



TODAY ABROAD

by Joseph Clark

The Tito-Khrushchev Discussion Continues

THE KHRUSHCHEV-TITO discussion which started at Brioni and continued in Yalta is still going on—but in considerably altered form.

One aspect of this discussion was illustrated at a Kremlin reception last week for Bulgarian Communist leaders. Reportedly, the Soviet leaders gave their warmest applause to Vulka Chervenkov, formerly Premier and top C.P. leader of Bulgaria. This is significant because Chervenkov had resigned as premier last year and was criticized in the Bulgarian party for his part in the Kostov execution. The Bulgarian party revealed that the conviction of Kostov as an alleged traitor and conspirator with the "fascist" Tito was based on a frame-up.

There was a remarkable scene enacted last year at a session of the Bulgarian parliament when Chervenkov resigned as Premier. Present was a delegation from Yugoslavia headed by Moshe Pjade, watching the proceedings from a place of honor. The same Pjade had been attacked as a fascist during the Kostov trial.

AT THE KREMLIN reception which greeted Chervenkov so warmly, Todor Zhivkov, Bulgarian C.P. secretary, outlined his views on Marxism and internationalism.

"We Bulgarian Communists," Zhivkov said, "think that any deviation from recognizing the leading role of the Soviet Union is incompatible with the principles of Marxism."

This was in line with a theme developed by numerous articles that have appeared recently in Czech, Bulgarian, Hungarian and Albanian publications. In Soviet newspapers as well as in the other east European press there have been sharp attacks against the views of various Yugoslav leaders and of the press in both Yugoslavia and Poland. These emphasized the

view that attacks on "Stalinism" are in reality grist for the mill of the imperialists. "National Communism" was assailed as a weapon of John Foster Dulles of certain Communists in Yugoslavia, Poland and also in the United States.

ON FEB. 14 the Yugoslav newspaper Borba published an article replying to some of these attacks, and also taking polite but firm exception to the remarks of former Soviet foreign minister Shepilov at the recent meeting of the Supreme Soviet.

The Borba article claims that the articles in question "have in the largest possible measure been denying the existence of inner factors that are retarding the socialist development. Ignoring the fundamental, social roots of the Polish and Hungarian events, fighting shy even of the findings adopted at the time of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU or thereafter, they are inclined to deny, or at least radically minimize, the harmfulness of Stalinist policies, of that complex of social phenomena that had been termed "Stalinism."

Borba goes on to say that nearly all the articles attack critics of "Stalinism" and who "desire to weaken the unity of the socialist countries" and "deliver socialism to its enemies." This argument, Borba says, ignores the truth or falsity of any question and merely asserts that the position in question harms socialist unity.

Borba argues that the imperialists were actually better served by the false kind of "Stalinist unity" and "monolithism" than by unity among socialist equals who maintain complete independence and practice mutually friendly criticism.

BORBA also writes: "Yugoslav Communists, and many, many other Communists

too, consider that socialism is exposed to the big danger of bureaucratism, stagnation, degeneration, unless there be ensured a more and more active, more and more direct participation of the producers in the management of the economy and the state, that which Marx termed the 'withering away' of the state. Therein lies, in conditions of socialist development, the social essence of democratization.

"Evading consistently every constructive discussion of this problem, which definitely stands at the head of the list of problems of contemporary socialism, the writers of the articles under review are contenting themselves with equating every criticism of bureaucratic centralism with an attack on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"The fact that practice had proved that bureaucratic centralism can lead to a complete the workers' party and the working class, that a dictatorship styled as 'proletarian' was liable to be everything else but that, just for the reason that it was not filled with democratic content—does not seem to worry them. This way absurdities can be born: those who are striving for an expansion of the rights and the actual strengthening of the authority of the working class can be accused of a near-conspiracy against the state authority of the working class."

It is significant, despite the sharp exchange of opinion, that both the Yugoslav and Soviet Communists urge continuing friendship and collaboration between both countries.

This reporter is tempted to add that the Yugoslav Communists would be even more persuasive in their argument if they did not have the dead weight of their imprisonment of Djilas for writing an article in a foreign publication. Wrong as Djilas may have been both in his action and his argumentation, prison is not proper criticism.