

Communist Workers' Movement

NC Minutes 4th November 1978

Internal Bulletin No.5: Item 4. Yugoslavia

Issued: January 1979

4. Yugoslavia. The following resolution was proposed by the Liverpool branch for discussion in the organization and adoption by the NC.

"The NC of the CWM notes with concern the People's Republic of China's recent change of policy towards Yugoslavia. The NC holds that Yugoslavia is not a socialist country; the means of production, distribution and exchange are not under the ownership and control of the working people, the Yugoslav state system is not the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia is not a Marxist-Leninist organization.

The NC notes that these views, expressed by the Chinese comrades themselves in their publication "Is Yugoslavia a Socialist Country?" (1963), have been dropped, and the CPC now recognizes the LYC as a fraternal party and Yugoslavia as a socialist country, and that this reversal of policy has taken place without criticism and self-criticism.

The NC stresses that this difference with the CPC does not in any way limit the support of the CWM for the Three Worlds Theory and for the development of an international united front against the super-powers. Members are called upon to study this question and use the internal bulletin for an exchange of views."

Most NC members were critical of this resolution, although agreeing with much of its contents. The Nat. Sec. reported criticisms made by a South London branch member, and indicated his agreement with the points made, which were:- 1) The resolution has not been proposed after serious investigation; 2) It is raising a secondary issue at a time when People's China is under unprecedented attack by Vietnamese and Albanian revisionists; 3) It shows a total lack of understanding of democratic centralism-the NC is supposed to decide the line of the organization, and then the organization is meant to discuss it!

M.M. replied that it was not intended to adopt the resolution then-it had been badly phrased. It was hoped that the resolution would get discussion going. He said that he thought the Chinese document of '63 on Yugoslavia was correct; the Chinese Communist Party long held to the position put in the document, yet now it regards Yugoslavia as a socialist country. This analysis is wrong-if the original stand of the CPC had been incorrect, why hadn't the Chinese party made a self-criticism? What justification is there for this change. M.M. said that we should re-affirm our stand on the question of Yugoslavia; Chinese policy on this question is opportunist. It is right to build the international united front, but wrong to treat Yugo-

slavia as a socialist country.

RB largely agreed.

We are against phoney "workers' participation" in Britain, and this is the system which exists in Yugoslavia. However, the Chinese stand on Yugoslavia in the early '60's was influenced by important tactical considerations. The CPC was seeking to avoid a split in the world communist movement, and at first tried to criticize Soviet modern revisionism indirectly; it therefore gave a lot of attention to criticizing Yugoslav revisionism in order to make its point effectively. Perhaps, because of these conditions, some of the CPC's criticisms of Yugoslavia were exaggerated.

Some compromises are necessary in diplomacy-it's hard to be friendly with a "socialist" country without having party to party relations. China has good relations with Romania, which is hardly a model of socialism. Just because China adopts a certain stand, it does not mean we have to. The Chinese comrades have, in fact, made some criticisms of their own position on Yugoslavia in earlier times to several recent delegations, including one from SACU. They expressed reservations about their own stand and that of the COMINFORM (Communist Information Bureau) in 1948, when the first attacks on Yugoslav revisionism were made; the Yugoslav CP was pushed into a corner and given no way out. In the late 1950's, Yugoslavia was playing an extremely reactionary role, playing up divisions in the socialist camp, and serving western imperialist powers, RB said. Now it is playing a much better role; there is a contradiction between Yugoslavia's progressive international role, in the Non-Aligned Movement in particular, and its reactionary internal policies. The Chinese (in "Peking Review") have produced some arguments and statistics to support the view that Yugoslavia is socialist, but these don't stand up to examination—for example, they point to the growth in "publicly owned" land to suggest Yugoslavia is socialist, when we know very well that "public ownership" does not equal socialism from our very own nationalized industries. One cause for concern is how the Yugoslav model is being pointed to by some in China as an example to follow. This is being done in internal struggles in the CPC, and Yugoslav methods of factory management ("workers' self-management") have come under fairly close scrutiny; some certainly favour the development of such a system in China.

M.F. agreed with most of what had already been said, but he pointed out that at the time when the CPC produced "Is Yugoslavia a Socialist Country?" it had already openly attacked Soviet modern revisionism. Hence, it could not be argued that that article was an indirect attack on the Soviet line—it certainly did represent the standpoint of the CPC at that time.

The Nat. Sec. agreed with M.F.'s point. On this issue, the CPC had changed its stand for the worse. The clear distinction between Party-to-Party and state-to-state ^{relations} should have been preserved. It was very good to encourage Yugoslavia to take a firm stand against Soviet social-imperialism and Marxist-Leninists should support the Yugoslav state when it takes a good position, but we must not encourage any illusions about "Yugoslav socialism." We must continue to oppose Yugoslav revisionism, particularly nonsense about "workers' self management!" Many British people who've been to Yugoslavia on holiday or who know something about it would certainly think "If this is socialism, we don't want it." Poverty is widespread there; there is such a high level of unemployment that about 1 million Yugoslavs have had to seek work in the West, mainly in West Germany; pornography is openly sold, and there is widespread prostitution: these are not features of a genuine socialist society. However, the Nat. Sec. said that there are important tactical considerations to be taken into account in dealing with this question. At the present time, the "leftist" opponents of the Three Worlds Theory and People's China present a more serious threat to the international communist movement than right opportunists do. We mustn't blow up the Yugoslav question out of proportion, but should simply raise it, when appropriate, within the general context of supporting the Three Worlds Theory.

The Nat. Chairman said we should look at the state of affairs in other revisionist countries, and try to define more precisely what socialism is. Perhaps when the Chinese made their criticisms of Yugoslavia in the early '60's, they hadn't made proper investigations of other revisionist countries. We should do some articles on workers' control.

M.M. said that these discussions must be continued soon. The situation is urgent, and we shouldn't just keep quiet about Yugoslavia.

The Nat. Sec. proposed that branches be urged to discuss the resolution from Liverpool and that the discussions in the organization be kicked off by the circulation of fairly full minutes of the discussion that took place in the NC.

The NC agreed.