

1957

F136

WRT-

KHRUSHCHEV LETS TITO DOWN

News Background

MUNICH, July 12 -- (STANKOVIC) -- The anti-Titoist side of KHRUSHCHEV's Janus face was amply displayed during the "family talk" at the "Stalingrad" metal works in PRAGUE on July 11.

In his off-the-cuff speech the Soviet leader mentioned, directly or by clear implication, at least seven major ideological differences between him and TITO. His words have once again confirmed that "trench warfare" between Yugoslavia and the Soviet bloc is continuing. Contrary to the old (1948-1953) Stalinist tactics employing direct and repeated assaults against TITO's Yugoslavia, in the post-Stalin period the conflicting sides have become ideologically entrenched, only occasionally breaking out with the warcry: "Don't attack me and I will not attack you!" The most they have been able to achieve in this way is an uneasy truce.

Following are the differences between TITO and the Soviet bloc dealt with by KHRUSHCHEV in his PRAGUE speech yesterday:

1. "Camp" policy. Speaking at a gala reception at the HRADCANY on July 11 KHRUSHCHEV mentioned "the strengthening of friendly relations within the socialist camp" and then added: "I mean also Yugoslavia when I say 'socialist camp'. I know the Yugoslav comrades do not like the word 'camp'. They prefer 'commonwealth'. But Yugoslavia is a socialist State". KHRUSHCHEV then said by implication that there was only one socialism and that Yugoslavia subscribed to it.

Maintaining their "between-the-blocs" policy, Yugoslav Communist leaders have been very strong critics of the "camp" policy both as attributed to the West and to the East. They have been using every opportunity to stress their non-adherence to either bloc. What they have preached is an "active coexistence" between all countries on the basis of equality and non-interference in domestic affairs of each other. In this connection KHRUSHCHEV's reference to the principle of --

2. proletarian internationalism, in the name of which the Soviet armed forces had crushed "counter-revolution" in Hungary, will not have met TITO's approval. In the opinion of the Yugoslav Communists, "proletarian internationalism" is only a smoke-screen for the Soviet Union to control other socialist countries.

3. Hungarian events. KHRUSHCHEV repeated the old Soviet thesis

F137  
DOWN

CURT ① K. LETS TITO

that what happened in Hungary was a "counter-revolution". He added that while "absolute unity" prevailed within the Communist world as to the "counter-revolutionary" character of the Hungarian uprising, "Yugoslavia remained isolated" finding herself in the "bad company" of EISENHOWER, DULLES, Guy MOLLET "and so forth".

Although approving the Soviets' second intervention in Hungary and their support for Janos KADAR, TITO has maintained stubbornly that the Hungarian events were a spontaneous people's revolution. In his interview with the Swedish journalists (published in the June 18 issue of the social-democratic organ "Stockholm Tidningen") TITO said: "We have not changed our opinion about the (Hungarian) events and will not do so in the future".

4. Dictatorship of the proletariat. KHRUSHCHEV said that "it is only the enemies of socialism who can declare the teaching of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin on the dictatorship of the proletariat 'outdated'".

One of these "enemies of socialism", in fact their most prominent spokesman, is Yugoslavia's Vice-president Edvard KARDELJ who at the moment is "holidaying" in the Crimea and awaiting the return of Nikita KHRUSHCHEV from Czechoslovakia to discuss the differences between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. KARDELJ, as well as all other Yugoslav theoreticians (PEROVIC, for instance), have claimed that what Lenin had written 30 or even 60 years ago cannot be applicable to the present situation.

In his talk with Luigi LONGO, TOGLIATTI's deputy, published in the December 14 issue of "Borba", KARDELJ said that "there is no need to keep on waving the red flag of the dictatorship of the proletariat at a time when socialist authority is actually being established with more and more working people participating in a democratic fashion, and when we are all aware that the term 'the dictatorship of the proletariat' does not cover every situation...."

5. Capitalism must perish. In KHRUSHCHEV's "idiots" who do not realize that "capitalism must perish and be replaced by Communism", the Yugoslav Communists may well see their own picture. Not because they believe in the survival of capitalism but rather -- in the line with the principle of "not waving the red flag the whole time" -- because of their claim that, first, "State capitalism (as prevailing in the Soviet Union -- Ed.) is no road to socialism at all" (RATKOVIC) and, second, that (as TITO put it in his May 1 interview with "Borba", quoting Marx) "capitalism carries within itself the germ of new socialist relations". Contrary to KHRUSHCHEV's direful forecast for the future of capitalism the Yugoslavs have in effect accepted the Bukharinite theory of the "peaceful growing of capitalism into socialism. In this connection TITO has also reverted to the old Yugoslav claim that "Stalin's thesis about an ever-sharpening class struggle.....was unmasked as anti-Leninist". From this thesis the Yugoslav Communists have proceeded to maintain



F138

X  
TO CRT ② K. LETS TITO DOWN

that co-operation with any country in the world, especially the acceptance of aid from capitalist countries, was correct and desirable. We now find KHRUSHCHEV scolding the Yugoslavs for "being helped by the American bourgeoisie".

It can very well be that KHRUSHCHEV's reference to "idiots" who do not believe that "capitalism must perish" even though this was "scientifically proved" by Marx -- is aimed specifically at TITO. For, in his June 30 interview with the American CBS television system TITO contradicted KHRUSHCHEV's TV prophecy made several weeks previously that grand-children of present-day Americans will live under Communism. TITO said that he "could not apodictically maintain" KHRUSHCHEV's thesis since "this is a much longer process". He added: "If this were not so, we should be looking at the development of society purely metaphysically and not dialectically...." KHRUSHCHEV seems to have been taking this point up when he referred yesterday to those who refused to believe what "Marx had proved scientifically". In calling such incredulity a "regrettable phenomenon" he was clearly thinking about erring Marxists rather than lost capitalists.

6. Different roads to socialism. KHRUSHCHEV said "we acknowledge different roads, comrades, but among the different roads, there is one general road, and the others are, as you know, like a big river with tributaries.... There is one road of Marxism-Leninism. This is the road on which the task of the construction of Communist society must be tackled..."

TITO's stand on this question is widely known. He is for different roads to socialism without any "one general road", i.e. "without any one having a leading role and without giving priority to the interests of any single country, regardless of which country it is" -- as Osman KARABEGOVIĆ said in his May 1 attack on MOLOTOV in SARAJEVO.

7. Workers' councils. KHRUSHCHEV's assertion that "the Yugoslav comrades have invented workers' councils" and his advice they should not think "this is the cleverest thing of all" -- will probably meet with the strongest Yugoslav rebuttal. The system of workers' self-management is TITO's greatest pride. In his June 25 speech at the opening session of the First Workers' Councils Congress in BELGRADE, TITO said that the workers' councils system was one "of the greatest, indeed it may be said one of the historic acts in the development of Yugoslavia's social order...." TITO attacked various "dogmatists" who "deny the value of our system of workers' self-management, calling it anarchism and the like". TITO added:

"Of course, we do not intend -- as we are often accused of doing -- to compel anybody to accept our system; but we are forced to defend it against all those who are blind and deaf of the facts in front of them, those who do not want to see reality as it is in our country...."

CURT (3) K. LETS TITO DOWN F139

It has been largely assumed that TITO's attack was aimed only at MOLOTOV's "dogmatic" group rather than against KHRUSHCHEV who continues to proclaim himself a "friend" of the Yugoslav Communists. But on the six important ideological issues listed above, KHRUSHCHEV's first public pronouncements were certainly more friendly in tone, but no less firm in principle, than the familiar accusations of the MOLOTOV faction.

It will thus be difficult for TITO to refute the assertions made by Vladimir DEDIJER in his STOCKHOLM lecture of May 6 when he said that there was no fundamental ideological difference between the Stalinist and anti-Stalinist leaders in the Kremlin.

End

2218