy and subordinating it more and more to the interests of the imperialism.” (1st July, 1949).
2. “The state sector of the economy (of Yugoslavia) is no longer public property. State capitalism predominates in industry and private capital is tightening its grip town and especially in countryside ... The restoration of capitalism in Yugoslavia is accompanied by shameless demagogy to the effect that all this, if you please, is building Socialism and so on.” (September, 1, 1949)
3. “In the sphere of economy, the fascist Tito-Rankovic clique took the line of restoring capitalism in town and countryside. They base themselves on the urban bourgeoisie which receive from the Tito-Rankovic clique the means of production wrested from the people and the Kulaks in the countryside. In order to facilitate the restoration of capitalism ... the Yugoslav fascists undertook the so called ‘decentralisation’ of the entire national economy, abolished state management of industry, planned production and planned distribution of raw materials and goods. From the pronouncements of Tito, Kidric and other Belgrade chieftains it follows that the basic law of Yugoslav economy is the capitalist law of ‘supply and demand’ (April 6, 1951).
4. “At the end of August, the Tito-Rankovic clique ... announced ‘New Economic Laws’ which signified nothing more than the complete transition to open restoration of

capitalism, open transfer of Yugoslav's national riches to American and British imperialists" (October 12, 1951).

Exposure of Titoism was maintained until the murder of Stalin. But after that this was softened and in December 1954 an official statement from Moscow was published, declaring:

"The strained relations that obtained between Yugoslavia and the U.S.S.R. during the past few years were only to the advantage of the enemies of both countries. ... Consistently pursuing a peace loving policy the Soviet government put forward a proposal to the Yugoslav government to normalise the relations between the two countries."

In June, 1955 a joint declaration of the Russian and Yugoslav governments was issued after negotiation held in Yugoslavia. The negotiations "were conducted in a spirit of friendship and mutual understanding.... The negotiations made manifest the sincere desire of the governments of both the countries for the further development of all-round co-operation."

The principles which would guide this co-operation were:

"...mutual respect and non-interference in internal affairs FOR ANY REASON – WHETHER ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, OR IDEOLOGICAL" and "cessation of any and all forms of propaganda and misinformation and also other activities which sow distrust or in one way or other impede the creation of an atmosphere favourable to constructive international co-operation."

What does the above mean? It only means that the criticism of Titoism was banned and it also means that Titoism was to be allowed to represent itself as a trend in the international communist movement.

And on July 16, 1955, **Pravda** wrote: "The abnormal, unhealthy relations that arose after 1948, resulting from the provocation of Beria and Apakermov have been ended."

What was the attitude and stand of the Communist Party of China to this development?

The Communist Party of China gave its full support. On July 14, 1955 **Peoples' China** wrote:

"...a shadow had once been cast over Soviet-Yugoslav relations. Now it is clear that the temporary disruption of relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia and other Peoples' Democracies ran counter to the fundamental interests of the socialist peoples. It was harmful to the international communist movement ... Our regret about the unhappy episode in Soviet-Yugoslav relations is paralleled by our great satisfaction with the restoration and rapid development of Soviet-Yugoslav relations now."

Explanatory Notes

1. **Self management system of Yugoslavia:** In 1956, the Peoples' Daily of China in its editorial entitle '**Once more on the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat**' wrote:

"In the past [meaning after the expulsion of Yugoslavia from the ranks of the communists and the socialist camp by the Cominform in 1948 up to the period of rapprochement with it in 1955] the Yugoslav comrades, under different conditions, made valuable efforts in UPHOLDING SOCIALISM. In factories and in order public organizations they have carried out experiments in DEMOCRATIC MANAGEMENT which have also attracted attention."

On September 26, 1963 the Editorial department of the **Peoples' Daily** and **Red Flag** in their "Third Comment" - **Is Yugoslavia a Socialist Country?** Wrote:

"In the enterprise under "workers' self government" ownership is described by Tito clique as "higher form of socialist ownership". They assert that only with "workers' self-Government" can one really "build socialism"

"This is sheer deception.

"Theoretically speaking, as anyone with a **slight knowledge of Marxism** knows slogans like "workers' self Government" and "factories to the workers" have never been Marxist slogans advanced by anarchists, syndicalists, bourgeois socialists and old line opportunists and revisionists.

"The theory of "workers' self-government" "factory to the workers" runs counter to the fundamental Marxist theory of socialism. It was completely refuted by the classical Marxist writers long ago. ...

"... It is clear that "workers' self-Government" has nothing to do with socialism.

In 1978, on June 19, the same Communist Party of China making another 180 degree right about turn said:

"After liberation, by developing glorious revolutionary tradition and persevering in independence and initiative the LCY has established a SELF MANAGEMENT SYSTEM SUITABLE TO THE CONDITION AT HOME, raised the socialist initiative of the working class..." (New China News Agency Broadcast; CPC's message of greetings to the 11th Congress of the LCY)

This is the "dialectics" of the CPC!

In this connection, see also "Preliminary draft resolution of the Tenth Congress of the RCP (Bolsheviks) on Syndicalist and Anarchist deviation in our Party" by Lenin and also Lenin's speech at the Tenth Congress of the RCP (Bolsheviks) in volume 32.

2. On the Question of Non-Interference in Internal Affairs: “Comrade Ramsay say: ‘Let us, British communists decide this question ourselves’. What would the international be like if every little fraction came and said: ‘Some of us in favour of one thing and some of us are opposed to. Permit us to decide the question ourselves? ‘What would be the use of then of having an international, a Congress and all these discussion? ... We cannot agree that it only concerns the British Communists. We must say **in general**, what are the right tactics to pursue.’”

Elsewhere, in the speech:

“But we cannot say that this question only concerns Britain - THAT WOULD BE COPYING THE WORST HABITS OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL (Lenin, Role of the Communist Party vol. 31.)

And further,

“The method of the old International [the Second International] was to refer such questions to be decided by the separate Parties in the countries concerned. THAT WAS FUNDAMENTALLY WRONG. It is quite possible that we are not fully aware of the condition prevailing in this or that Party. BUT WHAT WE ARE DEALING WITH HERE, IS, **the principle underlying the tactics** OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY. This is very important and we, in the name of Third International MUST CLEARLY STATE HERE THE COMMUNIST POINT OF VIEW”. (Lenin, **Affiliation to the British Labour Party**, vol. 31)

Lenin said that the revolutionary theory “GROWS OUT OF THE SUM TOTAL OF THE REVOLUTIONARY EXPERIENCES AND REVOLUTIONARY THINKING **in all countries IN THE WORLD**” (Vol. 21, Pg-354). Hence, a single organization of the world communists is a must for proletarian internationalism in practice and to a single world organization the question of external interference does not and cannot arise. That single organisation must have democratic centralism on international scale and international discipline for the unity of will and action.

3. Building socialism independently and singly: The very approach to the question of socialist construction, the character of the socialist construction, of its scope, of its depth in general changes with the emergence of socialism in several countries from the period of socialism in one country. In the period of socialism in several countries, to advocate and practice socialism in one country and building socialism independently and singly is the essence of **modern** revisionism.

In this connection consult Lenin’s **Colonial theses** and also our next pamphlet. Lenin said, in his **colonial theses** that there is a tendency towards the creation of a SINGLE WORLD ECONOMY REGULATED BY THE PROLETARIAT OF ALL NATIONS **as an integrated whole** AND ACCORDING TO COMMON PLAN. This tendency has already revealed itself quite clearly under capitalism AND IS BOUND TO BE FURTHER DEVELOPED AND **consummated under socialism**.

He further said, “The urgency of the struggle against this evil [petty bourgeois nationalism], against the most deep rooted petty bourgeois national prejudices looms ever larger with the mounting exigencies OF THE TASK OF CONVERTING THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE

PROLETARIAT FROM A NATIONAL DICTATORSHIP (i.e. existing in a single country and incapable of determining world politics) INTO AN INTERNATIONAL ONE (i.e. A DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT INVOLVING AT LEAST SEVERAL ADVANCED COUNTRIES and capable of exercising a decisive influence upon world politics as a whole). **PETTY BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM PROCLAIMS AS INTERNATIONALISM the mere recognition of the equality of nations and nothing more...**

With the emergence of socialism in several countries replacing socialism in one country, the objective basis of the “creation of a single world economy regulated by the proletariats of all nations as an integrated whole and according to common plan” as well as “exercising a decisive influence upon world politics as a whole” was created. In this period to uphold, advocate, practise “building of socialism independently and singly”, to talk of ‘socialism in one country’ is the core of modern revisionism.

Tito clique opposed this very essence of Marxism-Leninism in the period of socialism in several countries and the CPSU and CPC surrendered to this bourgeois nationalism of the Tito clique. With the bourgeois nationalist slogan of equality of nations as “petty bourgeois nationalism proclaims as internationalism the mere recognition of the equality of nations and nothing more” they brought back the Social Democratic theory and practice of “non-interference in internal affairs” thus, completing the ascendancy of bourgeois nationalism over proletarian internationalism.

4. The denial of the sharpening of class struggle during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism: The Communist Party of China as a faithful follower of Khrushchev clique, like Tito clique, denied the Marxist -Leninist theory of sharpening of class struggle during the period of transition from capitalism of socialism. In **Once more on the historical experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat**, the CPC, dancing in the tune with Khrushchev’s secret report criticized Stalin as under:

“After the elimination of the exploiting classes one should not continue to stress intensification of class struggle, as was done by Stalin, with the result that the healthy development of socialist democracy was hampered. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is quite right in resolutely correcting Stalin IN THIS RESPECT.”