

"E" DISTRIBUTION - 600

27 AUGUST 1960

---

RFE EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS DEPARTMENT

---

Background Report  
(Yugoslav Special)  
No. 943/1960

KARDELJ ON CHINESE POLICY: UNSOLICITED AND UNNEEDED  
SUPPORT FOR KHRUSHCHEV (VII)

Munich, August 25 (Stankovic) -- A "strange contradiction" exists in the present-day Communist world, said Edvard Kardelj in the Chapter XIII of his book "Socialism and War -- Survey of the Chinese Criticisms of the Policy of Coexistence", as reproduced in the August 19 issue of the Belgrade daily "Borba". This "strange contradiction" lies in the fact that Yugoslavia, "which is not a member of the socialist camp", has supported Khrushchev's policy of peaceful coexistence, while China, "which is a member of the camp, has criticized that same policy."

In Kardelj's opinion one should not forget this fact when one discusses the problem of the "Relations Between Socialist Countries" as reads the title of the Chapter XIII. As in some previous chapters, Kardelj -- while discussing the problems of these inter-Communist relations -- voices a strong opposition against any forcible imposition of the Communist system upon the "non-socialist countries." The Yugoslav leader is, obviously, opposing "any forcible imposition" not because of his love of "imperialism" but simply because of the Yugoslav Communists' own interests.

Kardelj claims that if one would accept the theory that the Communist system should forcibly be imposed upon the non-Communist countries, then that would mean that "definite forms of internal development or a definite internal or international policy can also be imposed upon a socialist country." Consequently, the Yugoslav leaders consider it their duty to fight not only capitalism but also every form of "imperialist policy within socialist world." They are strong opponents of "the principle of hegemony of any nation," including of course the Soviet Union.

Even though Kardelj is very careful not to do anything which (at least superficially) can be understood as opposition to the Soviet Union, he does not hide his idea that the "mechanical

supplanting" of Communist forms should not be taken either from China or the Soviet Union. Kardelj's idea is that a socialist country "even if she does not accept the Chinese conception of the camp," is a socialist country. One must not recognize any Communist "monopoly" or "hegemony" in order to be accepted as a socialist country, Kardelj says. By the way, Kardelj added, the Yugoslavs do not care whether anybody "recognizes" their socialism or not.

Discussing the problem of the Chinese "people's communes", Kardelj claimed that although this system may be suitable for China herself, "the present-day Chinese people's communes in no way can represent an attractive form of socialist instruction, a form which can sound encouraging to the working masses of other countries, making them enthusiastic about socialism." Moreover, Kardelj sees in Chinese people's communes idea "a sterile idealistic lamentation. "Anyhow", he added, "such as they are today, the Chinese communes constitute a form of 'war Communism'... Accordingly such relations cannot be retained for a long time... It is not accidental that even nowadays -- in spite of formal decisions -- the policy of 'people's communes' has failed in the towns." Why? Because this policy "is bound to provoke the resistance of the working class which -- as soon as it has realized that it is an economic power -- cannot stand bureaucratic hegemony or formal equality but seeks equality according to productivity..."

Discussing the problem of the relations between the socialist countries, Kardelj stated that these relations -- being "an embryo of the future relations between all countries in the world" -- if based on the Chinese policy of hegemony and monopoly, would destroy the whole socialist cause. He solemnly stated: "With this attitude, the policy of China has openly and brutally destroyed the unity of the socialist world." Thus Kardelj uses the stick with which the Soviets have so often attacked his own country -- and particularly himself -- against the Chinese. Does Khrushchev agree with this artifice -- or is he (ideologically at least) embarrassed by it?

+ + +

SOCIALISM AND WAR (VII)

By Edvard Kardelj

Chapter XIII

ON RELATIONS BETWEEN SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

The problem of imposing socialism by force from outside is at the same time the problem of relations between socialist countries. In fact, in terms of principle, if socialism can be forced upon a non-socialist country, then in a socialist country definite forms of internal development or a definite internal or international policy can be imposed. The Chinese anti-Yugoslav hue and cry is actually a form of pressure in that sense.

The question arises on which principles -- in such circumstances -- the Chinese theorists think that relations between socialist countries should be based. Apparently, they confound democratic principles of cooperation and unity based on equality with another principle, that is the principle of the hegemony of any nation. And this does not only mean to open a door to any kind of megalomaniac state trends in the relations between socialist countries, but the provoking of contradictions between nations as well. Ultimately, such relations could only lead to a revival of determined methods of an imperialistic policy within the socialist world.

I would like to illustrate the above stated theses by giving two examples of practical consequences of the theories upheld by Chinese authors which have been the subject of this pamphlet.

The first example relates to the internal social-economic development of contemporary China, primarily the system of Chinese "people's communes". Judging by their explanations, the Chinese theorists consider those communes as one of the most progressive forms -- if not the most progressive one -- in the development of world socialism, which they recommend to others.

On the significance of those communes they write:

"The basic objective of the establishment of people's communes is to accelerate the development of socialism,

while the objective of the realization of socialism consists of active preparations for a transition to Communism. It appears that the achievement of Communism in China is no longer a matter of the distant future. It is necessary to use actively the form of people's communes in order to find out what are the concrete possibilities for a transition to Communism."

(From the Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, issued on 16 September 1958.)

Or, on another occasion it was stated:

"Although in people's communes collective ownership still chiefly prevails, which is prevalently of socialist character, it already contains certain elements of common public ownership which will develop continually, and in three or four or five and six years fully replace collective ownership. Now the people's commune has still retained a socialist character, but it will become the best organizational form of the development of socialism and a step-by-step transition to Communism. That is why the establishment of people's communes represents an event of great historical significance."

(From a leader which appeared in the paper "Jen Min Jih Pao" of 1 October 1958, entitled "The All-National Holiday the Nation-Wide Victory", quoted after the newsagency "New China".)

Such allegations are really a classical product of bureaucratic subjectivism, because they can only be an expression of the concepts according to which the development of Communism is attainable through a further development of political forms, irrespective of the development of productive forces.

In fact, the current "people's communes" in China are a political expression of the historically conditioned although temporary and transitional efforts made by an underdeveloped revolutionary country to create her initial material base for the development of socialism. In other words, this does not yet mean socialism since it is the material basis paving the way for its building.

On the substance of communes the following quotations from Chinese writers can provide a convincing proof:

"...In people's communes the organization of work is arranged according to military principles, the entire activity is carried out in a fighting spirit, a collective way of life is adopted, being most suitable to the demands of the current situation when such a leap is being made."

(From an article in "Jen Min Jih Pao" of 1 October 1958 which appeared under the headline "The All-National Holiday, the Nation-Wide Victory", quoted after the newsagency "New China".)

"...To have free meals and at the same time draw regular monthly income marks an event of world-wide significance. Ever since Marx indicated the noble ideal of Communism, there were people who opposed it under the excuse that the pursuance of a policy based on the principle 'everyone should contribute according to his abilities, and receive according to his requirements' would create lazy people. The facts have provided evidence showing how inaccurate this statement has been. The introduction of a system of distribution which consists of the payment of a share of wages in kind, and of another being payable in ready cash and bonuses has freed the nation of the care for food and clothing. Now the chief concern of the people will be how to work better in order to be the worthy members of the new society, and to show their gratitude to the Communist Party and their leader Mao Tse-tung. The people have not become lazy; on the contrary they have become even more diligent and they work with even greater enthusiasm and zeal. It appears that gradually the introduction of the Communist economic system and the Communist-mindedness and morale of the people are at work simultaneously..."

(From an article by Vice-Premier Li Hsien-nien entitled "What I have seen in People's Communes", published in "Peking Review" of 11 November 1958.)

And the paper "Jen Min Jih Pao" of 10 September 1958 pointed out:

"Remuneration according to work done is a remnant of the bourgeois law. This principle is in contradiction with the future development of socialist forces. By the way it can incite the material interest, but it does not contribute to the development of Communist-mindedness."

I have given quotations of an earlier date although later certain deviations from these concepts occurred. However, this can only serve as a confirmation of our thesis that Communism cannot be built by subjectivist political constructions since it can only be achieved through a harmonious evolution of all the material, ideological, cultural and political factors which constitute the basis of society.

We lack elements to appraise more fully the Chinese communes, that is their positive as well as negative aspects, nor is it our wish to deal with those problems which are going to be solved by the Chinese practice as such. However, there is something that is certain, and that is the fact that the current Chinese communes can in no way represent such an attractive form of socialist construction that it can sound encouraging to the working masses of other countries making them enthusiastic about socialism.

Evidently, the Chinese theorists reduced the essence of Communist distribution to remuneration in kind. In addition to this, Marx's idea that "an abundance of products" is required for Communist distribution, is interpreted as the need for state organs to find out how much everybody needs. And, in effect, under the term "the abundance of products" Marx imagined the stage of highly developed labor productivity in which the costs of production would be reduced to such a minimum that a free distribution according to requirements would be rendered possible, and not the distribution by the state. Furthermore, Marx gave no priority to remuneration in kind over that in ready cash, but he only assumed that in Communism the currency would no longer exist and that this would, among other things, be the result of a free distribution according to requirements. This means that remuneration in kind of state-arranged distribution based on equal pay can by no means mark a contribution to a more rapid development of Communism. But, they may even delay the process in so far as they begin to thwart the development of productive forces and labor productivity. And to tell stories about abstract "socialist-mindedness", without its material bases and driving forces -- is nothing else but a sterile idealistic lamentation.

Of course, as a very radical squaring of accounts with all the types of relations in private ownership, they can play -- viewed from the angle of a long-term development -- a very positive political role in the production of Chinese people's communes. But all this depends on the future development of the internal

economic relations in communes. Anyhow, such as they are today, the Chinese communes constitute a form of "war Communism" and as such they do not represent a new phenomenon or a more progressive form for world socialism -- although they may represent something progressive for China -- nor can they be an impetus to others in the struggle for socialism. Such communes and such political and social relations in general could occur in a country with very specific conditions. First of all, China has gone through a very long civil war and a war with imperialistic aggressors, in which the people were thrown into extreme poverty and accustomed to suffer the greatest sacrifices in the interest of the victory for the revolution. In addition in China small-scale agricultural production prevails, as well as the poor peasant semi-proletarians who could become a political basis of a war Communism of its kind based -- at least seemingly -- on equality in poverty and sacrifices for the sake of a better future.

At a time which is marked by great ideological revolutionary enthusiasm this kind of sacrifices are not only possible and necessary but they actually render possible the great leaps in the overcoming of an underdeveloped material base. This was revealed in our revolution too. Our people were compelled to suffer great sacrifices for years. But, gradually this kind of deprivation is translated into its contradiction. People do not only renounce material benefits but they give up work as well, and this fact, on the one hand, begins to ruin productive forces, frustrating labor productivity, while on the other -- just because of the struggle against such trends -- it necessitates the ever greater administrative interference in economic relations.

Accordingly, such relations cannot be retained for a long time. While their political base consists of peasant semi-proletarians, this policy may most likely produce determined results, but along with the strengthening of the working class the contradictions, stemming from those relations, will be sharpened and make this policy untenable. It is not accidental that even nowadays -- in spite of formal decisions -- the policy of "people's communes" has failed in towns. It is bound to provoke the resistance of the working class which -- as soon as it has realized that it is an economic power -- cannot stand bureaucratic hegemony or formal equality, but seeks equality according to productivity.

The earlier quoted Li Hsien-nien obviously reached premature conclusions as regards "laziness" and "diligence".

Socialism can defeat capitalism only by means of higher labor productivity. And higher labor productivity, compared with that in capitalism, can be produced by such a working class which develops and works in the conditions of free labor, that is, labor which is freed to the extreme of the domination of private owners and the pressure of every other social force except the individual or united producers.

This historical task of the liberation of labor which undoubtedly cannot be fulfilled overnight, in the conditions of a period of transition and a relative shortage of consumer goods can solely be achieved through a process of an increasingly consistent development of social distribution on the basis of the principle that everybody should obtain remuneration according to his work. At a time when the society is not yet in a position to give everybody according to his requirements, obviously it is not only in compliance with economic needs, that is the requirements of the material stimulation to work, but it is in compliance with the common human feeling of justice that people should get remuneration according to their contribution to the society. Every other way -- insofar it may become part of a long-term policy -- must inevitably not only lead to the destruction of the social-economic preconditions of the struggle for higher labor productivity, but it is compelled to provoke grave political consequences, the emergence of political and even antagonistic contradictions, and ultimately powerful deformations in social-economic relations as well as in the system and the policy of a socialist country.

Consequently, sooner or later the Chinese socialism forces will be compelled to switch over to more advanced forms of socialist economic relations based on the principles of distribution according to productivity, if they would be willing to discard the trend to stagnation in the development of productive forces and labor productivity. However, today, the opinion still prevails that individual Chinese Communists consider as their weakness something that is their distinction, and on the contrary regard something to be their distinction while it is actually their weakness.

If this is how things stand in China, then one can imagine what negative consequences could occur if anyone tried to impose Chinese or any other similar internal political and social-economic forms upon another country, particularly an economically developed country, even if that country was capitalist. It is obvious that to impose such forms upon another country would result in a stagnation

in the social material basis, a decline in the productivity of labor, and serious political conflicts.

But, this question does not involve only social relations such as those which prevail in Chinese communes. The result would be more or less the same if anyone tried to transfer mechanically to other countries the forms which emerged, for example, as a result of the October Revolution or as a result of our own revolution. Both these revolutions occurred in countries which were relatively backward from an economical point of view, in countries of reactionary dictatorships which suppressed every notion of democracy. An automatic transfer of the experiences and forms of these revolutions -- even if we were to suppose that they are without any shortcomings, and this is not so -- to a developed country, with a relatively well established democratic tradition, might result in a complete isolation of revolutionary forces from the people.

Briefly, socialism cannot be spread by means of a mere reproduction and dissemination of the already achieved forms, but by means of a constant generation and development of new forms which influence and enrich the old ones, and thus encourage a further progress of socialism. Anything that stands in the way of that process, anything that is thrown into that process as an alien body, and this above all refers to all possible forms of political and ideological monopoly and hegemony -- represents a brake, a temporary setback, a reflection of the difficulties and deformations encountered in the overcoming of contradictory social movements in the socialist society, and must for that reason be subjected to the criticism of practice, and this is possible only under the conditions of a free development of socialist relationships in every individual country.

It is for this reason, in fact in the name of socialism itself and as revolutionaries, that we are against imposing socialism or specific socialist forms upon other forms of violence and pressure from outside. We are convinced that socialism will exercise "pressure" by its very existence, and that its influence will be all the greater if it proves capable not only of renouncing the use of violence in international political relations, but also of preventing the forces of capitalism from resorting to any similar use of violence.

The other example relates to the relations between socialist countries as an embryo of the future relations between all countries of the world. If the Chinese theories were to become the predominant factor in socialist international policy, then the relations between socialist countries themselves would have to undergo a thorough deformation. In practice, the example of Yugoslavia shows that such a

deformation has already occurred once in history -- this was at the time of Stalin's pressure against Yugoslavia -- and that the leadership of the Communist Party of China is in fact endeavoring now to restore and "develop further" that same policy of pressure against the internal socialist development of Yugoslavia and her international policy. The Chinese theoreticians do not even bother to furnish theoretical and ideological reasons for their present policy.

Here is how they "explain" the substance of the policy of Yugoslav Communists:

"The Union of Communists of Yugoslavia declined to take part in the Moscow meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties of socialist countries and to sign the Declaration adopted at that meeting. They said that the reason for this was that the Moscow Declaration 'contains certain standpoints and estimates which are contrary to the standpoints of the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia and which they regard as incorrect'. For their attitude, they were promptly given a recognition on the part of American imperialists. On 8 December 1957, Tito received the United States Ambassador to Yugoslavia, James Riddleberger. An enormous American loan to Yugoslavia followed immediately afterwards..." And so on.

(Article in "Jen Minh Ji Pao", dated 14 June 1958, as reported by the New China news agency.)

In quoting these words, I do not mean that I intend to go back to the explanations about the differences on the subject of the Moscow Declaration. My intention is only to point to the way in which Chinese authors deal with major problems of the modern socialist development which are the source of Yugoslav-Chinese differences.

The Chinese critics of our policy allege that we are a capitalist country for the simple reason because we do not endorse these forms of internal socialist development which they observe. In addition, they tell us that we are "imperialist agents" simply because we cannot agree with certain specific aspects of their international policy and their conception of the relations between socialist countries. The differences on these questions are, in the opinion of Chinese theoreticians, a reason strong enough to justify all possible forms and methods of pressure against socialist Yugoslavia.

Mao Tse-tung, in this time, wrote as follows:

"Those who recommend to us to implement the experiences of the Soviet Union, without modifying them, without taking into account the specific nature of our own position, suggest that we should make our feet shorter in order to adapt them to the shoes of Soviet theory and practice."

"A consequence of the activities of these dogmatists," Mao continued, "was that we forfeited all bases of the revolution."

It seems that the Chinese leaders today -- when they are trying to impose their own conceptions upon us and upon others by means of pressure -- forget the above-mentioned words of Mao Tse-tung, or perhaps they believe that they apply only to their own country and not to others. It is just those same today, and they are angry to see that we refuse to take them.

In addition, it seems that the Chinese critics of Yugoslavia have also forgotten the following words from the well known declaration of their own government of 1 November 1956:

"Because of these mistakes in relations between socialist countries, some of these countries were unable to build socialism in a way which would best correspond to their own historical conditions and specific characteristics. In order to maintain the unity of ideology and aims of the struggle, it happens often that certain leaders of socialist countries violate the principle of equality between nations in their mutual relations. This error, by its nature, is an error of bourgeois chauvinism. Such a mistake, particularly the mistake which consists of the chauvinism of a great country, must inevitably lead to serious damage being caused to the solidarity and common cause of socialist countries."

Are not certain leaders of the present-day Chinese policy committing just that same "mistake" today?

They may not agree with us. They may even reject any responsibility for our moves and our policy, in other words they may decline to support that policy if they do not agree with us. They may criticize us. But there are two things which they must do if they want to continue to be Marxists and revolutionaries:

firstly, they must take into account the fact that Yugoslavia -- in spite of the existing differences -- is a socialist country, and secondly, they must study and analyse, with due seriousness, the substance of these differences. If they are not doing so then it is certainly not because there are any weak points in their knowledge of Marxism but because they expound different views about the relations between socialist countries. And this fact only confirms the correctness of our criticism of the Chinese theories of this kind.

We have seen that in keeping with these methods, Yugoslavia -- in view of the fact that she does not endorse the Chinese orientation toward the inevitability of war and the Chinese conception of the "socialist camp" -- has simply been proclaimed to be a non-socialist country. Which factors serve to determine the socialist character of a country, this is at least quite clear, and has been quite clear since Marx onwards. But, Chinese theoreticians have apparently discovered a more simple formula: the country which is not formally included in the organization which is called the socialist "camp", is a capitalist country. Thus, Yugoslavia has been automatically included among those countries against which one can do whatever one likes, in the name of "socialism" and "Marxism". As the Chinese agitators say: "We must fight against Yugoslav revisionism to the end." What does it mean, "to the end"? This cannot mean anything else but that even force may be used to deal with a socialist country which does not endorse Chinese views and demands. In this way, the Chinese theory about the just and unjust war becomes clarified "to the end."

Indeed, a wonderful logic which is worthy of "true Marxists". This logic means: a country is socialist if it endorses our views in every respect, and if it does not endorse them, it remains a capitalist country even if her social and economic relations are of a socialist character.

With this attitude, the policy of China has openly and brutally destroyed the unity of the socialist world. Instead of endeavoring to uphold those factors which unite the socialist countries on a basis of equality, that policy lays emphasis on the differences between them in order to impose upon them -- by means of criticizing them -- its own political monopoly. In the name of what? It is obviously not in the name of the socialism, because socialism is incompatible with hegemony.

Of course, it was not my intention to refer to the Chinese attitude toward Yugoslav socialism, only because we are

particularly anxious to gain anybody's "recognition" of our socialism. But, I believed it was necessary to lay particular emphasis on this point because it is symptomatic for Chinese conceptions about the relations between socialist countries. Everybody can see clearly where this unprincipled and pragmatistic "Marxism", which resembles the right of the stronger rather than any kind of ideology, can lead the relations between socialist countries, and to what degree it can deform them.

True, it can very easily happen that the Chinese theoreticians should remain without that same theory of theirs, under which they have included Yugoslavia in the capitalist camp. Namely, there is a strange contradiction which now becomes apparent. Yugoslavia, which is not a member of the socialist camp, supports the basic conceptions of the international policy of the camp, particularly the policy of coexistence and peace, while, on the other hand, China, which is a member of the camp, has criticized that same policy! What to say now about the Chinese conceptions of the camp and the validity of their arguments about the capitalist character of Yugoslavia?

This shows what difficulties "theoreticians" must encounter as a result of their pragmatistic habit to conceal a very clear policy by theories which are not at all clear.

Therefore, it is not only because of political consequences in capitalist countries, negative to the cause of socialism, and not only because of the danger of disastrous devastation which must inevitably result from a possible world war, but above all in the name of a sound development of socialism in the world and for the sake of the development of relations between the socialist countries themselves, it is indispensable to reject the pseudo-leftist criticism of the policy of coexistence, as well as the orientation toward the inevitability of war.

End