

THE EDUCATION OF A SLOVENE MARXIST: EDVARD KARDELJ 1924-1934

Carole Rogel

Early Ideological Schooling

Young Kardelj's ideological schooling began in Ljubljana while he was preparing for accreditation as a school teacher.¹ It was not at the teacher training institute, but rather in the company of young men and older spiritual mentors that he learned his Marxism.² The Strajzl circle is where Kardelj began his leftist intellectual apprenticeship. It was organized in 1924 by Vlado Kozak, the son of a tavern keeper of substantial means whose politics were known to be liberal and progressive.³ Those who frequented the Kozak tavern, which was called "Pri Strajzlnu," were liberals of the left, leftist craftsmen and workers. The committed Marxist revolutionaries met secretly upstairs above the main tavern. Since the Communist party in Yugoslavia had been outlawed in 1921, from time to time one or another of the Strajzl group was detained by the police. Legend has it that "Mama Kozak" regularly intervened on behalf of the young *intelligent* by paying off the authorities. Indeed "Strajzlnova's" bribes seem to have kept the Ljubljana police in pocket money, while keeping the Slovene revolution alive in its early years.

From about 1923 Vlado Kozak used to frequent the Delavski dom where Marxist and revolutionary lectures were given. Among the inspiring speakers was a law student named Dušan Kermavner,⁴ who in 1922 and 1923 had studied in Berlin, where he had become involved with the Spartacists. He had translated into Slovene the works of Mathiez, the French social historian, and of Marx and Engels, among others. The Radical leftist youth and workers and craftsmen of a militant bent attended these talks. From the Delavski dom, which came to be known as the "Red University,"⁵ some regulars were recruited into the Strajzl Circle. Others, like Boris Kidrič, the son of an eminent professor of Slavic literature, were tapped by Vlado personally.⁶ Edo Kardelj was brought to the Strajzl tavern in 1924 by a school chum of Kozak's who had been told to find *engageé* youth for party work. Young Kardelj, whose parents had strong Socialist Party commitments, was at first a reluctant participant. By 1926, however, at age 16, he had become a convert and was soon initiated into SKOJ (The Union of Communist Youth of Yugoslavia), the youth branch of the underground Communist Party of Yugoslavia. It was Kardelj and Kidrič who named the circle which met clandestinely above the Kozak tavern. A significant number of the post-World War II leaders of Yugoslavia would come from that group.

In the mid-1920s, while Kardelj was becoming a Communist revolutionary, the world of the Slovene intellectuals was in ferment. The issue debated by all with most intensity was the Slovene national question. A continuation of the dialogue which had begun in the early nineteenth century, it centered on how a small nation and its culture might survive the assimilating pressures of modernization. The venue for the debate had changed from the Habsburg Empire to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, but the issues remained essentially the same. The most heated and sophisticated exchanges, many fully recorded in prominent literary journals, would come in the thirties. Kardelj would engage in these with ardor, assurance and the innocence of one who has embraced a new faith—in his case Marxism-Leninism. It should be noted, however, that schooling in the doctrine would come first, beginning about 1926, for this son of unlearned, working-class, Socialist parents. Sparring with the intellectual élite in whose midst Kardelj had found himself

would come half a dozen or so years later. Once Kardelj would master the revolutionary ideology, he would be confident that resolving the national question was not possible within a bourgeois society; and, moreover, that debating the issue was pointless: social revolution would render such matters obsolete.

Schooling in Prison

The year 1929 was in many ways a turning point in the life of Kardelj, then 19 years old. After a decade of political turbulence the Monarch established the Sixth of January dictatorship. For the political underground this meant an end to leniency. For Kardelj and the Slovene Communist youths it meant that the "Mama Strajzls" could no longer buy them police protection. Many, including Kardelj, saw the inside of jails and prisons during 1929. For Kardelj that year was also the year to make a career decision. He had completed teacher training and was to have begun work in an elementary school near Litija that autumn. Thoroughly immersed in the revolutionary cause as he by then was, it was not difficult for him to turn down the pedagogical post. That his mother, a long-time political activist in a Ljubljana tobacco factory, supported this decision, smoothed young Edo's way. Incidentally, it also affords Kardelj's biographers the chance to make the touching hagiographical reference.⁷

Toward the end of 1929 Kardelj was arrested for the first time and was detained for two months. In February 1930 he was apprehended again, and sent to Belgrade for interrogation at its notorious Glavnjača prison, which was dreaded by the revolutionary underground because of its reputation for the torture of political detainees. Kardelj recorded his experiences with the internal police in a brief fictionalized account entitled *Boj*. The main character in *Boj* reveals himself as being spiritually reborn by the experience of prison. One night of prolonged physical abuse and mental anguish, the prisoner (Kardelj) writes, "was the most important of my life. Hitherto, in my thoughts and work as a Communist, although of proletarian origin, I had dealt largely with theories. Now I knew and felt what it was all about. Struggle! . . . Struggle! . . ."⁸

After seven months in Glavnjača, Kardelj was sent to the maximum security prison at Požarevac for a two-year term. During his two incarcerations he established what were to be long-standing comradely associations with a wider Yugoslav underground network. Conditions were harsh, yet the underground not only survived but fortified itself. It engaged in periodic hunger strikes demanding better food and access to reading materials. That the striking *intelligenti* were brought books, journals, and writing materials seems to have been routine practice. While in prison, Kardelj read the major works of Slovene scholars, particularly the historians. He weighed them against Marxist works and found them wanting. By the end of the decade he would produce his own synthesis of Slovene historical development.

Some have described these early prison years of the underground intelligentsia euphorically, as a continuation of the "Red University" days. It seems that the ideological base and the will of the revolutionaries was nurtured under political arrest. In 1949 Kardelj described his own experience as a "course in human collectivity":

When I was sentenced, they sent me to the Požarevac prison in northeastern Serbia. There were about forty of us 'politicals:' Serbians, Montenegrins, Slovenians, Croatians, Macedonians. Our personal stories were essentially alike. We had a Party organization in prison and a small library of Marxist literature hidden under the floor boards. We took turns reading and keeping watch. Our

activity went on from daybreak to nightfall. It was an intensive, rich life. You felt yourself growing. Discipline, comradeship, the sharing of responsibility—a collective life; and, personally, I discovered freedom—in jail. When we were released, we knew something, and not only in our heads—we'd had actual experience. We were free, just as we had been in prison, because we had learned how to live together and strive together for ends we collectively believed in, even if some of us would have to die to achieve them.”⁹

Here Kardelj, in the post-1945 afterglow of victory, was waxing romantically on the idealism and sacrifice of his youth.

The 1930s were an exhilarating time for Kardelj, the young leftist radical and aspiring Marxist intellectual. He was undoubting in his new faith: in prison he had experienced spiritual conversion confirming his belief in the class struggle; and his commitment to a dialectical historical process was total. World developments of that decade were negatively encouraging: the establishment of dictatorships in Europe, including the Sixth of January 1929 government in Yugoslavia; the advent of fascism and nazism in Italy, Austria and Germany; and, not least, the world-wide economic crisis. For Kardelj, these developments were harbingers of a better tomorrow, for they required a dialectical antithetical correction. The signs were clear: capitalism was about to expire and the long-awaited future was surely on the horizon.

That Kardelj at age 19 was arrested and imprisoned soon after the Yugoslav dictatorship came into being affected his sense of his own importance in relation to these events. In the early thirties, writing feverishly, he produced articles, reviews and assorted polemics under various pseudonyms. They appeared in both legal and underground publications.¹⁰ Kardelj at that time also wrote an enticing, even capricious, children's primer on the wonders of economic history (see further below). Yet many of these works of his can only be described as brash, self-assured, overbearing, even cocky. They are assaults on authority which often lack subtlety or nuance, and belie a fierce ideological conviction.

Once the doctrine was in place for him, no subject was too peripheral for Kardelj's attention. From prison in 1932 or 1933 he reviewed a novel which purported to be an example of Slovene “social” literature. Kardelj retold the plot and identified the characters—good workers all—but he faulted the author, Cufar, for not employing a socialist-realist approach. “*Without the dialectic there is no social literature*,” [his emphasis], wrote Kardelj, and later in the review elaborated on his understanding of the writer's role as he conceived it: “to show the proletariat the way toward the daily economic struggles of the future.” Granted, Cufar had written a nice book, and his use of proletarian characters was a “healthy” antithesis to “bourgeois” literature; but for Kardelj Slovene social literature was only just emerging, as it were, “from children's diapers.”¹¹

The same year Kardelj used the occasion of a women's demonstration against State Law 171 to champion women's rights. In his view, the law forbidding abortions and the dissemination of contraceptives discriminated largely against the poor. Clearly it was a feature of capitalism's exploitation of the proletariat.¹² In this brief piece, Kardelj also attacked reactionary states and institutions, including the Roman Catholic Church and the governments of Hitler and Mussolini; these, he said, encouraged unchecked reproduction and therefore the enslavement of women. On the other hand, in the U.S.S.R., where the proletariat was building a new social order, sexual freedom was (in his view) guaranteed. In any case, Kardelj's language here resembles that of the freedom-of-choice advocates of our own times, and his article of more than half a century ago has been hailed by Socialist Yugoslavia for its defense of women's rights.¹³

On larger issues, those regarding international economic and political developments of the inter-war years, Kardelj published a great deal, even before going to Moscow in 1934. As might be expected, he wrote with dogmatic earnestness. His tendency was to preach rather than to persuade. He constructed arguments with logical precision, like a mathematician proving a theorem. Conclusions were based on the use of Marxist principles. Marx's *Kapital* was generally the reference source. The underlying assumption was that Marx's assertions were founded on measurements as valid as those of Pythagoras. In summing up Marx's labor theory of values, he writes: "We saw that Marx *uncovered* (not decreed) a fundamental law," [his own emphasis].¹⁴ This statement appeared in a critique of a publication by Andrej Gosar, whom he criticized for his interpretation of Marx's scientific socialism; at the end of this lengthy review, Gosar is labeled a social reactionary—a well-known Marxist terminological category. Most of this review is a lecture on Marxism, citing its precepts as a collective body of truth. Kardelj writes this (he says) for a Slovene audience because Slovenes know and understand little about the socio-economic laws which invest the proletariat with the historical mission of overthrowing capitalism. Marx's truths, Slovenes must also understand, point in a positive direction: toward a "sunny" future.¹⁵

Kardelj's View of Fascism (The Early Thirties)

The advent of Fascism was for Kardelj a sure sign that capitalism was coming to an end. It was clearly the last reactionary grasp of the capitalists to remain in control: certainly, Fascism would do nothing to better the lot of the proletariat, as promised.¹⁶ Using Marx's laws as criteria, he predicted an economic and political catastrophe for Germany in an article entitled "The Third Reich after Six Months," and foresaw another major European war and with it the inevitable revolution.¹⁷ To support his argument he gathered (for one confined to prison and running from the law) an amazing array of statistical data and he seemed incredibly well-informed about conditions in Germany. He was wrong, of course, about that state's immediate economic health, but was accurate in foreseeing the totalitarian excesses which came to characterize Hitler's rule.

His source on the nature of Fascism was not only Marx but Jack London, a "social" writer with a historical vision. London's *The Iron Heel*, which Kardelj probably read in Slovene translation, seemed to prophesy the coming of Fascism, while portraying the pathetic final efforts of the bourgeoisie for survival.¹⁸ It is not unusual for a Slovene, or for that matter another Yugoslav, intellectual (real or aspiring, as was Kardelj) to turn to novelists, poets and essayists for spiritual direction. This had been a fact of Slovene intellectual life since the late eighteenth century: self-awareness or national awareness is followed by lament or introspection; the *literati* offer glimmers of hope which lead to belief in a better future. Such idealism was a factor of Kardelj's intellectual and political milieu. He did not reject the optimism; he embraced it. Yet in the 1930s he chose to turn away from the Slovene intellectuals whose beliefs had a more liberal humanistic bent. For Kardelj, there was no doubt that a better world would result from none other than the workings of the inexorable laws of history. Those who chose to believe otherwise were only sorry examples of bourgeois delusion.

Among those who fell into the last-named category were Social Democrats. Writing about the coming of Fascism in Austria, Kardelj was critical of its socialists for being "parading" rather than "fighting" Marxists.¹⁹ Besides, most Austrian Socialists were intellectuals, who had succumbed to *embourgeoisement*. In other words they were not workers. Kardelj was hardest on Otto Bauer, the most left-wing of the Austrian Socialist

leadership, for not realizing that any accommodation to bourgeois politics was plainly a betrayal of the proletarian cause.²⁰ Fascism thrived on such hypocrisy.

Taking on the Slovene Intellectual Establishment

Kardelj also took on the Slovene intellectual establishment, a formidable giant. It had long been the élite of Slovene society and the guardian of the nation's cultural trust. (As in many small or emerging nations with no autonomous state, or at least with none in recent memory, the Slovene intelligentsia had constituted the national leadership. Even after political parties had formed in the latter 1800s, the nation's most respected leaders were often writers, poets and essayists.) Kardelj, the 23-year-old political radical, in a lengthy essay published in *Književnost* responded to a booklet entitled *Kulturni problem slovenstva* by Josip Vidmar, a distinguished writer and publicist fifteen years his senior. Kardelj began by noting the stir that Vidmar's article had caused among the *intelligenti* who frequented Ljubljana's Kavarna Union or who wrote for leading literary journals. For Kardelj some of the participants in this debate were simply stupid, and others interesting—even evocative—but in the end the dialogue was after all demonstrably irrelevant. The Slovene cultural issue itself was becoming obsolete, for nations were already merging into a larger international unity.²¹ The debate on nationality issues which was draining Slovene intellectuals' energies belonged to a bygone era, one characteristic of a bourgeois society. "Vidmar [and, presumably, anyone who accepted the premises of Vidmar's position] is," Kardelj concluded, "a child of petit bourgeois backwardness."²²

Kardelj then proceeded at length to apprise Vidmar of the errors which derive from his antiquated world view. Essentially, Vidmar's basic assumption was that a nation is an *a priori* entity, which awakens, flowers, and asserts itself *willfully* [my emphasis, C.R.]. For Kardelj this metaphysical conception of the nation is a vestige of a decaying past. Vidmar for him is like Fichte or other German idealists of the late eighteenth century, products of a period when the middle class had been a dynamic force. Granted, that class and its thought was at one time vital and therefore historically progressive. But in the 1920s and 1930s all this was *passé*, particularly for small nations such as the Slovene one, and especially now that the imperialism of the great powers was meeting its antithesis in an ever-growing internationalism among the oppressed of the world.

For Kardelj the Slovene middle classes—he generally dismisses them as petit bourgeois—had never been nor would ever become truly progressive, like those of Western Europe who had built the great national states of the nineteenth century. The Slovene bourgeoisie was not and never had been innovative or dynamic economically. That group, as Kardelj would "demonstrate" in a 1939 work,²³ even at its inception in the sixteenth century, never had the makings of a revolutionary social force. It was wanting, even inept, where it counted: in the area of the struggle for control of productive forces.²⁴ Everything that was bourgeois about the Slovene middle class was rootless, without an economic base. It was artificial, its cultural and political life filled with affectatious mimicking of a European bourgeoisie which by the twentieth century was experiencing the final stages of what one might call *fin de siècle* decay.

How could Vidmar, the distinguished author of *The Cultural Problem of Slovenism*, be so wrong? Kardelj's confident reply was a masterfully crafted example of the Marxist orthodoxy of the time. Vidmar's problem was his method. He relied on the metaphysical, looking within himself for answers, and "constructing" his conclusions rather than using scientific analysis for his answers. His method, in other words, were those of a Scholastic.²⁵ Real answers are derived from real life. National consciousness and conflicts result

from economic developments, not from the sparring of national wills. The latter, for Kardelj, are mere metaphysical abstractions. Had Vidmar applied analysis, he would have learned the following: a people *exists* as an ethnographic unit; a nation *develops* during the bourgeois period; and a nation *disappears* with the coming of socialism and with it internationalism. Alas, according to this scenario, Kardelj points out, for the Slovene nation as its bourgeois intellectuals conceive it, time is quickly running out.

Kardelj as an Educator of Children

While he polemicized in literary and political journals, Kardelj, ever the school teacher, was also working on an illustrated children's book. Entitled *Naš čudoviti svet: Potovanje skozi čas* [Our Marvelous World: A Journey through Time], it was first published in 1934. In it Kardelj, or rather the "Mr. Omnipotent" in the story, leads a bewildered little boy named Stefan through the ages of history in a flying machine or "aeroplane." The book is of course pure (although simplified) economic determinism: a Marxist primer for elementary school pupils. In it little Stefan, at first dismayed by the prospect of having to learn about economics, will predictably be caught up in his guide's wondrous narrative. "Economics," Mr. Omnipotent tells him, "is the invisible motor which incessantly rattles on and pulls along culture, science, art, politics and all else which belongs to man's spiritual existence. For that reason it pays to listen to the clattering of that motor."²⁶ As Kardelj's "aeroplane" transported Stefan to far away places and long ago times, the boy was instructed to observe how changes in technology worked upon economic systems and how these in turn affected man's spiritual life. Stefan saw for himself how each historical age was an improvement over the previous one, as his instructor had suggested. Enthralled by what he saw from Kardelj's fictional flying machine, he could truly believe that the people of the world were now approaching the attainment of the ideal society. *Potovanje*, a tale written for children, is essentially a modern-day fairy tale, complete with a happy ending.

Conclusion

In Moscow between 1934 and early 1936, Kardelj would be introduced to formal Marxist ideological training for the first time, while enrolled in the Marxist-Leninist School which the Soviets had established to train Communists from outside the U.S.S.R.. But Kardelj's philosophy was essentially in place by that time; Moscow training would add little to it. It is evident from his publications of the period up to 1934, and especially from the 76-page children's book described above, that his Marxism had fully matured by then. Kardelj was largely self-taught, encouraged by young leftists of his generation, some of whom also had shared with him the prison experience. A decade after he had first entered the secret room above the Strajzl tavern, Kardelj was already in 1934, at age 24, a Marxist ideologist of considerable depth and a polemicist of note in the Slovene intellectual community. A two-year stint in Moscow would merely authenticate Kardelj's credentials.

The Ohio State University

NOTES

1. Publications on Kardelj tend to be semi-official and complimentary. Two which are useful for establishing chronological sequence are: Janez Vipotnik, *Edvard Kardelj v besedi in slikah* (Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1981, 32 pp.) and Franc Setinc, *Misel in delo Edvarda Kardelja* (Ljubljana: Prešernova družba, 1980, 262 pp.)

2. Taras Kermauner, "Evropski socializem in jugoslovanski komunizem: ob primer Henrika Tume, Dušana Kermaunera in Edvarda Kardelja," *Most* 65-66 (August 1982) 42; Janko Pleterski, "Zgodovinska misel Slovenskih marksistov v času Speransove knjige," *Edvard Kardelj, Sperans in slovensko zgodovinopisje* (Ljubljana: Zgodovinsko društvo za Slovenijo, 1980) 5-16 [also published in *Zgodovinski časopis* 33/4 (1979)]. See also Janko Pleterski, *Narodi, Jugoslavija, Revolucija* (Ljubljana: Komunist, 1986) 171-271. For additional material on Yugoslav Communists in the interwar years, see Franc Če Filipič's two volumes of selected essays entitled *Poglavlja iz revolucionarnega boja jugoslovenskih komunistov 1919-1939* (Ljubljana: Borec, 1981). The present author is also indebted to Franc Če Filipič for information and an assessment of Kardelj's role in Slovene and Yugoslav Communist activities in the 1930s (interview, Ljubljana, October 4, 1982).
3. Vlado Kozak (1907-1985) was a younger half-brother to Juš (1892-1964) and Ferdo (1894-1957), both of them pre-1914 Serbophile revolutionaries and, in the interwar years, noted publicists: Juš Kozak edited, among other publications, *Ljubljanski Zvon*, and Ferdo Kozak edited *Sodobnost*. In 1923 Vlado became a Communist Party member, thereby carrying on the family's revolutionary tradition. The peasantry became his special interest. He gave financial backing to various progressive peasant newspapers in the 1930s, and in 1943 he was named editor of *Kmečki glas*, the Liberation Front's official newspaper for the peasantry. From 1949 to 1956 Kozak directed the Slovene Communist Party Central Committee historical archives. See Bogdan Osolnik, "Vlado Kozak In Memoriam," *Naši razgledi* 25 October 1985. For biographical sketches of Juš and Ferdo Kozak, see Stanko Janež, *Zgodovina Slovenskega slovstva* (Maribor: Obzorja, 1957) 549-52, 553-54. On the Strajzl circle see Vlado Kozak, "Strajzlov krožek," *Kozaška pričevanja* (Ljubljana: Državna založba, 1982) 72-86. Materials also from interviews with Vlado Kozak in Portorož, September 20, 1980; September 26, 1982; September 4-5, 1985.
4. Dušan Kermavner (1903-75) joined both *SKOJ* and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia [CPY] in 1920, and attended the Fifth Comintern Congress in Moscow in 1924 as provincial secretary of the CPY. In the twenties and thirties he was active as a writer, translator, and editor of works by political activists such as Prepeluh and Tuma. During World War II he was interned for several years. After the war he took on several government assignments and produced 150 historical works, generally relating to nineteenth and twentieth century Slovene history. He is perhaps best known for expanding and completing Ivan Prijatelj's multi-volume work on Slovene cultural and political history of the nineteenth century; see Bogo Grafenauer, "Dušan Kermavner - In Memoriam," *Zgodovinski časopis* 29 (1975) 140-54.
5. Kozak 26; interview with Filipič, October 4, 1982.
6. Kozak 65-66. Boris Kidrič (1919-1953) became a partisan in 1941 and political commissar for Slovenia. Premier of Slovenia in 1945, he went to Moscow to study the Soviet economy; when he returned he became virtual director of the whole Yugoslav economy. He is associated with the ruthless policies of collectivization and industrialization, later abandoned, that characterized Yugoslav economic development in the immediate post-war years. See Milovan Djilas, *Conversations with Stalin* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962) 197-98.
7. Two recent English-language accounts of the events which led up to the establishment of dictatorship in Yugoslavia are: Fred Singleton, *A Short History of the Yugoslav Peoples* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985) 131-71, and Vladimir Dedijer et al., *A History of Yugoslavia* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1974) 529-50. For a general history of the Slovenes in the interwar period see *Zgodovina Slovencev* (Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1979) 598-699; also Metod Mikuž, *Oris zgodovine Slovencev v starji Jugoslaviji, 1917-1941* (Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1945).
8. *Tomorrow* (1935) 21. In 1933 Kardelj gave his sketch of prison life to Louis Adamic, the Slovene-American writer, at the time a Guggenheim fellow in Yugoslavia. Adamic would translate *Boj* into English, and publish it in several noted American journals with prefaces intended to accent the repressiveness of Yugoslavia's dictatorial régime. He also included fragments of *Boj* in his book *The Native's Return* (a 1934 Book-of-the-Month Club Selection). The authorship of *Boj* was attributed to Kardelj only after World War II.
9. As quoted in Louis Adamic, *The Eagle and the Roots* (Garden City NY: Doubleday, 1952) 366.
10. Kardelj in those years wrote for a number of journals, and most frequently for *Knjижevnost*, *Sodobnost* and *Proleter*. The first two were published in Ljubljana, the third in Belgrade. Among the pseudonyms he used for these writings were: "A. Kovač", "Ivan Kovač", "Tone Brodar", "I. Ukmar", "Bevc", and "Sperans". See Stefka Bulovec' exhaustive *Bibliografija Edvarda Kardelja* (Ljubljana: Komunist, 1980), in which she lists all of his publications—he

- had died early in 1979—including those written from the underground. The pseudonyms he used are duly noted for each relevant publication.
11. Tone Brodar [= Kardelj], "Tone Cufar, Februarska noč," *Književnost* 1932-33: 102-05 (Bulovec no. 570).
 12. Tone Brodar, "Številka 171," *Književnost* 1932-33: 250-54 (Bulovec no. 567).
 13. Interview with Vida Tomšič, Ljubljana, October 1, 1982.
 14. A. Kovač [= Kardelj], "Dr. Andrej Gosar proti Karlu Marksu," *Književnost* 1933: 444-45 (Bulovec no. 564).
 15. Kovač 434.
 16. Tone Brodar, "Metode antifašistične borbe," *Književnost* 1934: 276-85 (Bulovec no. 575).
 17. Tone Brodar, "Šest mesecev 'Tretjega cesarstva,'" *Književnost* 1932-33: 312-20 (Bulovec no. 569).
 18. Anton Kovač, "Železna peta," *Književnost* 1933: 149-63 (Bulovec no. 572).
 19. Brodar, "Metode" 280.
 20. Brodar, "Metode" 277-78.
 21. Tone Brodar, "Nacionalno vprašanje kot znanstveno vprašanje," *Književnost* 1932-33: 5-9, 48-54, 73-79, 163-68, 236-43 (Bulovec no. 566).
 22. Brodar, "Nacionalno vprašanje" 242. Vidmar's work, upholding the individuality of Slovene national culture, caused a major crisis among intellectuals, particularly those associated with *Ljubljanski zvon*. By 1933 some of the writers who had withdrawn articles from *Zvon* during the quarrels of the previous year started the new journal *Sodobnost*, of which Vidmar was at first co-editor. See Lino Legiša, *Zgodovina slovenskega slovstva* VI (Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1969) 315-16. Kardelj's attack on Vidmar, which the latter describes as "war-like," received no reply. In later years, however, Kardelj mellowed. He had come to know Vidmar during the war years, debated cultural issues with him at length, and on the occasion of Vidmar's 80th birthday in 1975 Kardelj published a tribute to the old man, referring to his 1932 publication as "a significant progressive event." See Josip Vidmar, *Obrazi* (Ljubljana: Državna založba, 1985) 583-84.
 23. That work, *Razvoj slovenskega narodnega vprašanja*, which he published under the pseudonym "Sperans," is a monumental study of Slovene national development written from a Marxist perspective. Kardelj relied exclusively on secondary sources for this work.
 24. Carole Rogel, "A Marxist looks at the sixteenth century; Edvard Kardelj's view of the Slovene Protestant Reformation," *Slovene Studies* 6: 53-54.
 25. Brodar, "Nacionalno vprašanje" 79.
 26. Edvard Kardelj, *Naš čudoviti svet: Potovanje skozi čas* (Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1969) 8. The first edition of *Potovanje* was 76 pages long and was less elaborately illustrated than the 93-page 1969 edition cited here, which contained colored illustrations and photographs.

POVZETEK

LETA RASTI SLOVENSKEGA MARKSISTA EDVARDA KARDELJA, 1924-1934

Članek je posvečen letom dozorevanja Edvarda Kardelja (1910-1979), ki jih je kot marksist-novinec preživel v glavnem v Sloveniji (1926-34), še predno ga je Komunistična partija Jugoslavije poslala na šolanje v marksistično-leninistično visoko šolo v Moskvo. Kot mladega šestnajstletnika so ga mobilizirali levo usmerjeni liberalni študenti v Ljubljani, med njimi mnogi, ki so kasneje igrali vodilno vlogo v povojni socialistični Jugoslaviji. Zgodaj v tridesetletih letih je Kardelj, zdaj iz zaporov zdaj na svobodi, v revolucionarnem razpoloženju pisal o dogajanjih po Evropi in o problemih slovenstva, o katerih so v tistem času tako vneto razpravljali ljubljanski književniki. Članek obravnava Kardeljevo rast kot marksističnega izobraženca v luči njegovih člankov in razprav v revijah Književnost, Sodobnost, Proleter, in v luči njegovih mladiških publikacij ubranih na marksistično razlagu zgodovine. Avtor se ustavlja zlasti ob znanem konfliktu med Kardeljem in Josipom Vidmarjem, liberalnim zagovornikom slovenske kulturne samobitnosti, in zaključuje, da je širiindvajsetletni Kardelj v glavnem že doma, v idejnem dialogu s slovenskimi izobraženci svojega časa do dobra zgradil svoj marksistični svetovni nazor.