

YUGOSLAV REVISIONISM — PRODUCT OF IMPERIALIST POLICY

Chen Po-ta

The struggle of the Marxist-Leninist parties of all countries against the revisionism of the Yugoslav leading group headed by Tito is a big event in current international affairs. The Tito group provoked it. The programme which it put forward unleashed an attack all along the line against Marxism-Leninism and the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, in the belief that in this way it could weaken the positions of Marxism-Leninism and cause a split in the international communist movement. Marxist-Leninists had no choice but to accept the challenge and have already begun to show the challengers that they are knocking their heads against a brick wall. Contrary to the expectations of the Tito group, the Communist Parties of all countries have shown great solidarity in this struggle.

It is imperative that we examine this problem in the international political and economic setting as a whole and thus expose the very essence of the revisionism of the Tito group.

This article appeared in the June 1 issue of *Hongqi* (The Red Flag), fortnightly theoretical journal of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

The revisionism of the Tito group is in no way accidental; it is a product of the contemporary international class struggle, a product of the policy of the contemporary imperialists, in particular the U.S. imperialists, the fiercest enemy of the people throughout the world.

The revisionism of the period of the Second International, represented by Bernstein, also reflected the policy of the bourgeoisie — the imperialists. But the modern revisionism or neo-revisionism represented by Tito differs from Bernstein's in its function. Bernstein revisionism appeared at the close of the 19th century, when imperialism was still a complete system holding sway the world over, when there was as yet no state under proletarian dictatorship. But what era are we living in today? The great era of successful proletarian revolutions among a population of over 900 million and of socialism established as a new world system, the era in which the colonial system has already disintegrated or is in process of disintegration, and the imperialist system is tottering; it is the great era, as Comrade Mao Tse-tung has put it, of "the east wind prevailing over the west wind." In this new era, the struggle between the socialist and the capitalist systems, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in all lands, has become a fierce, life-and-death struggle. This is what inevitably stamps modern revisionism, that is, neo-revisionism, and gives it new features.

Marx and Engels in their time repeatedly pointed out that the British bourgeoisie used a small part of its superprofits to maintain a group of aristocrats of labour. In a letter to Marx, Engels once referred to "those very worst English trade unions which allow themselves to be led by men sold to, or at least paid by the middle class." It

is well known that Lenin — in the course of the relentless battle he waged against revisionism, opportunism, reformism, social chauvinism and social imperialism — time and again referred to this view of Marx and Engels and added new evidence to substantiate it. Lenin said: "Objectively the opportunists are a section of the petty bourgeoisie and of certain strata of the working class who have been bribed out of imperialist superprofits and converted into watchdogs of capitalism and corrupters of the labour movement."

How does the situation stand today? Since the working class has seized state power in many countries, the imperialists have found that it is not sufficient to buy over traitors to the working class within their own countries. Besides continuing the policy of bribery in their own countries, the imperialists, with the U.S. imperialists in the lead, are at the same time doing their best to find in some socialist countries bourgeois nationalist elements and unstable persons and buy them over and make them tools to undermine the proletarian dictatorship, the socialist system, the international communist movement and the unity of the socialist countries. That being the case the U.S. imperialists have picked on the leading group of Yugoslavia, and carried out a policy of buying it off at a high price.

According to figures published in the newspapers and periodicals of the United States and Yugoslavia, between 1945 and 1957 the United States extended over U.S.\$1,700 million in economic aid to the leading group of Yugoslavia; of which over \$1,000 million were given after 1949. In addition, according to Associated Press reports, the United States gave Yugoslavia more than \$1,000 million in military aid from 1950 to 1957. This is apart from

an estimated \$300 million of economic aid received by Yugoslavia from other capitalist countries. So all in all, the aid given to the leading group of Yugoslavia by the whole capitalist world headed by the United States amounted to about \$3,000 million.

In his report to the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, Tito disclosed that U.S. aid made up 4 per cent of Yugoslavia's national income. It can be estimated from this figure that U.S. aid accounts for a very large proportion of Yugoslavia's national budget, probably amounting to about 20 per cent.

The stark fact is that the Yugoslav leading group headed by Tito not only lives on its own people but on a large amount of U.S. aid. At the same time, the so-called "American way of life" of which the U.S. imperialists boast of so loudly has also been imported into Yugoslav society by means of U.S. aid, with the purpose of corrupting the Yugoslav people.

A report published in *The Washington Post and Times Herald* of June 6, 1957 says, "Instalment-plan buying of American-style electrical gadgets is changing the Yugoslavs from Communists to capitalists, says Pittsburgh's G.O.P. Congressman James F. Fulton, heretofore bitter foe of United States policy toward Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia. He has just returned from Tito-land. . . . He said: 'The May Day parade had a real American look, American tanks, American equipment. There's tremendous American influence . . . among the people, Americans are the most popular of all nationalities.'"

On May 2, 1958, Reuter's correspondent sent a long report from Belgrade in which he said that the Yugoslav press ten years ago was "just as dull and doctrinaire as *Pravda*." But "nowadays, it often tries to be as racy as

the American tabloids." "Marxist eyebrows are often raised by 'cheesecake' photographs and the American-angled features which regularly appear in the Yugoslav newspapers." "The Yugoslav reader is offered a liberal spread of 'human stories,' including frank and often gory details of crime and disaster." All this shows that some leading Yugoslav newspapers have been turned into instruments of publicity for the "American way of life."

Man's social being determines his consciousness. It is precisely the import of large quantities of U.S. aid and the "American way of life" that has wrought a change in the consciousness of the Yugoslav leading group, caused revisionist ideology to grow up in its midst, and determined its internal and external policies which are directed against the Soviet Union, against communism, against the socialist camp and against socialism in its own country.

What are the main points in the revisionism and the domestic and foreign policies of the leading group in Yugoslavia headed by Tito, as expressed in the programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia?

1. With regard to the over-all political struggle in the world, the Tito group sets forth views which are diametrically opposed to those in the Declaration of the Moscow meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries. It denies that the most fundamental feature of the present world situation is the counterposing of two different social, political and economic world systems and of the two camps arising from these two different systems. It rejects the point made in the Declaration that "in our epoch world development is determined by the course and results of the competition between two diametrically opposed social systems." It completely confuses the differences between the two

fundamentally different social systems — socialism and capitalism — and describes these two fundamentally different world economic-political systems, the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, as “the division of the world into antagonistic military-political blocs,” and it holds that “the division of the world into antagonistic military-political blocs also led to the economic division of the world . . . and thus obstructs the process of the integration of the world and impedes the social progress of mankind.” According to the sophistry of the Tito group, the world, or the world economy, was originally united under the system of capitalism — imperialism; as though the capitalist countries had never split into blocs contending for world supremacy, arising from the interests of monopoly capital in its drive for superprofits; as though monopoly capital had never engaged in life-and-death global wars for the re-division of the world. The Tito group does not in any way believe that the way out for humanity lies in the ultimate replacement of the capitalist system by the socialist system. Its proposal is for the United Nations, which is dominated by U.S. imperialism, to “encourage and promote comprehensive cooperation and closer connections between peoples, in short, to assist efforts towards achieving a fuller unity of the world.”

What kind of “unity” is the so-called “unity of the world” that is to be promoted through the U.S.-dominated United Nations? Isn’t this unity which the Tito group hankers after a unity in which U.S. imperialism seeks to dominate the world?

2. The Tito group declares that it does not belong to the camp of socialism. It brags about a so-called position of “standing above blocs.”

What is it all about, after all? The facts have shown: (1) that its purpose in staying outside the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union and outside the ranks of the international proletariat is nothing less than substituting reactionary bourgeois nationalism for revolutionary proletarian internationalism; and (2) that its so-called position of “standing above blocs” is nothing but an adaptation to the requirements of the imperialist bloc.

3. On the question of war or peace, Marxists have always held that the root cause of modern wars is monopoly capitalism, i.e., imperialism, and that the socialist countries and the Communist Parties of all countries are the core of the forces defending world peace. But the Tito group directs the spearhead of its attack against the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union and acts as an apologist for the war policy of the imperialist camp. Tito himself has declared: “Owing to Stalin’s inflexible and uncalled for threatening foreign policy, seeing that they would be unable to accomplish their aims by diplomatic means, the big Western powers decided they would be able to do so by displaying force. This was the basic reason for the formation of the Atlantic Pact, for the creation of a military bloc. . . .” (Tito’s report to the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.) Apparently the Tito group is trying to lead up to such an absurd, ultra-reactionary conclusion as this: that the danger of war arises not from the imperialist system and the imperialist camp headed by the United States but from the socialist system and the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union.

4. As scientifically analysed by Lenin, imperialism is the last stage of capitalism and, with it, mankind has entered the era of proletarian revolution. Since the Octo-

ber Revolution, the proletarian revolution has triumphed in a number of countries. But imperialism is not yet finally down and out. The era of proletarian revolution is not yet over. Yet according to the Tito group, the world today has already passed beyond the age of imperialism and proletarian revolution, because "the capitalist system in its classical form is increasingly becoming a thing of the past" and socialism is coming into being in the capitalist countries. The Tito group keeps harping on the word "age" in the following manner: "Mankind is indomitably moving into the age of socialism through a wide variety of different roads, into the age in which socialism and socialist relations increasingly become the content and method of everyday life of all mankind"; "the age in which mankind is living today is already, more than anything else, the age of the introduction, forming and strengthening of new social, political and cultural forms based on socialist economic relationships." From this it comes to the conclusion that "socialist thinking is no longer primarily concerned with questions relating to the overthrow of the old, capitalist system." In other words, the problem of destroying the capitalist system in various countries of the world no longer exists, the theory of proletarian revolution is "outmoded," and it has become nothing but a figment of the thinking of so-called "dogmatists."

5. According to Lenin, monopoly capitalism "introduces everywhere the striving for domination, not for freedom. The result is reaction all along the line, whatever the political system, and an extreme intensification of existing antagonisms in this domain also." But according to the Tito group, monopoly capital is peacefully growing into socialism in the capitalist countries through

the forms of state capitalism, and state capitalism in these countries is in fact "socialism." In the capitalist countries, it says, "the state increasingly controls the activities of capital, partially restricting the right of private management of capitalist property and depriving the owners of private capital of certain independent functions in the economy and in society." "In certain fields of activity the top monopoly circles are steadily losing their former completely independent role, while some functions of the monopolies are increasingly being transferred upon the state." "The state assumes an important role in the economy." "The role of the state as that of a regulator in the sphere of labour and property relationships, of social rights and social services and other social relations also grows."

So runs the extraordinary argument of the Tito group: the state apparatus of monopoly capital does not serve monopoly capital; it stands above classes and is fulfilling the task of expropriating monopoly capital.

6. Thus, the Tito group maintains that the working class in the capitalist countries can "make the state apparatus serve the society" without having to smash the bourgeois state apparatus. The task of the working class in the capitalist countries is thus confined to "winning decisive influence in state power and gradually — in keeping with its political strength — securing development of socialism."

7. Since the Tito group glorifies bourgeois dictatorship in every way, it is no wonder that it exerts itself to smear proletarian dictatorship. Speaking like all reactionaries, it alleges that proletarian dictatorship must inevitably lead to "bureaucracy" and "bureaucratic statism."

8. Marxists maintain that there are two forms of socialist ownership, i.e., ownership by the whole people and collective ownership, and that ownership by the whole people is the higher form of socialist ownership. But the Tito group describes ownership by the whole people, i.e., state ownership, in the socialist countries as "state capitalism" and "the last echo of old social relations." Socialist economy, it says, comprises only two kinds of ownership — "collective ownership" and "personal ownership." By "collective ownership" it means allowing the direct producers to "make decisions pertaining to the creation and the total distribution of products." The group further alleges that "private land holding" is "a component part of large-scale socialist agricultural production," and that small proprietors also represent "a component part of the socio-economic forces of socialism."

In short, the Tito group describes state capitalism in the capitalist countries as "socialism," and the ownership by the whole people in the socialist countries as "state capitalism." It is for the former but against the latter. "Socialism" of the Tito brand puts the collective above the whole people, and the individual, in turn, above the collective. Its slogan is "socialism cannot subordinate man's personal happiness to any kind of 'higher aims.'" Its logic is that individual interests may stand above the collective interests and the interests of the whole people but should not be subordinated to them, and that, certainly, collective interests may stand above the interests of the whole people and should not be subordinated to the latter.

9. The "socialism" of the Tito brand is so queer a thing that to all intents and purposes it is the "socialism" of the bourgeoisie, the kind of "socialism" that is toler-

able to the imperialists. It is fundamentally different from socialism as defined by Marxism-Leninism and practised in the socialist countries. No wonder the Tito group categorically repudiates the common laws of socialist revolution and socialist construction, sets itself against the common ideology and concerted action of the international proletariat and the international communist movement, and maliciously slanders this common ideology and concerted action as "ideological monopoly" and "political hegemony."

10. Proceeding from the above-mentioned views, the Tito group is hostile to all Communist Parties. It declares: "The conception that Communist Parties have a monopoly over every aspect of the movement of society towards socialism and that socialism can only find its representatives in them and move forward through them—is theoretically wrong and practically, very harmful." It also asserts: "Some of the Communist Parties cease to act as the revolutionary creative factor and motive power of social development in their respective countries."

The Tito group has great contempt for the Communist Party of the United States. But history will ultimately prove that though the U.S. Communist Party, which adheres to the truth, is now small, it is a really vital living force and has a great future; on the other hand, though the Tito group now rules Yugoslavia, who can guarantee that it will not trip over its own revisionism?

11. The Tito group holds that "the development of the international workers' movement during the last few decades did not advance in step with the social events and the development of material conditions"; and that "during the last few years of the Stalin period, the workers' move-

ment in the world . . . not only stagnated but even retrogressed."

The Tito group seems blind to the triumph of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the success of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, the great victories gained in the war against fascism in which the Soviet Union played the chief role, the existence of the new socialist countries, the growth of the workers' movements in the capitalist countries, and the great Chinese revolution and the People's Republic of China.

12. The Tito group is of the opinion that "Marxist thought in the course of the last few decades has not kept in step with the advance of contemporary society." As the editorial of the *Renmin Ribao* (People's Daily), May 5, 1958 pointed out, the Tito group brands the basic principles of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory as "dogmatism," and calls itself "irreconcilable enemies of dogmatism"; this being so, how can it possibly understand whether Marxism has developed or not? As it does not see the great world events that have come about under the leadership of the Communist Parties since the October Revolution, and utters such reactionary twaddle about "humanity," "personality of man," "free personality," "truth about man as a social being," and "man's spiritual constitution," on the pretext of opposing so-called "dogmatism" and "pragmatic revision," how can this group possibly have a common language with Marxism-Leninism?

These twelve points do not exhaust the revisionist views and the domestic and foreign policies of the Tito group. But they suffice to show how the revisionism of the Tito group serves the interests of the imperialists, particularly the U.S. imperialists.

In his report to the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, Tito called Djilas a revisionist. "By orders from outside and for Judas' silver," Tito said, "these traitors wrote slanderous pamphlets against the socialism and reality in Yugoslavia." However, as pointed out correctly by an article in the West German *Tagesspiegel* of April 22, 1958: "Here is harsh mockery. For the basic ideas of this programme were drafted by no other than Djilas himself who is today behind prison bars." Of course, there is a difference between Djilas and the Tito group. It is that while Djilas does not bother to don the cloak of Marxism-Leninism, the Tito group still uses Marxism-Leninism as a disguise. But has it ever occurred to Tito that the content of the programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia is actually another edition of Djilas' *New Class*? Tito might well hold up Djilas as a mirror to see his own reflection.

After the war against fascism, the people of Yugoslavia embarked on the road to socialism. But under the dominating influence of the policies of the Tito group, Yugoslavia has not yet carried out a serious, thorough-going struggle between the capitalist and the socialist roads on the economic, political and ideological fronts, and has not solved the question of which road shall win in the country. In the villages of Yugoslavia, individual economy still accounts for more than 90 per cent of the rural economy, and this preserves a seedbed for the return of capitalism.

The question in Yugoslavia is not solely that of ownership. For the people of Yugoslavia, a more serious question is that the dollar policy of U.S. imperialism is exerting influence on the leading group of Yugoslavia and

thereby causing confusion among the Yugoslav people as to the road to socialism.

As can be seen from the material quoted above, the dollar policy of U.S. imperialism towards Yugoslavia began in 1945. Even before 1948, the Tito group already began to forsake the road of proletarian internationalism and foster reactionary bourgeois nationalism. This was bound up with the dollar policy of U.S. imperialism and was a product of it in Yugoslavia. But to this very day, a good many of the Yugoslav people, and of the members of the Yugoslav League of Communists, still do not realize this.

Although the programme of the Yugoslav League of Communists declares that "personal ownership" and "private land holding" are also "socialism," it is understandable that the leading group of the Yugoslav League of Communists does not necessarily hope to discard immediately the forms of public ownership that came into being in the previous course of the revolution, and it is impossible for them to do so. For if it does, it will not only meet with resistance from the Yugoslav working class and other politically conscious working people, but also lose its political stock-in-trade for deceiving its countrymen and befuddling world opinion, and so eventually lose its political capital for bargaining with U.S. imperialism.

There is an acute contradiction between the degenerate policy of the Tito group and the desire of the Yugoslav people and loyal Communists inside the Yugoslav League of Communists to take the socialist road. This is why, to maintain its rule, the Tito group is willing to preserve certain forms of public ownership. Moreover, as long as the Tito group remains hostile to the international com-

munist movement and to the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, the U.S. imperialists may agree to the preservation of certain forms of public ownership in Yugoslavia and assume an attitude of "non-intervention." Consider, for instance, what *U.S. News & World Report* wrote in its issue of November 9, 1956: "In urging independent — but not necessarily capitalistic — governments in countries that are now Soviet satellites (the imperialists always talk this nonsense, referring to all the socialist countries other than the Soviet Union as 'satellites' — *Author*) the Eisenhower Administration is continuing its support of Titoism." Discussing Yugoslavia's function at a press conference on August 6, 1957, John Foster Dulles had this to say: "It is possible to have a communist regime without being dominated by what we call 'international communism' or a Soviet-type brand of communism."

As Marxists see it, there is nothing strange in certain forms of public ownership being tolerated in a particular society which is governed by an exploiting class, so long as they do not harm, and may even help, the fundamental interests of that exploiting class. In feudal society, for instance, it is quite common for certain village communes, or certain forms of public ownership or autonomy to be preserved. In capitalist society, a joint stock company may be considered a kind of capitalist form of "public ownership" and some workers may even hold shares in it. Yet, as we all know, that does not prevent the capitalists from drawing their maximum profits; on the contrary, it adds to the capitalists' assurance of maximum profits. After the October Revolution, the counter-revolutionaries at one time hoped to make use of the organizational form of Soviets — what they called "Soviets without Communists." When collective farming was brought about in

the Soviet Union, some counter-revolutionaries at one time similarly wanted to make use of the form of collective farms — what they called “collective farms without Communists.” On this point, Stalin rightly said: “Everything depends upon the content that is put into this form.” All organizational forms, political or economic, remain mere organizational forms. The question is who runs them, who leads.

As Comrade Mao Tse-tung said in his speech “On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People,” the revisionists, too, pay lip service to Marxism-Leninism. It is said that, in Yugoslavia, the Tito group permits people to hang up portraits of Marx and Lenin. This point needs to be seen from the same angle. What the Tito group is doing is to preserve a certain amount of Marxist phraseology while getting rid of its revolutionary content. In countries where the working class movement has a Marxist tradition behind it, revisionists and opportunists may accept a part of Marxist theory, and even the theory of the class struggle, where this accords with the interests of the bourgeoisie. Lenin said: “Those who recognize only the class struggle are not yet Marxists; they may be found to have gone no further than the boundaries of bourgeois reasoning and bourgeois politics. To limit Marxism to the theory of the class struggle means curtailing Marxism, distorting it, reducing it to something which is acceptable to the bourgeoisie. A Marxist is one who extends the acceptance of the class struggle to the acceptance of the dictatorship of the proletariat.” But the Tito group has gone much further than those opportunists who accept the class struggle. It has even repudiated the class struggle, in order to fit in with the needs of the U.S. imperialists.

The leading group of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia declares that under no circumstances will it abandon its revisionist stand, that any attempt to get it to change its position is illusory and will be of no avail. It also declares that it will not stop its contention, that is to say, it will continue to challenge Marxism-Leninism. It can be seen therefore that it is impossible to cease this struggle. Is this struggle good for Marxism-Leninism? Comrade Mao Tse-tung has said that under specific conditions “bad things can be turned into good things.” Things always develop dialectically. The programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia is a concentrated expression of modern revisionism. It will serve as an example in reverse to educate the Yugoslav people and the Communists of the world and enable people to distinguish still more clearly between Marxism-Leninism and anti-Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism has always grown and developed by combating opportunism of every description. So long as Marxist-Leninists wage clear-cut, uncompromising struggle against modern revisionism, the international communist movement is bound to benefit.