

~~SECRET~~  
I KROD -- (1) RUSSOY-SERBIAN RELATIONS

F-449

supported Soviet foreign policy and sharply criticized "all colonial powers", one cannot but conclude that the real reason for his wish to speak as the first speaker was not the one he quoted. Later information confirmed that Tito actually wanted to speak before Nikita Khrushchev had taken the floor in order to avoid the impression that he -- like all the Soviet satellites did -- followed the Soviet order. In this way Tito obviously wanted to kill two birds with one stroke: a) to demonstrate in front of the Western world his independence from Moscow and b) to demonstrate in front of the Eastern Communist world the similarity of his foreign political views to that of Moscow.

Tito's speech at the UN was positively evaluated by the Soviet papers and radios while the Chinese took quite an opposite attitude, claiming that the Yugoslav leader "tried to sell his false revisionist arguments of 'peaceful co-existence' and 'overall international cooperation'... parroting the tune of US imperialism..." All other Soviet Bloc countries, with the exception of Albania, commented positively on Tito's speech. In the General Assembly itself, Khrushchev applauded Marshal Tito's entrance while the Yugoslavian delegation, sitting in the front row, immediately below the rostrum, did not join in the applause!

Next day, on September 23, Khrushchev spoke, contributing largely to the worsening of the situation in the United Nations. Several days later, on September 29, Tito had a 100-minute meeting with Khrushchev. The Soviet leader stated after the meeting that he had not come to any agreement with Tito but he added: "Our viewpoints are very close on all questions". It was amusing to listen to Khrushchev's explanation that "we did not discuss any ideological points because that is a question between Parties and I am the Chairman of the Council of Ministers and he is the President of Yugoslavia". In any way their talks according to the communiqué, "were held in a friendly atmosphere".

After the United Nations

Moscow and its satellites, with the exception of China and Albania, have tried to retain "this friendly atmosphere" in their relations with Belgrade even after the UN sessions ended. True, "Pravda" of October 14 blamed the "newborn" nations and Yugoslavia as well as the United States and "other imperialist powers" for the fact that disarmament had not been discussed at a plenary session of the UN General Assembly, but went to the Political Committee. "Pravda" adds: "This is the fault, in particular, of such a nation as Yugoslavia which has not come out for a plenary session debate on general and complete disarmament".

However, if "Pravda's" criticism of the Yugoslav attitude in the United Nations is compared with the stand taken by the Chinese and Albanian Communists, one must admit that the Soviet criticism could not be taken too seriously. In spite of this, the Yugoslavs did not find it necessary to polemize with the Chinese

and the Albanians, but published an answer to "Pravda". "Narba" of October 23 accused "Pravda" and Radio Moscow of having "distorted the picture" and then continued:

"Why all this? Why did 'Pravda' and other Soviet papers not inform their readers about the real attitude of Yugoslavia toward the disarmament problems as well as toward all other problems so profoundly outlined by President Tito in his speech before the General Assembly..."

Ten days before "Narba's" counter-attack, another Belgrade daily, "Politika" of October 14, ridiculed Khrushchev's behaviour in the United Nations. Said "Politika": "But this was almost the most unfortunate irony of this oratorical duel between the East and the East, which resulted in upsets and scenes the likes of which had never before been seen. Never before had it happened that any of the delegates had taken off his shoe and wore it about as did Nikita Khrushchev, expressing his dissatisfaction with the speech of the Philippine delegate..."

#### Yugoslavia Suspicious

The Yugoslav leaders could not complain too much about the anti-Yugoslav attitude of the Soviet bloc countries with the exception of China and Albania (their ambassador in Budapest, Hiron, was even allowed to speak over radio Budapest about "Yugoslavia's special road to socialism") -- and they retained their cautious attitude. Moreover, on October 3, Lazar Koliševski, leader of the Macedonian People's Republic in Yugoslavia, attacked Bulgaria's policy towards the Yugoslav minority.

The fact that the Yugoslav papers have been very reluctant to publish any "positive" echo in the Soviet bloc countries toward Yugoslavia can be explained only by the Yugoslav fear that Khrushchev and his followers in the satellite countries have certain afterthoughts and that their friendliness is aimed at something quite different. The article published in the Czechoslovak periodical "Pravda" of September 22 as an answer to Kardelj's book on "War and Socialism" is only one of the evidences taken by the Yugoslavs as a reason for their cautious attitude.

On the other hand, "Izvestia" of November 28 published an article which at the first glance sounds very friendly to Yugoslavia. However, its insistence that "peoples of Yugoslavia no longer doubted that the fraternal Soviet people would come to their assistance and they were not disillusioned in their hopes" demonstrates that the Soviet leaders have maintained a long-term policy toward Yugoslavia. Similar to the Yugoslav leaders themselves who are considering the present days as a period in which the problem of Tito's succession is to be solved, the Soviet leaders too are obviously doing their utmost not to do anything which would spoil the chances of any pro-Moscow elements in Yugoslavia after Tito's disappearance from the political scene.

The Chinese and Albanian attacks cannot contribute any-

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~  
1 Also -- (S) Moscow-Pravda Relations

thing to Yugoslavia eventually joining the "Communist family". On the contrary, the anti-Moscow people in Yugoslavia (a huge majority) are becoming even stronger and the new Constitution would certainly enable them to deviate still more from the Soviet views. For the Yugoslavs seem to be aware of the fact that even though the Soviet-Chinese disagreements exist -- Moscow and Peking are not in conflict over "Titoism" as a separate trend within the Communist world. Both Moscow and Peking dissent from "Titoism" with Moscow also stressing the danger of "dogmatism and sectarianism". However, with the new Constitution, which according to Tito will be even more liberal than the present one, the Moscow attitude toward Belgrade cannot but become tougher -- Yugoslavia may become a very dangerous example.

F-51

21 50 MB

End