

22 JUNE 1957

RFE NEWS & INFORMATION SERVICE - EVALUATION & RESEARCH SECTION

Background Report  
(General Desk)

TITO AND THE JANUS FACE OF NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV

The respective first anniversaries of the signing in MOSCOW of the Joint Statement of the governments of Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, and of the Declaration on relations between the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and the Soviet Communist Party (20 June), provided the second occasion in little more than two weeks for the Soviet and Yugoslav newspapers to deal with the present status of these relations.

Just as on the occasion of the second anniversary of the BELGRADE Declaration on June 2 both the Soviet and Yugoslav press and radio were at pains to stress how bad it would be for the whole socialist world if only differences between two countries were given prominence rather than the points which link them.

In this connection "Borba" of June 20 says that in the course of last year "there were times when differences in view toward definite things, and particularly some differences of an ideological nature, had a negative effect on inter-State relations too..." "Borba" recalled its interview with Marshal TITO on December 31 in which the Yugoslav President emphasized that differences in views need not influence inter-State relations, and that discussions on ideological questions must not be an obstacle to the fruitful and all-round development of our mutual relations."

"Borba" adds that "the Yugoslav public has accepted with satisfaction a similar statement by Nikita KHRUSHCHEV on April 15 of this year to the effect that attention should not be turned mainly to differences in our views on this or that question, but to things that bring the peoples of our countries closer together in their struggle for socialism and the strengthening of peace..." In conclusion "Borba" repeats that "Yugoslavia... will do everything possible in the future, too, for a further all-round development.... Ideological differences must not be allowed to assume other significance than they really have."

In a similar vein but with even greater emphasis on the "points which bring the two countries closer to each other", "Pravda's" June 20 editorial stress that the MOSCOW documents "were important milestones along the road toward strengthening friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia...."

However, while "Borba" does not mention "proletarian internationalism" as one of the pre-requisites for "equal relations" between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, "Pravda" reiterates just this slogan. (The weekly organ of the Yugoslav Communist Party "Komunist" of June 21, in dealing with the first anniversary of the MOSCOW documents, says that they are bringing about the "consolidation of proletarian internationalism". This is for the first time that the slogan "proletarian internationalism" has been mentioned with a favorable implication in the discussion of Yugoslav-Russian relations. At the same time this is also the first time that the slogan "principles of coexistence" as a basis for the relations between socialist countries has not been mentioned by the Yugoslav side -- judging at least from the Tanjug English version.)

(What the article in "Komunist" especially stresses, however, in discussing the first anniversary of the MOSCOW Declaration is the fact that it "regulates relations among the parties of the working class on a bilateral basis...")

For its own part "Pravda" says that "difficulties referring mainly to the ideological sphere.... should not be passed over in silence... They should be overcome on the basis of loyalty to the great cause of Marxism-Leninism, in the spirit of the sound principle of proletarian internationalism..." "Pravda" adds:

"In order to improve Soviet-Yugoslav relations it is necessary not to emphasize the differences of view which still exist in certain points, but to intensify co-operation in those numerous spheres in which complete unity exist between our countries..."

#### The Other Side of the Coin

Judging from everything said and written by the Yugoslavs, there is a great desire on TITO's part to see much better relations established between the two opposing Communist trends in the nearest possible future. Undoubtedly MOSCOW too would be very happy if the quarrel with TITO ceased. The "only" defect of this mutual desire is the fact that neither side is willing to achieve "sincere friendship" by abandoning its own ideological positions which, as "Borba" put it, "had a negative effect on inter-State relations."

What we are now witnessing is an attempt to ignore precisely these ideological differences as if they had never existed. "Borba" says they "must not be allowed to assume any other significance than they really possess." This is a typical piece of double-talk, since it is the "real significance" of the ideological differences between TITO and MOSCOW which had



assumed such proportions that it cannot be simply ignored. It is obvious that the reason why TITO would like to see them discussed in public as little as possible is his desire to see inter-State relations improved, in other words to get the economic help he so badly needs.

When asked by Swedish journalists in a recent interview on the Island of BRIONI (the interview was published in the June 18 issue of the "Stockholm Tidnigen", the Socialdemocratic Party daily) to comment on "ideological differences" between him and the Soviet leaders, TITO replied:

"It is better not to discuss this question. They are certain ideological differences which we have agreed, with the Russians, not to discuss in a way which might inflame the debate anew. We wish that this discussion will not upset the relationship between the two countries..."

One of these differences is of course the revolution in Hungary. In this connection TITO told the Swedish journalists the following: "Our opinion about the events in Hungary is well known and I have nothing to add. We have not changed our opinion about the events (i.e. that it was not a "counter-revolution as the Russians have claimed but rather a "spontaneous people's revolution" -- Ed.) and will not do so in the future." (Although the latest UN report on Hungary coincides in many points with the official Yugoslav attitude toward the Hungarian Revolution, the Yugoslav Communist leaders would certainly have preferred not to be reminded just now of the anti-Soviet line they have committed themselves to on this topic, even if they justified the second Soviet intervention.

The fact that TITO has agreed with the Russians, as he put it, "not to discuss" ideological differences "in a way which might inflame the debate anew", places the Soviet leaders in a very favorable position. On the one hand they smile at TITO, KHRUSHCHEV makes statements welcomed by the Yugoslavs as "positive"; KHRUSHCHEV accompanied by BULGANIN, MIKOYAN, GROMYKO and ZHUKOV even appear at a reception given by the Yugoslav ambassador in MOSCOW, MICUNOVIC, on June 19 for General Ivan GOSNJAK, the Yugoslav Defense Secretary, and "Pravda" and "Izvestia" write conciliatory articles stressing "what links the two countries" rather than "what separates them".

On the other hand, can it be sheer coincidence that at the very time when prominence is given to these "conciliatory" moves made by KHRUSHCHEV and by some of the Soviet Party organs, bitter attacks are also made on the "revisionists" and "national Communism"?

The second anniversary of the BELGRADE Declaration on June 2 was accompanied by at least two anti-Yugoslav attacks. The

first one was made on May 30 over Radio MOSCOW by Ivan GRIGORIYEVICH-RYABTSEV who attacked "national Communism" as nothing "but opposing the mistaken national interests of a single country to the common international interests of all countries". RYABTSEV attacked -- by implication -- Yugoslav theoreticians for continually trying "to revive the decrepit opportunist ideas of the 'peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism'..." (The "theoretician" RYABTSEV is here really attacking is none other than Marshal TITO himself. In his interview with "Borba" of May 1 TITO had said that "Capitalism carries within itself the germ of new socialist relations". He said that "it was wrong" to view the problem of socialist progress "through old and petrified dogmas". "It is necessary to see life as it is today", TITO said. "It would be utterly non-dialectical to think that nothing has changed in the forms and manner of treating social problems.")

The day after "Pravda" (June 2) published its "conciliatory" article on Yugoslav-Soviet relations, an article by the editor-in-chief of "Rude Pravo", Vladimir KOUCKY, was published in "Pravda" attacking "national Communism". KOUCKY said that "national Communist" propaganda "seeks to set one Party at loggerheads with another, searches for 'different trends' which can be used in various countries in order to create all kinds of platforms, to cause vacillation and factional strife". In KOUCKY's opinion the most important task for Communists throughout the world is "to strengthen to the utmost the influence of socialist ideas on the masses, to combat more actively the nationalistic and revisionist tendencies with which reactionary propaganda tries to infect certain sections of the working people."

Thus, while nothing unfavorable to the USSR and its satellites can be read in the chief Yugoslav papers, we see that the other side is not so conscientious in fulfilling the unwritten "truce". Of course, it is much easier for KHRUSHCHEV to smile at TITO with one eye and with the other to wink at the satellites to continue their attacks against "revisionism" and "national Communism". (TITO is debarred from these tactics because he is completely alone.)

In accordance with these Janus tactics it is notable that the first anniversary of the MOSCOW documents, just like the second anniversary of the BELGRADE Declaration two weeks earlier has brought forth along with the "conciliatory" articles in "Pravda" and "Izvestia" some strong "anti-revisionist" attacks too. One was contributed by Boris NIKOLAYEVICH PONOMAREV, identified for the first time as Head of a Department of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the other by Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee Secretary, Jiri HENDRYCH. These articles were published in the Soviet and Czechoslovak press on June 18 and 19 respectively.



Attacks on "Modern Revisionists"

PONOMAREV made his speech in MOSCOW at a meeting commemorating the 75th anniversary of the birth of Georgi DIMITROV. He specially stressed a statement by DIMITROV saying that "sincere friendship with the Soviet Union is no less essential for the national independence and prosperity of Bulgaria than are the sun and air for every living creature." PONOMAREV also quoted DIMITROV as saying that "only by participating in a single, democratic, anti-militarist camp, headed by the mighty Soviet State, will every people's democracy be able to secure its independence, sovereignty, and security from aggression by the imperialist forces."

("Borba" of June 18 published an article on DIMITROV but without any pro-Yugoslav or any-Soviet implications regarding the late chief of the Comintern. In his book "Tito Speaks" DEDIJER quoted Milovan DJILAS as saying that DIMITROV, when passing through BELGRADE on his way to PRAGUE in 1948, had said to the Yugoslavs: "Be firm!" This pro-Titoist attitude by Georgi DIMITROV is not mentioned now.)

Later in his speech PONOMAREV said that "imperialist reaction is at present placing its hopes in the revisionist elements which have become more active lately within the ranks of certain Communist parties..." PONOMAREV attacked the "revisionists" for their teaching on the "class struggle" and "the dictatorship of the proletariat" (in Yugoslavia Edvard KARDELJ is the chief advocate of the "revisionist" teaching on these two issues.) The same is true of the role of the Communist Party (in Yugoslavia this role theoretically is of an "educational character" only) and with the revision of the principle of "democratic centralism" (in which the Yugoslavs detect Stalinism.)

PONOMAREV said that the revisionists "seek to oppose national interests to international ones". (In its issue of May 31 the Yugoslav Communist Party organ "Komunist" said in an article that "the most consistent socialist movement is the one which most successfully and resolutely builds socialism in its own country....")

Like Vladimir KOUCKY in his June 3 article in "Pravda", PONOMAREV said that "the struggle against... these and other signs of revisionism... is essential for the strengthening of Communist and workers' parties... Only in the closest alliance with the victorious proletariat of the great Soviet Union can the working class win..."

The statement by HENDRYCH published on June 19 was still sharper. He called "revisionism" the chief enemy of Czechoslovak Communist ideologists. HENDRYCH mentioned Yugoslav "errors" specifically and said that "unless" the struggle against revisionism was

completed, "it is not possible to wage an effective struggle against imperialism in its entire width."

Contrary to the Yugoslav Communist Party organ "Komunist" of June 21, HENDRYCH rejects as "completely unfounded" views that "bi-lateral" talks between the various Communist parties "are the only possible or even admissible form of international co-operation among the Communist parties." Rather, "conferences of a larger number of parties" would seem only natural. This is an indirect denial of both the BELGRADE Declaration (June 1955) and MOSCOW Declaration (June 1956). All this was published a day before "Pravda" published its "conciliatory" article on Yugoslav-Soviet relations.

### Conclusion

But these attacks are not the only ones. The June issue of "Molodoi Kommunist" (the Young Communist), monthly organ of the Soviet Youth Organization (Komsomol), published an article by S. TITARENKO under the title "'National Communism' -- A Reactionary Idea". In the article "revisionist and reformatory views" are sharply criticized and the names of the Yugoslav theoreticians Vlahko BEGOVIC and Djuka YULIUS are attacked by name because of their attitude toward the Hungarian revolution.

The article by Jurij GUSTINCIC published in "Politika" of 26 December 1956 (TITARENKO mistakenly says that this article was published in "Borba" of December 27) under the title "Principles for All" is also sharply attacked. As is known, in this article GUSTINCIC defended BIBROWSKI's idea of the "principle of coexistence" rather than "proletarian internationalism" as a basis for mutual relations between socialist countries. The Yugoslav Youth Organization's organ "Mladost" is also attacked by TITARENKO because of its article of January 9 in which the Yugoslav paper sharply criticized the East European Communist leaders for their unconditional acceptance of Soviet leadership. "Mladost" said that Yugoslav Communist youth, despite their "great respect" for the Komsomol, do not think that "the Komsomol must necessarily have a privileged position or that we must accept its experience as a 'holy bible', as it was and is being done today by someone else" "having in mind Bulgaria and Albania). "Mladost" rejected the Soviet interpretation of "proletarian internationalism" because "this conception does not allow any independence to socialist countries and parties."

Does this mean that the Yugoslav-Russian agreement "not to discuss" ideological differences "in a way which can inflame the debate anew", as TITO put it in his interview with the Swedish journalists, is obligatory only for the Yugoslav Marshal and not for KHRUSHCHEV? For how long can TITO maintain his silence and tolerance in view of the Janus face of Nikita KHRUSHCHEV?

S.S.

End