

# Pravda Editorial on Hungary

(Continued from yesterday)

In his speech Comrade Tito dealt with another important international question—the aggression of England, France and Israel against Egypt.

"This is a most typical aggression," he said, "that in no way is to be distinguished from the former classical aggressions of the colonial powers." "Israel" Tito continued "showed itself this time to be a weapon of the great powers and it appears as much a threat to peace.

"The most tragic thing in my opinion," the orator noted, "consists in the fact that the French Socialists disgraced themselves and again showed that they are the most faithful servants of the circles that try, at any price try to maintain the old classical forms of colonialism. And this teaches us, comrades, to be careful because it shows that the carriers of the so-called democracy—France and England—are for peace, justice and democracy only in words, but in reality they are sources from which can spring extremely reactionary and aggressive actions if opportunities for this are presented."

From this correct evaluation one conclusion should follow—that is, the necessity of heightening the vigilance and unity of all peace-loving peoples.

Speaking about the Hungarian events, Comrade Tito makes a number of critical remarks addressed to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Special attention should be made to these remarks. We, evidently, are not against criticism.

In the Moscow Declaration it is written, as the common opinion of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia, that our cooperation will be based on friendly criticism and on the comradely character of the exchange of opinions on disputable questions between our parties. There is no basis on our side to retreat from this decision. But the critical remarks of Comrade Tito attract our attention because they are made in a tone such as had almost disappeared in the recent period.

Let us take the basic proposition put forward by Tito with regard to the Soviet system. He insistently emphasizes that "the cult of personality is really the product of a definite system." He states that one must speak about "the system that guaranteed the creation of a cult of personality."

In actuality the cult of personality was in direct contradiction with all of our Soviet social system. Being the products of our political and economic system we could carry on the struggle against the cult of personality and obtain in the shortest time great successes in liquidating its consequences.

The Soviet social system, created by our working class in union with the peasantry, by all the workers of the Soviet Union and by its Communist Party, has been tested by the experience of history.

The basic invincible might of the Soviet Socialist system consists in the fact that it is based on Socialist form of ownership of the instruments and means of production. The Soviet social system is a real people's society. In our country the exploiting classes have been fully liquidated; the moral and political unity of society has been created and made permanent. The alliance of the working class and of the peasantry has been most greatly strengthened; the indestructible friendship of all peoples of the U.S.S.R. has been forged in the struggle for socialism.

This is the result of life's verification of our system; the creation in a short historical time of a mighty industrial socialist power, of a country with an advanced socialist agriculture in conditions of hostile capitalist encirclement, when not only were we not given any material aid from abroad, but also when, in the course of decades, there went on a persistent and open economic, political and

ideological struggle against the first country of socialism.

After a series of object lessons, even the enemies of the Soviet Union have no reason to doubt the reality of this result. The enemies of socialism tried to test the strength of our system in the most extreme furnace of war. The Soviet political and economic system created by the people of our country under the direction of the Communist Party has withstood with honor this most difficult test. The victory of the Soviet Union in the World War II had universal historical significance. It saved the peoples from fascist enslavement, opened the way to and created favorable conditions for the construction of socialism in a number of countries.

The Soviet system has shown its might in the restoration of an economy ruined by war, when we not only could not count on foreign aid, but also ourselves gave aid to the young peoples' democratic states.

The strength of our system lies in its collectivity, in its deep Socialist democracy. The Soviet system is the union of millions and millions of workers of city and country in the name of the great goal of the construction of a new society. The glorious cause of the Soviet people is before the eyes of all. Quite recently in the great crusade on the virgin lands, hundreds of thousands of people were united at the call of their party and they obtained great results under different conditions.

All this, of course, does not mean that we do not have any inadequacies. There are such, and we subject them to sharp and direct criticism, carrying on systematic work toward eliminating them.

Our inadequacies were revealed at the 20th Congress of the party and there was shown also the correct road to overcoming them. Nobody can deny that our party and the Soviet government is persistently and substantially realizing the greatest measures for raising the living standards of the workers, for strict observance of revolutionary legality, for the further development of socialist democracy.

So stand matters with the Soviet system, which could not be destroyed by war, by economic blockade, or by the various efforts of the enemies of socialism. It could not, of course, be destroyed either by the cult of personality, because this system, the socialist system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, has as its basis the alliance of the working class and of the collective farm peasantry having been called into life by the laws of the historic development of society, and being the embodiment of the creative energies of the mass of millions of working people.

How, in this case, can the remarks of Tito about our system be applicable? How can one try to cast a shadow over the system of social life of the Soviet Union? How can one raise this question without repeating the former attacks on the Soviet Union that were fashionable in the past when there took place a worsening of the relations between the USSR and Yugoslavia?

It is the business of the Yugoslav people and of the Union of Yugoslav Communists to apply any forms and methods of building socialism, but is it correct, while doing this to disparage the socialist structure of other countries, to exalt their experience, and advertising it as universal and the best?

It is impossible not to see that in the Yugoslav press all too often there appears the thought that "the Yugoslav road to socialism" is the most correct or even the only possible road for all countries of the world. At the same time they do not talk about the positive sides and attainments of socialist construction in other countries. Such a position reminds one of the old saying, "Without us even the sun does not rise!"

Creative differences on the com-

mon path of Socialist development are determined in different countries by concrete, objective conditions.

Notable experience in Socialist construction has been gained by the great Chinese People's Republic. Working under complex historical conditions, the Chinese Communist Party has introduced a great contribution into the theory and practice of building a socialist society.

The world Communist movement may properly pride itself on the ability of the Chinese comrades to discover and successfully implement new methods of solving the most complicated problems in the life of hundreds of millions of people. However, the Chinese comrades always maintain that they are far from claiming that their methods of socialist construction are universal, although these methods have fully justified themselves in their country.

The wisdom of the directors of the Chinese Communist party finds its expression in the fact that they do not oppose the experience of building socialism in their country against the experience of other countries, being able to utilize the experience of all socialist countries for the successful solution of the tasks of building a new society in China.

Much that is unique in the solution of different questions of building socialism is possessed also by the European countries of people's democracy. The experience of economic and cultural development in Poland, Rumania, and Albania, the experience of cooperative agriculture in Bulgaria, the significant attainments in the development of industry and agriculture in Czechoslovakia—all this and much else enriches the treasury of experience in the creation of a new social structure.

In Yugoslavia there are also particular forms of socialist construction. New methods and techniques for administration and economic management are being tested in practice.

The workers' councils in Yugoslavia appeared comparatively recently. Each year of their existence correctives are introduced into their functioning, but already now it is clear that there are some positive aspects of this form. It is impossible to say this about other innovations that have produced negative effects, and also it is impossible to say this about some measures in the field of planning, which have weakened the planning bases of the Yugoslav economy and have strengthened the influence of market relations, about which the Yugoslav press has written.

There can be no doubt that good experience will always find its adherents and followers if it withstands the test of time and gives positive results. Conversely, it is laughable to take umbrage at other countries if one method or another applied in one country is considered unsuitable for another.

What are the advantages of the "Yugoslav road to socialism" about which Yugoslav authors speak? Answering this question, the authors of articles in the Yugoslav press usually refer to one innovation or another of a political character.

But socialism—the new social structure—presupposes the reconstruction of the economy, which is the basis of all social life. This reconstruction has begun in Yugoslavia, but, as the Yugoslav comrades themselves know well, much still remains to be done to complete this reconstruction.

It is known that in Yugoslavia's economy a great role is played by agriculture, but nonetheless, in the area of grain production there still has not been attained the pre-war level, and unfortunately the victory of socialist relations in agriculture is still distant. It is known also that the annual deficit of wheat in Yugoslavia is approximately 600,000 to 650,000 tons.

It is completely evident what great significance the aid received from capitalist states, in particular the U.S.A., has for the economy of Yugoslavia. As a result of the situa-

## SOVIET CP. MAGAZINE HITS DW EDITORIAL ON HUNGARY

"KOMMUNIST", theoretical journal of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, has expressed its disagreement with the Daily Worker on the Hungarian situation, according to Moscow new dispatches.

"Kommunist" said the Daily Worker had made an error in putting the events in Hungary and Egypt on the same plane. It accused the Daily Worker editorial of "babbling about the right of self-determination" and of failing to see the difference between Egypt—"invaded by imperialist interventionists"—and Hungary where "Soviet troops came at the call of the workers' and peasants' government to help Socialist patriotic forces".

"Kommunist" asserted that the position taken by the editorial writer "does not testify to the firmness of his principles or his understanding of the processes under way in the world." It expressed the hope that when emotions receded the Daily Worker would take back its "hasty and unjust accusation" with regard to Soviet activities in Hungary.

## Asks UN Aid Victims Of Invasion in Egypt

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., Nov. 26.—Lebanese delegate Edward Rizk told the General Assembly today that "the number of Egyptian victims of the war of aggression who are in need of aid has now reached 60,000. To this must be added more than 200,000 refugees in the Gaza strip who are also in dire need of assistance."

Rizk said Lebanon was preparing a draft resolution on emergency UN aid to Egypt and to the Gaza refugees similar to the aid proposals adopted on behalf of Hungarian citizens.

An appeal to the U.S. and Britain to mend their diplomatic rift "for the good of the whole democratic world" was made by Australian external affairs minister R. G. Casey, as the Assembly was hearing explanation of votes on two resolutions approved Saturday. One deals with arrangements for the international police force and clearing the blocked Suez Canal. The second repeats the UN call to Britain, France and Israel to get their troops out of Egypt "forthwith."

LONDON, Nov. 26—Norwegian forces of the UN police army took up patrol duty in Port Said today in the first actual move to take over from British and French occupation troops and hasten their withdrawal.

The Anglo-French command announced today it had cleared a sunken dredge from the harbor mouth leading into the Suez Canal, permitting passage of the 10,000-ton Liberty ship size.

Ninety-nine Swedish troops for the UNEF command arrived by Canadian airlift this morning at the ABU SWEIR barracks near Ismailia.

Both Israel and Egypt reported some action in the Sinai desert. But for the most part, the uneasy cease-fire prevailed.

PARIS, Nov. 26—Egypt has made no official decision to expel

tion that arose, Yugoslavia, in the course of a number of years, had the possibility of utilizing the aggravation of contradictions between the imperialist and socialist countries.

But if a vital part of its economy is the aid from capitalist countries, then it is impossible to recognize that such a road has any special advantages. All countries in the socialist camp can hardly reckon on such aid. They cannot build their policy on the assumption of aid from the imperialists.

Consequently, such a road cannot in any case be universal. It is known that imperialist circles have given aid to Yugoslavia not because they are sympathetic to socialism or to building of socialism in Yugoslavia. The politicians from the camp of imperialism have recognized that any means to introduce and inflame differences among Socialist countries may enter into their plans. It is impossible for a minute even to forget that the enemies of socialism also now want by every means to sow differences in the cooperation of socialist countries and to weaken the connection between them.

In his speech Comrade Tito puts forward the slogan of the "inde-

Britons, Frenchmen and Jews, but persons of these three nationalities are being harried by Egyptian police, sources close to the French Foreign Ministry said today.

They said that of the 4,500 French citizens in Egypt, 200 already have been expelled.

## Yugoslavs See No Buildup of Soviet Troops

BELGRADE, Nov. 26.—A Yugoslav government spokesman today denied knowledge of Soviet troop buildups inside Hungary along the Yugoslav frontier.

"We do not have any such information," government press officer Branko Draskovic said.

The spokesman also said that reports that Yugoslavia sent urgent messages on Russian buildups to Greece and Turkey were "entirely without foundation."

Telephone checks from Belgrade to points along the Hungarian frontier showed no indications of unusual activity across the border.

## Tommy Dorsey Dies

GREENWICH, Conn., Nov. 26—Tommy Dorsey, 51-year-old bandleader who won fame as the "sentimental gentleman of swing," was found dead in his home here today.

pendence" of Socialist countries and of Communist parties from the Soviet Union and from the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union.

However, it is known to all that the Soviet Union does not demand from anyone any sort of dependence or subordination. This was said with all force in the decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Union. This position was once more supported in the declaration of the Government of the U.S.S.R. of Oct. 30, 1956, "On the Bases of Development and the Further Strengthening of Friendship and Cooperation Between the Soviet Union and Other Socialist States."

The past errors that existed in this direction are being corrected in all decisiveness by our Government. Of this there is testimony in the experience of our relations during the last years with Yugoslavia. We boldly acted to wipe out all errors of the past relationship with Yugoslavia, not caring about any considerations of prestige, being first to extend the hand to the Yugoslav Government and to the union of Communists.

Nobody can deny that on the

(Continued on Page 5)

# Pravda Editorial on Hungary

(Continued from Page 2)

side of the Communist party of the Soviet Union there has been done and is being done all that is necessary to place relations on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideology in the interest of strengthening cooperation with brotherly people of Yugoslavia and in the interest of the struggle for peace and socialism.

Giving a generally positive evaluation of the development of Soviet-Yugoslav relations and of agreements concluded between the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia, Tito reproaches the Soviet leaders for not wishing to spread the principles fixed in these relations to other socialist countries.

This strange and entirely far-fetched allegation is needed by Tito to accuse the Soviet Union of "insufficient confidence in the socialist forces of the countries of people's democracy."

This declaration is refuted by facts.

There is the Belgrade declaration and the joint statement of the governments of the USSR and of Yugoslavia regarding Soviet-Yugoslav relations, and there is also the declaration about the relations between the union of the Communists of Yugoslavia and of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. There is the declaration of the government of the USSR about the bases of the development and further strengthening of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and other socialist states.

There is the joint statement in connection with the conversations between the delegation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the government of the Soviet Union and of the delegation of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party and of the government of the Polish People's Republic.

In these documents there are reflected the Leninist principles of the relations between socialist states; yet Comrade Tito all the while continues to speak about some supposed "Stalinist course" in relation to the countries of people's democracy.

Already before the 20th Congress, in connection with the consideration of the question of Soviet-Yugoslav relations, the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in July, 1955, unanimously adopted the following decision in which it is said:

"In all our relations with the countries of people's democracy, and also with the brotherly Communist and workers' parties, the Soviet and party organs and all our workers abroad must be strictly guided by the Leninist principles of socialist internationalism: Full equality, respect for national sovereignty, and taking account of the national peculiarities of each country. Soviet Communists must serve as an example in carrying out the principles of proletarian internationalism, as is fitting for the representatives of the multi-national socialist country where, on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory, the national question has been fully solved.

"The historic experience of the Soviet Union and of the People's Democracies shows that, given unity with respect to that which is most important and basic in the cause of guaranteeing the victory of socialism, different forms and methods for deciding the concrete problems of socialist construction can be applied in different countries, depending upon historic and national peculiarities."

As is known, the Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union paid much attention to the questions of the correct relations—based upon the principled positions of Marxism-Leninism—between our party and all other brotherly Communist and workers' parties.

To speak now, after the Twentieth Congress, about supposed "Stalinists" in the Communist Party

of the Soviet Union who are supposedly trying to subordinate brotherly parties means simply to close one's eyes to the policy that the Communist party of the Soviet Union is actually carrying out in relation to the socialist countries.

This policy is based on the principles of full equality, respect for territorial integrity, state independence, and sovereignty and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, and it is permeated by the spirit of strengthening friendship between peoples and by the spirit of proletarian socialist internationalism. This policy is permeated by concern for strengthening the friendship, brotherly cooperation and unity of all countries of the socialist camp and concern for strengthening peace in the entire world.

What does Comrade Tito call for in his speech? To go it alone? But it is permissible to ask what this road promises, what advantages it offers the socialist countries? There are no such advantages.

There can be nothing useful for the cause of building a socialist society in the appeal to break with other socialist states and to separate from the friendly family of socialist countries. The most important conditions for the success of our great cause are faithfulness to the great banner of socialist internationalism and the unity and solidarity of all fighters for socialism.

In the light of the requirements of socialist internationalism, there cannot help but be surprise at the tone with which Comrade Tito considered possible to speak about Communist parties and their leaders. All leading figures of the brotherly parties, both from the West and the East, who do not agree with his point of view he includes, without any basis, among the "Stalinists," attributing to them the most negative features.

About them he uses no other term than "inveterate Stalinist elements" and "irresponsible elements in different Communist parties." Similar attacks directed at Communist leaders abound in the entire speech delivered in Pula.

Choosing as the theme for his speech the question of the mutual relations among Communist parties, Tito in reality did not conduct a comradely polemic. He did not debate, but rather abused various leaders of the Communist and workers' parties. The speech was not delivered in the tone of a conversation or a debate on an equal basis with proper respect for differing opinions. In particular, there was no basis for talking about "Stalinists" and "Stalinism," inasmuch as our party, as well as other Communist parties, has based itself and will base itself on the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism.

Particularly impermissible is the disparaging attitude reflected in the speech about such a country as Albania and its leaders. Speaking about the Albanian comrades, Tito used rude and insulting expressions. At the same time, it is known that the Yugoslav leaders often speak in defense of the thesis of the equality between large and small peoples, of the right of each to have its opinion and to support it. Usually they insist that nobody can pretend to have a monopoly on the definition of truth.

But here, hardly had Comrade Enver Hoxha written an article that did not please the Yugoslav comrades before they threw abuse at him. It is possible that the article could have been written differently. But why may Comrade Hoxha not have his own opinion, that right to criticize, that the Yugoslav comrades claim?

In his speech Comrade Tito did not only permit clear interference in the affairs of the Albanian Workers' Party. Equally unceremoniously he intruded into the affairs of the French Communist Party and also the affairs of other Communist parties, including the affairs of our party. He tried, without giving the others the right of appeal, to give an evaluation of the

internal situation in these parties and the activities of their leaders.

"The election of leaders," wrote the organ of the French Communist Party, L'Humanite, "is the internal affair of each party, and foreign intervention in this affair, may, as the past has shown, only bring harm to the workers' movement as a whole."

It is impossible not to agree with this justified remark.

After all that has been said, it is not surprising that Comrade Tito's speech was met with joy in bourgeois circles abroad. We may remember here the words of the veteran figure of the workers' movement, August Bebel, who recommended that one think about what one is doing if one gives joy to the enemy. Our opponents are hastening now to the conclusion that this speech is the cause of serious differences between the Soviet and Yugoslav comrades and will lead to the worsening of Soviet-Yugoslav relations.

To whom is it not clear that in the general interests of the Communist parties it is impermissible to inflame disputes, to go over to mutual attacks, to return to the atmosphere of differences that, thanks to mutual efforts, belongs to the past.

The higher interests of the cause of the working class and of the interests of socialism firmly require the attainment of mutual understanding and the elimination of all that can bring negative consequences to the further solidarity of the forces of socialism on the basis of Marxism-Leninism principles.

The cooperation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Union of Yugoslav Communists, as is shown in the declaration "On the Relations of the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia and of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," must be based on complete voluntariness and equality, friendly criticism, and the comradely character of the exchange of opinions regarding debatable questions between our parties.

It is known that in the past, among some of the leaders of the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia, there were spread incorrect views, not corresponding to Marxist-Leninist theory, on some important questions of socialist construction. These permitted deviations from the principles of proletarian internationalism.

Approaching a rapprochement with the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia, our party had in view that the attainment of a unity of views regarding important ideological problems would require significant time, inasmuch as there were and still are differences between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia with respect to a number of questions of an ideological nature.

For its part, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will also in the future carry out a policy of cooperation between our parties on a principled Marxist-Leninist basis in the interests of the brotherly peoples of the USSR and Yugoslavia, and in the interests of the defense of the cause of peace, democracy and socialism. We are convinced that disputed questions must be considered and cleared up in a quiet, friendly atmosphere by means of a comradely exchange of opinion.

The Communists of the Soviet Union, like the Communists of all countries of the world, are conscious that in conditions where reaction is carrying out a merciless campaign against the forces of socialism and democracy, when the imperialist and fascist elements in many countries are attempting furious attacks against Communists and are trying to introduce divisions in the socialist international movement, there is necessary a further consolidation of all the forces of socialism on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles and on the basis of the principles of socialist internationalism.