

THE THE COMMUNIST ^{6^d}

No. 7.

20th. Sept. 1967.

BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY.....HIPPIE STYLE.

As the bourgeois system degenerates and cracks at its seams all over the world, and becomes more decadent and rotten in the metropolitan imperialist countries, especially Britain and the United States people, mainly the youth are trying to 'drop out' by discarding the hypocrisy of the bourgeois system. The latest name for these unfortunates is 'hippies'. They are reacting against the hypocrisy

the greed for commodities, and the general attitudes of one form of bourgeois culture, and assisting the development of another form of bourgeois culture, i.e. decadent bourgeois culture. This culture is one of continuously looking for something new, clean, pure and so on, things which do not exist in the dying bourgeois system and which can never exist until that system is overthrown. Because the hippies can not find what they are looking for in this system, they 'create' false worlds for themselves with the help of 'transcendental

CONTENTS

Bourgeois ideology	Page 1
The International Town-Country Contradiction	4
A Rational look at Judaism	11
Yugoslavia	13
If you wish to make any comments on this magazine please write to D. Laurie, 75 Cromwell Avenue, London N. 6;	
D. Laurie is publisher of this magazine for the COMMUNIST WORKERS ORGANISATION (anti-r.)	

meditation', 'pot' and LSD. This may satisfy a few of the hippies whose general background and mode of existence has lacked a close contact with reality (i.e. the sons and daughters of the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie, who have lived all of their lives without any real struggle as parasites living off their parasitic parents) but it cannot satisfy those hippies who face

2.

reality in their everyday lives, i.e. the young workers. The hippie form of bourgeois ideology has been developing for a long time but with different names. Decadent bourgeois writers and artists, throughout this century at least, have been looking for 'good' things within the dying bourgeois system. They have placed more importance on the ideas of lesbians, homosexuals and drug addicts and so on, assuming that these people alone could have anything worthwhile to relate because of the social pressures they were subjected to. Only people who are divorced from the working class, either in their own class position, or in their thinking can hold such ideas, because the social pressures and struggles of the working class (the only really 'good' thing in this society, because of the revolutionary potential of the working class in struggle) forces them into a position where their ideas are, in general, the only worthwhile ones, not least of all in the cultural field. The reason why this potentially great culture is not released, is because the capitalist class control the class nature of culture in the bourgeois system as a consequence of holding political power.

Already the bourgeoisie are welcoming the development of the hippies on a mass scale, for two reasons. First, as long as they can control the degree of drug taking etc., (so that young workers can continue to make profits for them) it will not do a great deal of harm to their system, and in fact could consolidate it for a period, and secondly hippie clothes, records and so on will be a tremendous commercial venture for them. One of the many clear signs of this was an article on the end of the 'mod' period which made the bourgeoisie tolerant attitudes towards the hippies very clear, and the fact that profits are going to be made! This appeared in the capitalist 'Observer'.

The capitalist system as a whole is encouraging the hippie ideology and is using a number of individuals who have influence among young people to divert the varying degrees of 'youthful rebellions' into harmless directions. Among the many, the three major disciples acting consciously or unconsciously on behalf of the capitalist class are the Beatles, Bob Dylan and Allen Ginsberg.

The Beatles are used by the capitalist class to divert the broad masses of the working class who are rebelling against the system on a low level without a high level of class consciousness or political consciousness. One of the Beatles, George Harrison, tells young workers in a popular record magazine, that it is alright to wear flowered shirts and be a hippy but,

" You don't have to drop out. In fact if you drop out you put yourself further away from

the goal in life than if you were to keep working'
(Melody Maker. September 2nd. 1967).

In otherwords young worker, keep on working and make more profits for the capitalists. Be a hippie at weekends and take 'pot' and LSD if you want to, and no one will care about what kind of physical and neurotic state you develop as long as you keep on making profits. George Harrison then goes on to tell young workers to 'love people', 'to harmonise with everything'. Does he then tell young workers that man can only end wars, and live together helping one another, by ending the cause of these problems, the capitalist system itself, with its motivating force of profit, profit, profit at all costs to mankind. No he fills them full of idealistic nonsense by saying:

"You can only do it if you beleive in it". (ibid).

In otherwords he tells the working class that if we all beleive in fairies they will come into existance!

Another advocate of the hippie ideology is Bob Dylan. Even though Bob Dylan does not have the widespread influence of the Beatles, he is even more dangerous than the Beatles, because he diverts young workers who have definitely began to hate the capitalist system and are developing a political attitude towards it, in a word, potential communists.

The earlier Bob Dylan songs were never revolutionary, but had a social content which might be termed 'Leftist' by American standards at the time. They never gave any answers to the problems, but exposed some of the problems. Because these songs had this 'Leftist' content the accompaniment was a simple guitar and harmonica. In recent years his songs have contained innumerable instruments with complicated arrangements. This confirms the degeneration of his songs, because bourgeois culture must concentrate on technique in order to hide the content which can only reflect the rotten nature of its system.

Bob Dylans songs are now subjective ramblings which are meaningless to everyone except perhaps himself. His inevitable degeneration reached its ultimate when he told everyone, on a record, to 'get stoned' (i.e. drugged up) as an answer to their problems.

Allen Ginsberg is another used by the capitalist system to divert potential communists. His poems continuously romanticise drug taking, homosexuality, and in general promote the idea that it is hopeless and useless to attempt to develop anything positive within the framework of reality.

According to Ginsberg man can only 'see things', can only 'be' under the influence of drugs. He states in many of his poems that he has taken drugs, perhaps in order to give the reader the impression that he is reading 'visions of greater insight than mans normal consciousness; arrived at by a study of the objective world; because the author is under the influence of drugs. He begins one poem: '4 sniffs and I'm High', and then proceeds to inflict pages of intellectual gibberish on the reader.

When his poetry is fathonable it is telling people, e.g. communists to give up attempting to understand problems and resolving them, because:

'Sooner or later all Consciousness will
be eliminated
because consciousness is
a by product of ---
(Cotton & N20).

(Reality Sandwiches, Page 86)

This is only one of the 'reasons' why Ginsberg tell us to give up our efforts.

Perhaps his poems are supposed to be humorous, or his words 'nice' to the mind, but in fact, they have the effect of filling potential revolutionaries heads full of words and phrases whihc have no real meaning in the world of reality. This has the effect of diverting potential revolutionaries away from the path of communist ideas and revolutionary action on to the path of bougeois thinking and reactionary activities. Such is the effect of the conventional bourgeois hippie ideology as a whole.

Dave Laurie.

.....

THE INTERNATIONAL TOWN- COUNTRY CONTRADICTION
(Workers, peasants and world revolution)

The oppurtunism which has been brought into the anti-revisionist movement in Britain by the Finsbury Communist Association has been exposed in past issues of 'The Communist'. Essentially it is a revival of Bernsteins oppurtunism, with a gloss of pseudo reволutionary phraseology added. The main thing in Bernsteins oppurtunism was the idea that as capitalism developed the interests of the workers and capitalists began to merge. The main thing in the F.C.A. brand of oppurtunism is the idea that the British working class has become a

5.
labour aristocracy: and it is well known that a labour aristocracy has an interest in collaborating with the bourgeoisie. In its unprincipled efforts to shield its opportunism from exposure, the F.C.A. has tried to sow confusion on the question of the contradiction between town and country. It is therefore necessary to clarify this question.

Two statements have been made recently on this question. One was by Lin Pao, one of the leaders of the proletarian cultural revolution. The other was by Dr. Nkrumah, a national bourgeois leader of the national bourgeois opposition to imperialism. Revisionism tries to sow confusion on the question of national bourgeois opposition to imperialism and to represent it as socialism. It claims that Nkrumah developed Marxism-Leninism in the African situation. However it was as a national bourgeois leader that Nkrumah made a contribution to the struggle against imperialism. Though he exposed certain aspects of revisionism, he did not develop Marxism-Leninism.

Lin Pao wrote, in "Peoples War":

"Taking the entire globe, if N. America and W. Europe can be called the cities of the world, then Asia, Africa and Latin America constitute the rural areas of the world. Since World War II, the proletarian revolutionary movement has for various reasons been temporarily held back in the N. American and W. European capitalist countries, while the people's revolutionary movement in Asia, Africa and L. America has been growing vigorously. In a sense, the contemporary world revolution (like the Chinese revolution) also presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas". (P 48/9)

Nkrumah writes in the introduction to "Neo-Colonialism", that since the end of the 2nd world war the monopoly capitalist system in the metropolitan imperialist countries has made a "deliberate attempt...to divert colonial earnings from the wealthy class and use them to finance the welfare state"; which Nkrumah regards as imperialist bribery of the metropolitan working class out of the exploitation of the colonies and neo-colonies. Nkrumah concludes that, "Marx predicted that the growing gap between the wealth of the possessing classes and the workers...would ultimately produce a conflict fatal to capitalism in each individual capitalist state. This conflict has now been transferred on to the international scene".

It can be seen that there is a great difference between these 2 statements. Lin Pao's, being based on a Marxist-Leninist anal-

6.

ysis, recognises that the contradiction between the workers and capitalists in the imperialist countries is one of the main contradictions in the world. Nkrumah's adopts the false position that the development of imperialism has eliminated the antagonistic worker-capitalist contradiction in the imperialist countries and changed it into a contradiction between rich and poor nations.

A HISTORICAL VIEW OF THE CONTRADICTION BETWEEN TOWN AND COUNTRY

At the root of the international division of labour is the division of labour between industry and agriculture. At first this division of labour exists mainly within one country. But with the development of capitalism it becomes international. Marx described this process in Capital:

"...since the production of means of subsistence is the very first condition of (the existence)...of all production in general, labour used in this production, that is, agricultural labour in the broadest economic sense, must be fruitful enough so as not to absorb the entire available labour time in the production of means of subsistence for the direct producers. That is, agricultural surplus labour and therefore agricultural surplus product must be possible. Developed further, the total agricultural labour...of a segment of society must suffice to produce the necessary means of subsistence of the whole of society, that is, the non-agricultural labourers too. This means therefore that the major division of labour between agricultural and industrial must be possible; and similarly between tillers of the soil producing means of subsistence and those producing raw materials". (Vol 3 P 620)

"The foundation of every division of labour that is well-developed, and brought about by the exchange of commodities, is the separation between the town and country". (Vol 1 . 345)

"The territorial division of labour, which confers special branches of production to special districts of a country, acquires fresh stimulus from the manufacturing system, which exploits every special advantage. The colonial system and the opening out of the markets of the world, both of which are included in the general conditions of existence of the manufacturing period, furnish rich material for developing the division of labour in society". (Vol P 347)

"...the cheapness of the articles produced by machinery, and the improved means of transport and communication furnish the weapons for conquering foreign markets. By ruining handicraft production in other countries, machinery forcibly converts them into fields for the supply of raw material. In this way East India was compelled to produce cotton, wool, hemp, jute and indigo for Great Britain... A new and international division of labour, a division suited to the requirements of the chief centres of modern industry springs up, and converts one part of the globe into a chiefly agricultural field of production, for supplying the other part which remains a chiefly industrial field". (Vol 1 P453,4)

Stalin wrote:

"The economic basis of this antithesis (between town and country) is the exploitation of the country by the town, the expropriation of the peasantry and the ruin of the majority of the rural population by the whole course of development of industry, trade and credit under capitalism. Hence the antithesis between town and country under capitalism must be regarded as an antagonism of interests". (Economic Problems P 29)

The exploitation of the country by the town is then basic to the capitalist system. At one time this contradiction existed mainly within Britain (though from the very beginning it included the ruin of Irish handicrafts and the exploitation of Ireland as "country"). Did this mean that no antagonistic contradiction existed within the developing centres of manufacture -- which were developing on the basis of exploitation of the country? Did it mean that both urban workers and capitalists had a common interest in exploiting the country, and that the urban workers were parasitic on the agricultural workers?

The physiocrats, the earliest form of bourgeois political economy (who developed in feudal society) did hold that only agricultural labour was productive. Since manufacturing existed on the basis of the agricultural surplus, the physiocrats treated both workers and employers in the towns as being parasitic on agricultural labour. This view was criticised by later bourgeois political economy. It was most thoroughly criticised by Marx.

The Physiocrats, like the F.C.A. (but unlike the FCA in that their mistake occurred at the dawn of capitalism, and was part of a positive contribution to the understanding of capitalism) failed to distinguish clearly between use value and exchange value. "In manufacture the workman is not generally seen

8.

directly producing either his means of subsistence or the surplus in excess of his means of subsistence. The process is mediated through purchase and sale, and through the various acts of circulation, and the analysis of value in general is necessary for it to be understood. In agriculture it shows itself directly in the surplus of use values produced over use values consumed by the labourer, and can therefore be grasped without an analysis of value in general, without a clear understanding of the nature of value... ..value is reduced to use value, and the latter to material substance in general. Hence for the Physiocrats agricultural labour is the only productive labour... The workman in industry does not produce the material substance; he only alters its form. The material...is given to him by agriculture".

"...industry (as the physiocrats see it) creates nothing but only transforms values given it by agriculture into another form". (Marx: Theories of Surplus Value P 46 & 52)

On the basis of a thorough analysis of the nature of value Marx produced a comprehensive explanation and exposure of industrial capitalism, and of the exploitation of industrial labour by capital. But today in the anti-revisionist movement we see Physiocrats in anti-revisionist dress reviving the idea that the industrial workers in Britain are parasitic on the workers who produce food and raw material in the neo-colonies exploited by British Imperialism.

WHY THE STORM CENTRES ARE NOW IN THE "COUNTRY"

There can be no doubt that the storm centre of revolution today is in Asia and that the revolutionary movement in Europe is going through a bad patch. There are causes for this, and they have nothing to do with the disappearance of antagonistic contradictions, or of productive labour, in Europe.

The Chinese revolution in its democratic stage was described by Mao as a peasants' revolution led by the working class. Peasant revolutions have reached their highest development in Asia in the past half century. They have displayed a revolutionary power far greater than that shown by peasants' revolts in Europe. There are two basic reasons for this. The first is that capitalism developed gradually within the feudal society of Western Europe, and especially of Britain. The elimination of the peasantry was a gradual process spread over centuries. And since capitalism developed as a revolutionary force out of the contradictions of British society it was able to cope fairly easily with the peasants' revolts which it provoked. But in

9.

Ireland, where capitalism appeared, not as a native revolutionary force, but as an alien oppressing force the peasants' reaction was far stronger than in England, and English capitalism found more difficulty in coping with it. Asia today is what Ireland was in the 18th and 19th centuries, but magnified 1000 times.

The feudal mode of production in Asia grew out of the "Asiatic" mode of production. Marx described the peculiarities of this mode of production as being that it kept contradictions at a minimum, particularly the contradiction between town and country, and that it allowed the development of a very high density of population. (It is significant that Marx also included the old Irish society in this mode of production.) Capitalism came to Asia, not out of its own social contradictions, but as colonialism, after it had reached a high level of development in Europe. Thus the mode of production in which the antagonism between town and country has reached its highest development forces itself as an alien force upon societies in which this contradiction has been very little developed, and in which there exists a very high density of population.

Having come to Asia from the outside, capitalism could not develop within Asian societies with the relative ease with which it developed in Britain, France and Germany. The structure of the society and the density of the population stood in its way. It could destroy the handicraft basis of the old society. But it could not clear the peasants from the land as it did in Britain. Firstly, there were too many peasants. Secondly, the growth of a native industrial capitalism was obstructed by the structure of the society. And thirdly, it was obstructed by the imperialist capitalism which gave birth to it. Under the domination of international capitalism Asian society could only be a producer of raw materials for imperialist industry. The only prospect for the mass of the population is continuous misery and periodic mass starvation. This prospect could only be changed (under capitalism) by the elimination of the peasantry and the development of great industrial centres. But the peasantry cannot be eliminated and industrial capitalism cannot flourish as a "national" force.

These cause alone would make the peasant revolts in Asia far more powerful than they were in Europe. But there is a second factor in Asia which was completely absent in Europe. In the period of peasant revolts in Europe there was no ^{politically} developed industrial proletariat in existence on earth. But today the small working classes in Asia can become aware of their historical destiny from the historical experience of the European

10.

working class, and they can give a historical direction to the peasants revolution. And with the leadership of the industrial proletariat the masses of poor peasants can become a powerful revolutionary force not only in the national struggle against imperialism, but also in the struggle to build a socialist society.

There is therefore a historical revolutionary unity in the fullest sense between the struggle of the industrial proletariat of West Urope and the struggle of the workers and masses of Asia. If it had not been for the historical experience and achievements of the European proletariat, the Chinese masses could not today be in the forefront of the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism, and for socialism, and the European proletariat would not today be in the position of being able to learn from the historical experience of the proletarian revolution in China.

TO BE CONCLUDED

SUBSCRIPTIONS to The Communist cost 4/6 for 6 months post free. Available from D. Laurie,
75 Cromwell Avenue,
London N 6

HAVE YOU READ The Irish Communist? Subscriptions cost 9/- for 6 months. Available from P. Murphy,
75 Cromwell Avenue, London N 6.

100th ANNIVERSARY OF CAPITAL...

....just published :

Capital and Revisionism

1/-, available from P. Murphy at the above address

Religion is a contributory factor of almost all the major troubles that afflict the world. Religion was used as an excuse to stop all progress in the millenium known as the middle ages. For 1000 years, the Church, a subsidiary of the feudal nobility, drummed into the masses such nonsense as 'the meek shall inherit the earth', 'Blessed are the poor', that the masses were able to be held down kept illiterate and exploited by the master classes. Religion had a large share of responsibility for the Holy Wars, the Anglo-Spanish wars, the English Civil War, the Inquisition and several other wars. People after having been brainwashed by religion have even been known to support the god-fearing Hitler against the atheist Russians. Therefore it could hardly be called an understatement when Lenin said, 'Religion is the opium of the people.'

However I do not wish to discuss religion generally merely one section of it which has succeeded in reeking havoc in ridicule excess to its size. I refer to Judaism. Judaism shows most of the hypocracies and other evils of religion but carried to a much greater degree. I shall now prove this statement.

One of the most basic principles of Judaism is that jews can only marry jews and indeed in more extreme circles if a son marries a non-jewess the family pronounce him dead and go into mourning. This principle has enabled the jews to maintain their identity and to develop into the organisation it is. When jews immigrate into a country they tend to form themselves into a socially tight group and by efficient capitalist methods, although starting penniless, manage to extort money from the working classes, manage to build themselves up into a social elite with stragglers left on the wayside. Tailoring is a good example. With almost no holdings at the turn of the century the jewish people now have a near monopoly. Similar phenomena have occurred in the diamond industry, accountancy and to a lesser extent in all walks of life. The methods are; to help themselves; low pay to workers; high profite, preferential treatment to other jews so that a monopoly can soon be formed. This is just another example of Marx's theory, 'The history of the world is the history of class struggle'. The jews are the class.

Modern Isreal tells an even worse story; capitalism now made worse with copious amounts of imperialism. Before the recent war, big bussiness there decided the West Bank of the Jordan would be a opinion worthy asset and so plans were laid. When a large slice of world/ suddenly moved over to Isreal after some badly planned but completely harmless Nasser tomfoolery the trap was set and Isreal

12.
ruthlessly took over parts of Egypt, Jordan and Syria. The difficulty they had shows the extent of the threat Naser posed. Capitalist interests in Isreal based of course on Judaism, were not satisfied with merely being given wealthy new territories to buy out as they did originally in Palestine and then profiteer the population. Two other big strikes had to made at the masses by Jewish big bussiness.

Firstly big bussiness in Isreal kept over 30,000 people (3% of the working force) unemployed due to the slight recession on top of the normal capitalist unemployment. However money was found to fight the war and these jews were employed in their dangerous job for a few weeks. After mobilisation, however, the jewish capitalist class had a choice. They could either employ the previously unemployed jews which would mean paying a normal working class wage. NO! This was too near charity. When possible they had to go one step further and permit large numbers of successfully brainwashed volunteers to come and work excessively long hours for almost no wages living in very poor conditions called Kibbutzim. The previously unemployed Isrealis are still unemployed, needless to say the Arabs living in Isreal are still as second class in their citizenship as ever.

Secondly large numbers of people were lied to and in various ways coerced into sending money to Isreal. They sent it because being jewish in the main they had been efficiently brainwashed by Zionism. To make the mater even worse a lot of the money sent to Isreal was extorted from the masses. The £1 million sent by the Rothschilds and Marks and Spencers each represent excess capitalist profit. The story of world judaism takes an even worse turn when we realise how judaism has succeeded more in capitalism than anything else. If the jews of the world intermarry, this act would represent no pain to the jews or the world, but yet in staying distinct they are a target for mass persecutions such as occurred in the last war. It is an unfortunate fact that people like Hitler get to power, and we have no guarantee that a similar extermination drive will not occur. No guarantee except the world assimilation of all jews.

Judaism is based on principles such as the world is less than 6,000 years old, divine inspiration, miracles, praying three times daily and for several hours on Saturday in a language few understand. Meat may only be eaten if it comes from an animal which chews the cud and has cloven hooves and may not be eaten within half an hour after or three hours before a milk containing liquid or food. A bird cannot be eaten if it hops instead of walks. If one becomes spitually unclean effected by touching a dead insect or human, one may be made spiritually clean by having the dried blood of a fully red cow poured over ones head wherrupon the preist becomes unclean.

It is such time consuming, wasteful, unscientific nonsense, that is a menace to the world in general and jewish people in particular. I will terminate by quoting two of the greatest of jews.

Karl Marx said: 'The emancipation of the jew is the emancipation of society from judaism.'

Albert Einstein said: 'Judaism is not a faith. The Jewish god is but a negation of superstition and an imaginative result of its elimination'. Thus Einstein indicates the jewish god (which is of course the same as the christian one) is merely carefully chosen piffle that is difficult to disprove.

Norman Temple (Yosef ben Avrom).

.....

Y U G O S L A V I A

In the struggle to develop an anti-revisionist party in Britain the working class movement has to analyse the nature of modern revisionism and of how it developed. Unless a correct analysis of modern revisionism is made, and the lessons from such an analysis drawn and applied, there is no hope of a truly anti-revisionist party coming into existence.

In the developing of such an analysis a close study of events in Yugoslavia in the past 20-25 years will be very useful, for it is in Yugoslavia that modern revisionism first achieved state power. Because socialism was never fully established in Yugoslavia, and because of the earlier capture of power by revisionists there, capitalism in Yugoslavia is now so much developed as to be easily seen. It has reached the stage where foreign capitalist investment is to be allowed within the country, and where capital from Yugoslavia may be invested abroad. Therefore if we can chart the path by which Yugoslavia reached this position, this will give us a guide in assessing developments in other countries.

The Yugoslav revisionists did much pioneering work in developing an economic theory which would seem to be leading to socialism, but would in fact be establishing capitalism. The ideas of the "socialist market economy" and "socialist commodity production" were put into practice in Yugoslavia long before revisionism succeeded in taking power in the Soviet Union after Stalin's death.

On the level of state power, the Yugoslav revisionists discovered

14.

that by preventing a dictatorship of the proletariat from being established they could maintain capitalism. By talking instead of the "leading role" of the working class and of the Communist Party they succeeded in pretending that socialism was going to be achieved in Yugoslavia.

On the field of foreign policy, the Yugoslavs developed the "non-alignment" position, while aligning themselves with the U.S. imperialism, and put the idea that progress lay not through the expansion of the socialist bloc until it embraced the whole world, but in the erasing of the antagonisms and differences between the capitalist and socialist blocs. In other words, not class struggle, but class collaboration on an international scale should be the aim of the progressive forces.

Furthermore, the idea of peaceful and gradual transition from capitalism into socialism was adopted from Bernstein and put forward. This method of "achieving" socialism was particularly recommended for the advanced capitalist countries. So on a national level the idea was being put that the more capitalist a country is, the more easily it would become socialist. Socialism without tears in three easy stages!! So class collaboration was recommended on the national level too.

It is intended to start a series of articles in THE COMMUNIST next month which will deal in some detail with the development of revisionism in Yugoslavia. Of especial importance will be the study of the attitudes of other countries to Yugoslavia. In particular the change which occurred in the Soviet Union's attitude from one of uncompromising opposition to Titoism under the dictatorship of the proletariat to an attitude of friendship and cooperation under the "rule of the entire people".

HOW YUGOSLAV REVISIONISM WAS FIRST EXPOSED

It is important to examine the way in which Yugoslav modern revisionism was first exposed, for this has many lessons for the anti-revisionism movement today. When Stalin and the international communist movement became aware of the revisionist leadership of the Yugoslav Party, they carried on a full uncompromising struggle against it in spite of the difficulties involved.

It must be remembered that at that time Yugoslav revisionism was not the openly capitalist thing it is today; that the Yugoslav contribution to the anti-fascist struggle had been considerable -- they put 1 million enemy troops out of action; and that Yugoslavia and Albania were the only countries in Europe in which the anti-fascist front was led by the Communist

Party. In these circumstances it was very difficult to achieve a united anti-revisionist class struggle against the Titoite leadership. There would have been strong revisionist tendencies in the world communist movement itself to counsel moderation and compromise.

The Titoites did not fail to make use of these things in order to try and defeat the sharp class struggle being waged against them. They emphasised particularly the fact that the Soviet Union was a large country, and Yugoslavia was a small country, thus pretending that Stalin's motives were chauvinist or imperialist; and they strove to use the successes gained in the anti-fascist struggle to confuse the issue. Part of the reply made to the Cominform resolution criticising the leadership of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia said:

"Could the members of the party who dauntlessly faced death in thousands of battles, tolerate in the party a state of affairs unworthy of both men and communists?"

However the international communist movement succeeded in isolating and exposing the Titoite modern revisionists. The sharp class struggle waged by Stalin and the international communist movement against modern revisionism in Yugoslavia exposes the latest variation of the "criticism" of Stalin. Bourgeois liberalism in the anti-revisionist movement was exposed when it claimed that Stalin's "errors" led to the development of modern revisionism without him realising it. Now these "sensitive" people have come up with a more refined attack: Stalin's errors led to the development of modern revisionism, but he realised it before he died and started a campaign against revisionism, but too late.

Perhaps these bourgeois intellectuals will explain to us how Stalin succeeded in leading a sharp class struggle against a very subtle expression of modern revisionism in Yugoslavia in 1948, without quite realising what exactly was the nature of the enemy. We look forward to the reply.

Another allegation concerning a "Stalin's error" is also exposed by a study of the issues involved in the dispute with the Titoite modern revisionists. It is claimed by various bourgeois intellectuals in the British anti-revisionist movement that Stalin held that the class struggle decreases in intensity as socialism develops. In the letter from the CC of the CPSU to the CC of the CP of Yugoslavia on 4th May 1948, the Yugoslav leadership is accused of holding

16.

"an opportunist policy according to which the class struggle in the transitory period from capitalism to socialism is alleged not to increase in fierceness, which is taught by Marxism-Leninism, but that the class struggle gets less and less as according to the opportunist school of the Bukharin type who preached the rotten theory about capitalist elements peacefully growing into socialism.

"Nobody could deny the profound nature of the social transformation in the USSR as a result of the socialist October revolution. Nevertheless the All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik) have never deduced from these facts that the class struggle had weakened in our country or that there does not exist a danger of capitalist elements growing in strength." (My emphasis)

So much for this "criticism" of Stalin!

A. Clifford