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Introduction

Comment on the Belgrade Conference in several Communist countries has shown a marked difference of emphasis and attitude in each case. Poland's position has been the most openly favorable, as is shown in Trybuna Ludu (26 August 1961) and Zycie Warszawy (27 August 1961). These papers expect:

"that the conference will offer a constructive stand towards the most important international problems..."

and take up the colonial problem as the primary item on the agenda. Polish newspapers relegate the German question to second place, which probably accords with the attitude of the neutralist countries themselves but makes an interesting contrast with the Soviet position as set out in Pravda (30 August 1961).

Until yesterday the Kremlin had done its best to soft-pedal the Belgrade conference, but now Pravda shows that in the Soviet view Belgrade will only be "important to the consolidation of peace" if it takes up the German and Berlin problems in a manner favorable to the USSR. Pravda makes the colonial question a secondary issue to Berlin, and thereby seems likely to run counter to neutralist opinion.

China too has made efforts to gloss over the Belgrade meeting, the first official reference to which was made by Marshal Chen Yi, the Foreign Minister, on August 17th. The occasion was Indonesian National Day, and Chen Yi hoped:
"the conference will make contributions to the cause of all countries in winning national independence, opposing imperialist aggression and intervention, opposing old and new colonialists and defending world peace...It is therefore necessary to guard against the imperialist scheme of sabotaging the conference by diverting its struggle to other objectives." (Reuter, Peking, August 17).

The Chinese attitude therefore seems slightly more positive than that of the USSR, since China's optimism is unconditional and China believes that the main emphasis should be on anti-colonialism. Incidentally the only major attempt to divert the conference to other objectives yet made has been the USSR's effort to bring it to focus on Berlin.

Lastly there is the Albanian position (Zeri i Popullit, 13 August 1961). As was to be expected, this has been by far the most negative, but Tirana has been careful to concentrate its attacks on the Tito regime, rather than on the conference itself. Tirana argues that Yugoslavia is not a neutral country but a stooge of the imperialists, and that therefore "attempts to form a third bloc", which (unlike Pravda) it treats as real and serious, are dangerous for the national liberation movement. In fact Tirana implies that true neutralists have come to Belgrade under the delusion that Tito is one of them, a gambit which appears to belittle the intelligence of the underdeveloped countries.

Thus the attitudes of the four countries would all seem to be significantly different - an interesting indication of polycentrism in practice and of the divisive effect which the unsolved Yugoslav conundrum continues to have on the communist world as a whole.

R.F.G.
Pravda
30 August 1961

Belgrade, 29 August 1961 by Pravda special correspondents V. Mayevsky, B. Tarasov.

Preparations are ending here for the beginning of the conference of heads of states and governments of the neutralist countries which begins on the first September. In recent days the city has been decorated with the state flags of the countries participating, with slogans and placards calling for a struggle for peace and against colonialism.

Statesmen of 24 countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America which are following a policy of peaceful coexistence and of solving international problems by negotiation will take part in the conference. At the present time participants in the conference and also many representatives of the press, radio and television of many countries are arriving in Belgrade.

In the press center which is not far from the people's Skupshchina building, where the session will be held, there is animation. Correspondents from various countries are exchanging news, studying the preliminary agenda of the conference and discussing its prospects. The agenda published in the papers includes such questions as a general exchange of opinions on international affairs, on the strengthening of the peace and security of the peoples, on the struggle against imperialism and for the victory over colonialism on general and complete disarmament, on foreign military bases on alien territory, on the existence side by side of states with different social and political systems, on the role and structure of the UN, on the development of economic cooperation between countries.

Journalists are suggesting that if the conference in Belgrade is in reality called upon to play an important role in consolidating international peace, it should examine the problem of the present tense atmosphere in Europe, in connection with the intrigue of the imperialist forces in W. Berlin and should advocate the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the settlement on this basis of the status of W. Berlin. It is also thought here that participants in the conference are drafting the necessary measures to implement as quickly as possible the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples which was adopted last year by the overwhelming majority of the UN General Assembly and which the imperialist powers conducting bloody wars against the peoples of Algeria, Angola and other countries do not wish to carry out.

Some Western journalists express the opinion that there are certain forces which advocate the formation of some kind of "third bloc" of neutralist countries at the conference but others think that this is unrealistic.
Soviet citizens' indubitably will follow with interest the trend of the conference and hope that it will bring positive results. As the recently signed Soviet-Ghana communiqué states "The Soviet Government expresses the hope that this conference will make its contribution to the consolidation of peace, the solution of the problem of disarmament and to the liquidation of colonialism."
Unsigned: BEFORE THE BELGRADE CONFERENCE

Preparations are nearing their end in the capital of Yugoslavia for a conference of uncommitted nations which will open on September 1. The conference was called on the initiative of Indonesia, Yugoslavia and the United Arab Republic. The majority of participating states will be represented by chiefs of government. Several countries are to send observers to Belgrade. Also several political organizations and parties have announced their sending an observer to Belgrade, including the Japanese socialist party.

The conference will bring together outstanding statesmen and national leaders representing nearly 30 African, Asian and Latin-American states, with over 800 million inhabitants. It will be a conference of countries which do not belong to any politico-military group and which support the principles of peaceful coexistence and a struggle against colonialism and imperialism.

Many participants in the conference have already contributed greatly to the struggle for world peace. It can be expected, therefore, that the conference will offer the possibility for a constructive stand in the face of most essential international problems which have been awaiting solution for years.

It appears from unofficial information that the agenda of the conference will include, above all, a vital problem of a final and speedy liquidation of the remnants of open and hidden colonialism and the problem of struggle against all forms of neo-colonialism. We know all too well the glaring practices of colonialist powers which refuse to bow to the historic resolution of the last session of the General Assembly of the UN, calling for a speedy liquidation of the remaining shameful system of exploitation and subjugation of dependent nations.

The conference will also not be able to by-pass other, more general problems concerning world peace, general and complete disarmament, nuclear disarmament, peaceful coexistence in international relations, streamlining of UN activities and the causes of the present tensions in Europe.

Uncommitted countries, similarly to socialist countries, are vitally interested in the peaceful solution of controversial problems, in the improvement of international situation and in strengthening of peace. For only under peaceful conditions can the nations develop and improve their living conditions. Only under peaceful conditions can those nations which have only recently freed themselves from the colonialist yoke, or a neo-colonial one, strengthen their independence and wage a successful struggle against economic underdevelopment. The improvement of international situation, settling of controversial problems and especially general and complete disarmament can liberate material means so necessary to their rapid economic development.
It is understandable, therefore, why uncommitted nations should also be concerned with the most rapid settlement of European problems remaining since the Second World War.

The fact that the conference is opening on the memorable day of September 1 and that it will take place in a country which lived through the horror of a Nazi occupation will certainly direct the thoughts of the uncommitted nations toward the remnants of the last war, the dangers arising from the rebuilding and developing of militarist forces of West Germany. The sufferings which were dealt to the nations of Europe, including Yugoslavia, by the German militarism point to the immediate need of liquidating those remnants, so that the catastrophe may not be repeated to an incomparably more horrible extent.

Those and other problems which will undoubtedly appear on the agenda will be discussed by outstanding statesmen who have visited European countries, including the socialist ones, and who have learned of the conditions which must be established if peace in Europe is to be strengthened.

A great Asian leader, Prime-Minister Jawaharlal Nehru who spoke in the Indian parliament a few days ago, affirming in such a forceful manner the inviolability of our Western frontier and pointing out that in regulating the German problem one must take into consideration the real situation, i.e. the existence of two German states -- will take part in the conference. Also participating will be the President of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah, who was recently a guest of our country and who -- in a joint Polish-Ghanian statement -- proclaimed the need for a stabilization of the European situation and showed full understanding of our attitude toward the German problem.

There will also take part in the debates the Tunisian delegation whose foreign minister, S. Mokkadem -- as emphasized by a joint communiqué of the talks in Warsaw -- was "happy to state how greatly Tunisia appreciates the tireless efforts of Poland toward a peaceful solution of European problems which constitute a part of world peace."

The constructive efforts and attempts of the states participating in the Belgrade conference are watched with attention and sympathy by all peace-loving nations. Those states can play an important part in the struggle for peace. The resolutions of the Belgrade conference can seriously influence the solution of international problems which lie at the basis of the present tension. The public opinion of our country awaits this and for that reason the Belgrade debates will be followed with greatest interest.
YUGOSLAVIA NOT SOCIALIST OR NEUTRAL

Tirana ATA in French to Europe 0900 GMT 13 August 1961—L

(ZERI I POPULIT article: "Neutral Yugoslavia")

There was a time when Tito shouted in his speeches at the top of his voice that Yugoslavia was "socialist". This continued until the moment that wretched program, otherwise called "the code of modern revisionism", was published. This does not mean that in the past Tito's "socialist Yugoslavia" was really socialist, just as it does not mean that when speaking today about "neutral Yugoslavia" Tito no longer means "socialist Yugoslavia." He talks about both, although one is opposed to the other. But apparently he needs these two masks to cover up the truth—that today Yugoslavia is neither socialist nor neutral.

It is nothing new to the Yugoslav revisionists to play with masks. We are faced with their old demagoguery. However, while the purely demagogical aspect lies in the noise about "neutral Yugoslavia", one also cannot fail to see another aspect. After the Moscow meeting of November 1960, when the Tito gang was pilloried for betrayal to Marxism-Leninism, it found it increasingly difficult to hide behind the mask of "socialism". It became aware of this fact, and so did its patrons, the imperialists. Therefore it had to take recourse also to the mask of "neutrality". Besides, the imperialists, afraid of the growing anti-colonial and anti-imperialist movement of national liberation, planned to use Tito's clique for another purpose as well, to undermine this movement, to divide the countries which had just gained independence, to reduce the growing sympathy in these countries to the socialist states while harnessing them to their chariot. This was "neutrality" on order...

Another fact: the preparatory meeting of the nonaligned countries conference, which took place in Cairo in June, after establishing conditions for participation in this conference, notably included this condition: "There should be no associations in collective military alliances". If we take a closer look at things, we must admit that Yugoslavia does not meet this condition. It is a member of the Balkan Pact, which is a military alliance and an appendage of the aggressive NATO pact. Through Turkey it is also linked to the aggressive CENTO pact. Through Greece it received armaments within the framework of NATO. In cooperation with Athens it creates plans and plots against the socialist countries in the Balkans...

We must recall that Tito's Yugoslavia does not fulfill either of the conditions required for the Cairo meeting of the nonaligned countries. "The policy of the country must be independent" is what one of the conditions stipulates. But can one honestly speak of an independent policy of contemporary Yugoslavia? The facts speak for themselves. "It must support the movements for national liberation" is what another condition stipulates. Referring once again to the facts and not to words, the Yugoslav revisionists are not supporting but, on the contrary,
are torpedoing these movements. This is the truth. But apparently this does not stop them from raising a hullabaloo around "Yugoslav neutrality". One can easily understand the reason. At the present moment there are in the world truly neutral countries pursuing independent policies and unassociated with any military alliances. These countries represent a major force in the anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggle being waged by the oppressed peoples and by those who have just gained independence in Asia, Africa, and Latin-America. They are also a major force in the struggle for peace against the danger of another war, a struggle being waged by the people of the world. The socialist countries are the supporters and best friends of these people, while the imperialists are their worst enemies. Is there anything in common between the Yugoslav revisionists and the really independent countries? Nothing whatsoever. But the fact that the revisionists are trying to put Yugoslavia on the side of these countries — this is another cup of tea. The yelling about a "neutral Yugoslavia" does not change real facts. The really neutral countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin-America are one thing and Yugoslavia, a member of the Balkan Pact and linked with NATO, is another. They say that the honking of geese saved Rome, but the Yugoslav revisionists' yelling about their "neutrality" is not going to save Belgrade.

As a matter of fact, the question is simply this: "Because nobody recognizes Yugoslavia as a socialist country, it should be at least recognized as a neutral country" — and the wrong will be halved. But no, with theories about "bloos" and "nonalignment" the Yugoslav revisionists are trying to create a "third bloc" in which a "notable part" will be played by Yugoslavia. As one can see, this is a particularly dangerous game to the detriment of the movement of national liberation, the movement of the oppressed anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist countries, and of those who have just gained independence, to the detriment also of the forces of peace and socialism and therefore to the benefit of imperialism.

But what can one expect from those who have sold themselves to the imperialists? All this is clear to us. And this begins to be clear to many others. The day is not too far distant when the cat will be out of the bag. It cannot be otherwise. It is possible that at the September conference the Yugoslav revisionists will try their utmost not to say anything concrete about imperialism, or they will, at the most, say a few things about colonialism. One must admit that the Belgrade revisionists have assumed a difficult task — to talk about colonialism and not say who the colonialists are, or else to keep silent about imperialism — all this means supporting the colonialists, supporting the imperialists in general and the American imperialists in particular. Tito and company are very much mistaken when they think others are blind. But there is nothing else to do, this is the boss' watchword.

However, those who have suffered because of it and who know quite well who the imperialists are, who know
as the traitors of Belgrade think they are. They cannot forget the colonialists' oppression and exploitation. They cannot forget the imperialists and particularly the American imperialist, that ruthless enemy of freedom. They cannot keep silent, even if that will please Tito. Algeria is fighting, Cuba too, and so are the others, fighting against the American, British, French, and other colonialists. And they will continue this struggle everywhere, even if it displeases Tito and his confederates. Briefly, the subjective desires of Tito and his gang are one thing and objective reality another. There is no doubt that the Yugoslav revisionists will fail in these fresh maneuvers as they have failed so far. Demagogy is one of their weapons, but it cannot replace objective truth.

As for the "notable role" to be played by Yugoslavia with regard to neutral countries about which Tito himself spoke a few days ago, we must remember that this is one of their old manias. They want to add to the "notable roles" played once in the struggle against fascism and later on in the international Communist movement, another one, in present international circumstances, "meant to give weight to the neutral countries in the settlement of world problems".

The truth differs. If one speaks of "notable roles" played by the Yugoslav revisionists, one must say that they have always played those of a renegade of socialism and a flunky of imperialism. And no one envies these roles. The Titoites are trying to play this part even behind the mask of "neutral Yugoslavia".