

## YUGOSLAV REVISIONISM IS JUST WHAT U.S. IMPERIALISM NEEDS

*Kang Sheng*

The attack on the Soviet Union and the international communist movement launched by the leading group of the League of Yugoslav Communists by means of the League's revisionist programme and its Seventh Congress has been rebuffed, rightly and seriously, by the Communist and Workers' Parties of various countries. Now an important struggle to safeguard the purity of Marxism-Leninism is unfolding. This struggle is of immense importance to the international communist movement and the just cause of safeguarding world peace.

To date, the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League has not given any valid answers to the criticisms made by the Communist Parties of various countries; nor can it do so. Its so-called answers are mere sophistry. For example, it describes its odious action in serving the U.S. imperialists as an effort "to seek joint elements of the line of peace and international co-operation," and even claims this action coincides with the aims of Soviet foreign policy. It arbitrarily links two essentially different things: Yugoslavia's economic dependence on the United States and the Soviet Union's

---

This article appeared in *Renmin Ribao* on June 14.

proposal to expand trade with the U.S. At the same time, it dismisses the serious and justified criticisms made by Marxist-Leninist parties of various countries as "interference in internal affairs" and "unprincipled attacks," "detrimental to world peace." But the facts speak louder than lies. Any objective observer can see that the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists by its policy of serving the U.S. imperialists — planners of a new war — under the mask of socialism is playing a role particularly damaging to the just cause of defending world peace. Precisely for this reason, the U.S. imperialists, who are hostile to the socialist camp and to peace, lavish praise on Yugoslavia.

Yugoslav revisionism has not arisen accidentally. Since the Second World War, socialism has grown into a new world system. To save capitalism from still deeper general crisis the U.S. imperialists have been searching for a new tool from within the socialist countries, to add to the old revisionism — social democracy. They thought it would be ideal to find a "socialist" country with a Marxist-Leninist signboard, which can split the camp of socialism from within. John Foster Dulles has long been highly confident that the policy of the leading group in Yugoslavia fits the needs of the United States. Referring to Yugoslavia at a press conference on August 6 last year, he said: "It is possible to have a communist regime without being dominated by what we call 'international communism' or a Soviet-type brand of communism." What this remark of Dulles means is: 1. The new tool needed by the U.S. imperialists should be one that they do not consider as "international communism," that is, it should have the "communist" label yet be against international communism. 2. This new tool must

not be a "Soviet-type brand of communism," that is, it should discard the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, depart from the trail blazed by the October Revolution and set itself against the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union. 3. This new tool should be a "regime" controlled by a "communism" which embodies the foregoing two characteristics. This is particularly important, because only those revisionists who are in power in what was for a time a socialist country can effectively serve the imperialists today when socialism has become a world system. To Dulles, the ideal tool must fit these "specifications" and Yugoslav revisionism is just the thing.

U.S. Big Business has spared no small investment in building up its Yugoslav revisionist tool. According to Senator Knowland, the U.S. has given Tito's government aid amounting to 1,500 million dollars (Associated Press Washington dispatch, March 20, 1958). It is well known that the Draft Programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists, which runs to about 150,000 words, did not dare even once to use the term "U.S. imperialism," as though this were a "royal taboo." The same is true of the pronouncements of the leading members of the Yugoslav Communist League. Take, for example, Tito's version of the U.S. plot of aggression against Syria last year. He said in his report at the Seventh National Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists: "The pressure exercised against Syria last year led to the speeding up of the unification of Egypt with Syria. . . ." And regarding the U.S. aggression in Indonesia, he said: "Similar developments took place in Indonesia. The young united republic of the peoples of Indonesia has through intrigues and interference in its internal affairs

on the part of Western circles become the battlefield of civil war." In short, it seems that there is no such thing in the world as U.S. imperialism. The question arises: If a self-styled Marxist-Leninist party in analysing the current world situation does not even dare to point to the existence of U.S. imperialism, what does this indicate other than U.S. dollar influence?

A great many statesmen and political commentators in many capitalist countries that stand for peace and neutrality, such as India, Indonesia and the United Arab Republic, it should be pointed out, do not call themselves Marxist-Leninists, yet they dare to condemn the policy of aggression of U.S. imperialism.

The leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League goes to great lengths to deny that its Programme fits the needs of the imperialists, particularly the U.S. imperialists. But the facts speak louder than eloquent words. A brief review of some of the historical events in the past few years clearly shows the ugly face of the Yugoslav revisionists and how they play the game of the U.S. imperialists.

Firstly, during the counter-revolutionary uprising in Hungary, the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists played the role of instigator and interventionist. It openly called the counter-revolutionary uprising a revolution and supported it. It gave encouragement and support to the "Workers' Councils" which were in the hands of the counter-revolutionaries and engaged in activities hostile to the worker-peasant revolutionary government. It maintained close ties with the renegade Nagy group, openly sheltered Nagy and other counter-revolutionaries and made the Yugoslav Embassy in Hungary a haven for these counter-revolutionaries. Only

because the leading comrades of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, during and after the suppression of the uprising, maintained a consistently principled, correct stand did its scheming come to nothing and it was compelled to give ostensible support to the Hungarian Government headed by Comrade Janos Kadar. But to this very day, the attitude of the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists on this question still harmonizes with that of the imperialists, particularly the U.S. imperialists. Time and again, the U.S. imperialists have tried to drag the so-called "Hungarian question" on to the agenda of the United Nations, in the vain hope of making a breach in Hungary by means of the United Nations, which is under their control. And Tito too, in his report to the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists, said that "Yugoslavia exerted efforts in the U.N. for a settlement of this question." Is this not enough to show that the leading group of the Yugoslav Communist League advocates precisely what the U.S. imperialists need?

Secondly, in the speech he made at Pula in November 1956, Tito joined in the anti-Soviet, anti-communist campaign launched by the imperialists taking advantage of the Hungarian events. In that speech he attacked almost all the socialist countries and the Communist Parties of many countries, and proclaimed that Yugoslavia would work in various ways for the victory in the Communist and Workers' Parties of various countries of "the trend" which "began in Yugoslavia," so as to defeat the so-called "Stalinist course." In the Yugoslav press, they also attacked the leadership of many Communist and Workers' Parties and encouraged the revisionist elements to carry out splitting activities. The U.S. imperialists were highly appreciative

of these activities. Walter Lippmann, mouthpiece of the U.S. bourgeoisie, stated at the time that it was in the "true interest" of the U.S. to make what he called "Titoism" "prevail" in the socialist countries (*Washington Post*, October 30, 1956). At secret talks among leaders of the U.S. Senate, James P. Richards also expressed the view that "it is to the advantage of our country, as well as the entire free world, to encourage Tito and other communist dissenters like him." (*New York Post*, December 31, 1956.) We would like to ask the leaders of the Yugoslav Communist League: Since the U.S. imperialists describe your "ism" as in their true interests, does this not mean that your "ism" suits their needs? You say this kind of talk by the Americans does not count; if so, why do you never regard it as an "insult" and repudiate it?

Thirdly, in November 1957, the leaders of the Yugoslav League of Communists, betraying the agreement reached at the Soviet-Yugoslav talks in Rumania, refused to take part in the Moscow Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries or to sign the Declaration of that meeting. They announced that this was because the Moscow Declaration "contains certain attitudes and appraisals which are contrary to the standpoint of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and which it considers to be incorrect." For this action, they immediately earned the praise of the U.S. imperialists. An *Agence France Presse* report of November 22, 1957, said: "There were clear signs that the Yugoslav attitude caused great interest in the State Department. The prevailing impression in Washington was that Yugoslav President Marshal Josip Broz Tito had once again insisted on demonstrating his independence from the communist bloc." On December 8, 1957 Tito received James W.

Riddleberger, U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia. *The New York Times* wrote on the following day that Tito "did mention Yugoslavia's refusal to sign the Declaration as further proof of her continued independence." This was immediately followed by a huge U.S. loan to Yugoslavia and the signing of an agreement for the supply of 62.5 million dollars worth of American surplus farm produce to Yugoslavia.

On the refusal of the League to attend the Moscow Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries and to sign the Declaration of that meeting, there is an article by Immanuel Birnbaum, a bourgeois commentator who has quite a few contacts with the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists. The article appeared in the first number of *The Problems of Communism* this year, a magazine published by the U.S. Information Agency and expressed many views that are well worth noting. Using the statements of the leading group of the League as its basis, the article analysed the true reasons behind the refusal to attend the Moscow Meeting and sign its Declaration. The writer said: "Belgrade could not agree to the two basic theses put forward in the Declaration, namely that the entire blame for the continuation of international tension rests on the shoulders of the West, and that the only way to prevent a world catastrophe is for all countries under communist rule to stand solidly united in support of the Moscow policy and leadership." Judging by the Draft Programme of the League and the speeches made by the leaders of the League at its Seventh Congress, this appraisal by Birnbaum is true to the facts. The article added: "It is important that, at a time when Moscow is seeking once more to tighten its reins over

the other segments of the communist world, at least one country professing to be a disciple of Lenin refuses to submit." The persistence of the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists in its "independence from the communist bloc" is just what the U.S. imperialists need; the two "basic theses" opposed by the leading group of the League are exactly what the U.S. imperialists have resolutely opposed. Does not this standpoint of the leading group of the League fit the needs of the U.S. imperialists exactly?

Fourthly, the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists issued its out-and-out revisionist programme in opposition to the Declaration of the Moscow Meeting at a time when the east wind prevails over the west wind and the United States is experiencing an acute economic crisis. At the Seventh Congress of the League, it went out of its way to defend and curry favour with the U.S. imperialists, and to unscrupulously attack the socialist camp; and on a series of questions, it issued most absurd statements, counter to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism but suited to the needs of U.S. imperialism. This is true of its analysis of the present international situation, and its statements on the question of proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, the question of the leading role of the Communist Party and the so-called question of "opposing dogmatism."

For example, Eisenhower defamed the Soviet Union as being a "strongly armed imperialistic dictatorship" (1957 State of the Union message); and the Draft Programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists also attacked the Soviet Union as being a "hegemony." Dulles attacked the foreign policies of the Soviet Union and the camp of socialism as a "major threat" to the entire world (Octo-

ber 1957 issue of the U.S. *Foreign Affairs* quarterly); and in his report to the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists, Tito similarly slandered them as proceeding from a "power policy" and "big power principles." Tito went so far as to allege that it was "owing to Stalin's inflexible and uncalled for threatening foreign policy" that the U.S. had engaged in arms expansion and war preparations, established military blocs and manoeuvred to conclude the North Atlantic Treaty. Eisenhower and Dulles have been attacking the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements all the time; the Draft Programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists also openly opposes these agreements.

Again, the imperialists have always tried deliberately to confuse the fundamental differences between the two systems of socialism and capitalism in order to benumb the revolutionary consciousness of the working class. Eisenhower said that since the government in a capitalist country "controls" part of the "economic life" of the bourgeoisie, "such things can, of course, in the long run lead to communism, but we have had this same kind of thing inherent in our form of government for many years." (Reply to the correspondent of the *New York Herald Tribune* at a press conference on June 5, 1957.) The Draft Programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists also stresses so-called "factors of socialism" in the capitalist countries, saying that in this type of country "the specific forms of state capitalist relations may either be the ultimate effort made by capitalism to survive, or the first step towards socialism, or may, at the same time, be both the one and the other."

Again, the imperialists hold the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular hatred. In a speech delivered at

the annual luncheon of the Associated Press on April 22, 1957, Dulles reviled proletarian dictatorship as "despotism," alleging that "those who are subject to it in vast majority, hate the system and yearn for a free society"; the Draft Programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists also attacks the state of proletarian dictatorship as so-called "bureaucracy," "bureaucratic statism," and "monopolists," alleging that it "strives to transform the state apparatus into the master of society instead of being its servant and executive agent," stresses so-called "antagonisms" between the socialist state and the masses, and trumpets a crudely distorted theory of "the withering away of the state" in order to undermine proletarian dictatorship in the countries of the camp of socialism.

Again, the imperialists, in order to suppress the workers' movement in their own countries, often smear the Communist Parties in these countries as being "under the domination of a single power, international communism, acting under the direction of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union" (Dulles' statement at the Ministerial Council of the Bagdad Pact on January 27, 1958). And in his report to the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists, Tito also slandered the Marxist parties in various countries as conducting "dependent policies" and being "accustomed to receiving and implementing directives coming from outside." The Draft Programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists even tries to induce the workers in the U.S. and some other capitalist countries to renounce the Communist Parties. It alleges that "it is most probable that — in the countries where classical political parties of the working class are practically non-existent, as in the United States, for example—the working people organized in trade unions"

can strengthen "its leading role in the system of government."

Again, the imperialists often attack Marxism-Leninism by making use of so-called "opposition to dogmatism," twaddling that "international communism has become beset with doctrinaire difficulties" and the label communism as "unimaginative" (Dulles' address at annual luncheon of the Associated Press on April 22, 1957) and the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists also does all it can to defame fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism as "dogmas." Preposterously asserting that "Marxist thought in the course of the last few decades has not kept in step with the advance of contemporary society," and that some people "attempt to turn it into a static collection of stale dogmas and abstract truths." The leaders of the Yugoslav League of Communists, moreover, style themselves as "uncompromising towards all kinds of dogmatism" and persistently advocate that "the roads leading to socialism differ" in an attempt to negate the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism and the general laws of achieving victories in revolution and construction by the Communist Parties in all countries.

Even more absurd is the fact that Tito showered praise and eulogy on the United States at the Seventh Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists, although all the ferocity of the U.S. imperialists has been exposed in its true colours. According to him, U.S. relations with Yugoslavia are based on "mutual respect, co-operation on an equal basis and non-interference in internal affairs. If there were certain attempts that were not in line with these principles, they usually came from individuals or groups and not from the U.S. Government." In tones of profound gratitude, Tito praised U.S. aid as having helped

Yugoslavia surmount colossal difficulties. It is indeed a "creative exploit," unparalleled in history, that people who style themselves Communists and revolutionaries should, at their Party Congress, pay tribute to the U.S. imperialists—the most ferocious enemy of the people throughout the world. This is presumably the "creative contribution" which the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists often boast they have made to the international communist cause!

The U.S. imperialists have warmly applauded the Draft Programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists and its Seventh Congress, C. Burke Elbrick, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, said at a hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate that Tito was "doing a pretty good job." Viewing the recent activities of the Yugoslav Communist League the imperialist press of the United States went into raptures. "The incident illustrates once more Yugoslavia's unique value as an independent centre of attraction in the communist world," said the editorial of the *Christian Science Monitor* on April 24, 1958. "His (Tito's) latest outburst cannot fail to have an upsetting effect on Soviet foreign policy. The West stands to profit from all this," said the U.S. *Newsweek* on May 5, 1958.

The Yugoslav revisionists are very annoyed to hear others say that they are serving the U.S. imperialists. Of course, they will be welcomed if they really come round to a revolutionary standpoint against U.S. imperialism. But they have no intention whatever of changing their stand, though they accuse people who are telling the truth of having "abused" and "insulted" them. Yugoslav papers have recently repeated what Tito said at the Congress of the Yugoslav League of Communists showing

stubborn adherence to the revisionist standpoint, that "any expectation in any quarter that we shall renounce our principled stands both in international and in internal matters, is only a loss of time." The modern revisionists have curried favour with the U.S. imperialists by this kind of reactionary stubbornness.

The struggle against modern revisionism has just begun. It is essential that the banner we raise in this serious struggle stands out clearly. We stand firmly on principle and shall carry the struggle to the end. The leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists shall not be allowed to impair the great cause of Marxism-Leninism.