

## ENEMIES OF MARXISM

In the Tito clique of bourgeois nationalists, Kardelj has the reputation of being a theoretician.

On May 28 this year, Kardelj made a speech in the Yugoslav Skupshtina about the people's committees.

In his speech the most striking thing was the petty-bourgeois bragging. He boasted that they (Kardelj, Tito and their cronies), had never made mistakes in estimating the nature of people's democracy, and made the claim that they were the first to give a Marxist analysis to the new phenomenon of the development of the people's democratic system. After falsely, like a good trotskyist, accusing the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) and other Communist Parties of ideological and political confusion, Kardelj says: "You will not find such phenomena and theories in our country nor in our literature, nor in the policy of our Party".

Nobody has ever even thought of Tito, Kardelj, Rankovic and Djilas as Marxists. Neither the history of the international Communist movement nor the history of the Communist movement in Yugoslavia knows anything about their Marxist merits.

The Tito gang, pretending to the international role of "developers of Marxism", and shamelessly ascribing to themselves the merits of the Yugoslav people, usually clamours: We organised the partisan movement in Yugoslavia, we waged a national liberation war... consequently we are Marxists.

But nobody can seriously pretend that a partisan commander is a Marxist simply by virtue of being a partisan commander. Nor has the entire Tito clique any better reason for claiming the role of Marxist theoreticians than such a partisan.

Who can seriously regard Tito as a Marxist—Tito who declared that the programme of the People's Front was the programme of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia? It seems that the People's Front, whose social composition is extremely mixed (including kulaks and speculators) dictates its programme to the Communist Party. Kardelj boasts that they have never been confused in their theoretical estimation of people's democracy. But here is what Tito said in 1946 in Zagreb on the nature of people's democracy: "We tell the peasants that they are the firmest basis of our State not because we want to win their votes but because they are really this basis." It is purely social-revolutionary, kulak chatter which denies that the proletariat is the main leading force in the system of people's democracy.

In 1947, Djilas tried to prove that it was "completely incorrect and senseless to call separate meetings of the trade unions and the people's Front. They should be held together for the trade union is also in the Front". Djilas belittles the role of the working class to such an extent that he considers independent working class meetings impermissible and drives the organised workers to attend meetings of the Front where they are dissolved in the general mass of Front members, including kulaks and speculators.

Writing in "Borba" last year the "theoretician" Moshe Pijade maintained that in Yugoslavia the trade unions—that is, the working class—did not play any role in the liberation struggle and because of this were not the main force in the Yugoslav State system.

In his speech in the Skupshtina, Kardelj, generalising on the question of the negation of the leading role of the working class in the People's Democracies said that "for the dictatorship of the working class it is not violence that is essential, as the philistines believe..." Consequently, according to Kardelj, only philistines think that violence is an essential feature of the dictatorship of the proletariat, that violence is not imperative for the dictatorship of the proletariat. And thus we get dictatorship of the proletariat without the violence against the bourgeoisie! This reveals Kardelj as an out and out bourgeois nationalist.

And all this is presented by the Tito obscurantists as "a further development of Marxism in Yugoslav conditions".

V. I. Lenin had gentlemen of the Kardelj type in mind when he wrote:

"In defining the term 'dictatorship', Kautsky tried his utmost to conceal from the reader the fundamental symptom of this concept, namely: revolutionary violence." (Vol. XXIII, p. 343, Russ. Ed.)

Refuting the anti-Marxist assertions that the dictatorship of the proletariat allegedly concerns only the use of force against the bourgeoisie, Comrade Stalin points out: "But of course, the dictatorship of the proletariat does not mean only force, although there is no dictatorship without force." ("Problems of Leninism" p. 129).

Lenin also wrote: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is a persistent struggle—sanguinary and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative—against the forces and traditions of the old society." (Vol. XXV, p. 190, Russ. Ed.)

Anyone can judge now what kind of "Marxist" is Mr. Kardelj who has taken upon himself to teach Marxism to the CPSU(B) and to the other Communist Parties. The Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat, including the suppression of the exploiting minority by the working class is not essential for Kardelj evidently, because it does not suit the Yugoslav bourgeois nationalists.

Kardelj had to falsify the Marxist doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat so that the bourgeoisie of town and countryside should have no fears, so that the bourgeoisie would understand that the draconic measures of the anti-Communist Rankovic police regime were directed only against the Communists, the friends of the Soviet Union.

The anti-Soviet malice of Kardelj is boundless. An enemy of the Soviet Union, Kardelj denies that socialist democracy has been consistently achieved in the Soviet Union. He has the effrontery to say that: "the principles of socialist democracy... have not been realised to the full even by the Soviet power in the Soviet Union".

The falsifier, Kardelj, is doing all this to "prove" that the anti-Communist, anti-democratic regime set up by the Tito clique in Yugoslavia represents the highest type of socialist democracy!

It is known that in home policy the Tito-ites have irrevocably taken the path of restoring capitalism, a process which is being speeded-up particularly in the countryside where under cover of the ceaseless Tito propaganda about "producer cooperatives" and that "capitalism is no

longer growing in the countryside”, the kulaks are consolidating themselves in still stronger positions in economic and political life.

It is known that every day the Tito-ites are more and more drawing Yugoslavia into the orbit of Anglo-American economy, subordinating Yugoslavia’s economy to Anglo-American imperialism.

It is known that both at home and abroad the Yugoslav provocateurs are pursuing an irreconcilably hostile anti-Soviet policy. The main thesis in their propaganda which Kardelj reiterated in his recent speech, is the well-worn thesis of the Hitlerites and the Anglo-American imperialists about “Soviet imperialism” reworded by the Tito-ites who present the Soviet Union as adopting an attitude of “inequality” toward small nations and subordinating them politically and economically to the interests of the Soviet Union.

Then Kardelj goes on to say that the Tito, anti-democratic regime is in form closest of all to the Soviet system.

Is not this the meanest of mean attempts to distort Soviet socialist democracy and once again deceive the Yugoslav people, making capital out of their genuine friendship for the Soviet Union?

The idea that the transition from capitalism to Socialism—that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat—can be realised in various political forms, is alien to Kardelj, the anti-Marxist metaphysician, the man who cannot understand the real meaning of dialectics. He denies that the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat are being carried out in the People’s Democracies.

He cannot see that the revolutionary creative power of the proletariat is inexhaustible. Concrete historical conditions can bring forth and do bring forth new forms of the political organisation of working class power.

This has taken place in the countries of Central and South-Eastern Europe where it became possible to realise working class power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, not in the Soviet form but in the form of the system of people’s democracy. This is a historical fact recognised by the entire international Communist movement.

Neither Lenin nor Stalin has ever made absolute one or another form of organisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin repeatedly stressed that it was a question of the type of power, of the type of the State, that the dictatorship of the proletariat had existed historically in the form of the Paris Commune, and that it now existed in the form of Soviets. But this is one type of State—the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin and Stalin reason as really great dialecticians. They do not bind the hand of the proletarian parties in carrying out the dictatorship of the proletariat. They point to the Soviets as a type of the dictatorship of the proletariat already realised in the Soviet Union under modern conditions. That is why the Soviets are the model for the proletariat of all countries. The Soviets are the type of State power for which the proletariat throughout the world should strive in order to overthrow the bourgeoisie and build Socialism.

The generalisation of the experience of building Socialism in the People's Democracies and the scientific, theoretical definition that in these countries the dictatorship of the proletariat is being realised in the form of a people's democratic republic where the working class is the ruling force with political power in its hands, is a new contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory and is a new triumph of the genius of Stalin's teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But Kardelj is not in the least concerned with the Marxist-Leninist teaching of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He is not interested in the historical experience of the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat in a number of countries in new forms of organisation of the working class power. Like one of Shchedrin's pompous characters, Kardelj declares that "this cannot be", and this is the end of his "science". He hysterically cries: "It is incorrect, unscientific and stupid to say that the dictatorship of the proletariat is expressed either in the form of the Soviet power or in the form of people's democracy".

Only a person who does not know the A.B.C. of Marxism and fumes against it could, like Mr. Kardelj, talk such nonsense which is contrary to reality and common sense.

All this shows once again that the bourgeois-nationalist Tito clique has nothing in common with Marxism. How can there be any talk of Marxism when the Tito-Rankovic gang have destroyed a considerable part of the Communist cadres in Yugoslavia, when tens of thousands are languishing in prisons and concentration camps, and when thousands of Communists have been shot!

At the same time this gang has accepted into the Party many of yesterday's Chetniks and Ustashi, kulaks, speculators and other such elements and has turned the Party into an auxiliary apparatus of the blood-thirsty hangman Rankovic and utterly destroyed all the principles of a Communist Marxist-Leninist Party.

P. Yudin

Workers of all lands, unite!

For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy!

Bucharest. Organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties

No. 12(39), Wednesday, June 15, 1949