Munich, July 5 (Stankovic) — Tito’s obvious aim to avoid commitments to both East and West and his grandiose attempt to form and to lead the so-called “third international force” based on “non-alignment” (which he understands as something quite different from “neutrality”) was prominently brought to the forefront in his July 4 speech in Titovo Uzice (pronounce: Uzhitse), a major speech given in observance of the 20th anniversary of the Yugoslav Communist revolution.

Even though the Yugoslav leader was careful enough not to stress publicly his self-appointed role of a leader of the “non-aligned countries” of Asia and Africa, the way in which he presented world problems clearly indicated that he considers himself the main spokesman of the states whose chiefs will be meeting in Belgrade next September 1.

Said Tito: “The meeting is a logical consequence of the unsuccessful current attempts of the great powers to find solutions by themselves, outside the frame of reference of the United Nations and without the participation of small and uncommitted countries, to problems which threaten world peace.”

In Yugoslavia, which due to its limited resources must remain an economically dependent country, capable of playing such a big role in international politics? Must not she receive extensive economic help from somewhere if she is to survive?

Tito’s answer to the first question is positive; to the other negative. He claimed that in the past 15 years Yugoslavia had made huge progress “because we have relied on our own forces” rather than on foreign aid. He added: “Precisely the fact that in our development we have relied on our own forces and our own accumulation of economic resources, has enabled us to use foreign aid, to accept it without any strings attached, and to fit it into our own means and our own programs of development”. (Tito, however, did not say that between 1945 and 1961 Yugoslavia had received from Western countries — especially from the United States — a total of about 4.5 million dollars.)

West and East in Tito’s Eyes

This as the background against which one should observe Tito’s attitude both toward the West and the East. Although both blocs are criticized, there is still a difference in the emphasis
used while one or another type of criticism is made. While, for
instance, the Western world is almost solely taken to task for
the present troubles in the world as a whole, the Eastern camp
is criticized only for maintaining a negative attitude toward
Yugoslavia. It appears as if the Soviet policy of "peaceful co-
existence" could be accepted as sincere only if Yugoslavia would
be treated differently by the Soviet bloc, i.e. in a friendly
way. This being not the case the Yugoslavs (as now Tito) have
come to the conclusion that one cannot simultaneously propagate
peaceful coexistence and "smear" Yugoslavia "under the guise of
ideological struggle".

This linking of the Soviet bloc attitude toward Yugo-
slavia and with its (the Soviet bloc's) activities in international
politics is nothing new. When in the past Moscow was endangering
Tito's position, the Yugoslav leader claimed that the whole world
was endangered. When, however, he and Khrushchev reconciled in
1955, Tito changed his mind and came out with the claims that no-
body in the world had been endangered by the Soviet Union. But
still later, i.e. after the Hungarian revolution, the "everybody-
is-endangered" line was adopted again.

There are two important points in Tito's criticism of
the Western world: 1) his presenting West Germany as the "grave
danger" threatening the world peace; and 2) his claim that the
world division into two blocs has been a bad thing but that still
one cannot equalize them.

As to the attacks against West Germany it is interesting
to note that something paradoxical is taking place before our
eyes: While Tito is supporting almost completely Soviet foreign
policy, Moscow does not care too much to recognize it as a suf-
ficient proof of Tito's loyalty. True, it may help Koca Popovic
to a certain extent in the course of his visit to Moscow starting
July 7, but it is improbable that Titoist ideological conceptions
would be approved because of Tito's foreign political support.

Who Started First?

Point 2) is even more interesting because Tito, in his
attempts to appease Moscow, changed one of his important formula-
tions made at the 7th Party Congress in Ljubljana in April 1958.
Discussing who has been "the first" to start making trouble in
the world -- the Western world or the Soviet bloc -- Tito said
in his July 4 speech:

"The deviations from the principles of the Atlantic
Charter as well as from the principles of the UN
Charter, had first led to the creation of the Atlantic
Pact bloc (NATO) and then to the creation of the
Eastern bloc, i.e. of the Warsaw Pact... If we observe
historically how blocs were formed, since many have
claimed that the culprit is always the one who starts
first, then these two blocs could not be equated..."
However, in his opening speech at the Party Congress, held on 22 April 1958, Tito was of the opinion that it was not the West which started first! According to him it was Stalin who was the source of all international tensions. After having established the fact that Stalin’s policies achieved quite the opposite effect to what was intended, Tito said the following three years ago:

"Stalin’s policies put weapons into the hand of the other (Western) side... Because of Stalin’s rigid and unnecessarily threatening foreign policy, the big Western powers, realizing that they could not achieve their aims by diplomatic aims, took the attitude that they would be able to achieve these aims from the positions of strength. Here lies the chief reason for the creation of the Atlantic Pact... And the creation of the Atlantic Pact, and the inclusion of West Germany in it, had inevitably to lead to the creation of the Warsaw Pact of the Eastern countries as a counter-balance to the Atlantic Pact..."

As we now see Tito in his latest speech simply omitted Stalin (i.e. the Soviet Union) as the bearer of the "original sin" making the Western world the chief culprit for the creation of "military blocs", which again fits into Tito’s stubborn insistence that Soviet foreign policy has been correct.

**Attitude Toward Yugoslavia Criticized**

The Soviet bloc policy toward Yugoslavia found sharp echo in Tito’s July 4 speech. Carefully omitting the Soviet Union, Tito attacked "some leaders of the Eastern countries, like China and Albania, who have been waging the sharpest cold war against our country". "In some other Eastern countries", Tito added, "endeavors are being made in various ways, either internally and covertly, or openly, under the guise of ideological struggle, to harm Yugoslavia". Tito then continued:

"We have not cared too much whether they spread in their countries the untruths and misinformation about socialist development in Yugoslavia, or whether they keep silent about our foreign policy... For we do not have possibility to influence people in those countries to get the truth about Yugoslavia. However, we are very interested in making impossible the spreading of misinformation and various smearings about us in other friendly countries. We want to unmask such activities against our country and for this purpose we have many opportunities. The protagonists of this cold war policy against our country have very often spoken about peaceful coexistence, about possibilities of good inter-state relations with Yugoslavia and about economic cooperation. However, behind the scene they are working against our country whenever possible, because they dislike the position and prestige enjoyed in the world by Yugoslavia... When we from time to time defend ourselves against such anti-Yugoslav attacks, they are angered and..."
again pervert facts... It seems as if they believe that we should not become nervous, that we should not answer their attacks, because such answers, in their opinion, benefit the capitalists... We would like to ask them: how often these attacks would repeat? We would like seeing them stopped in our mutual interest..."

In conclusion Tito claimed that these anti-Yugoslav attacks have harmed the general struggle for peace. "This is the way they are being interpreted in the whole world", Tito said.
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