

# MOSCOW'S EFFECT MAY BE DIVISIVE

## 'Healing' Act Seen a Spur to World Red Disputes

By HARRY SCHWARTZ

The Soviet Communist party statement on the downgrading of Stalin, apparently an effort to heal the rift in Red ranks caused by the campaign, raised the possibility of a further split in world communism.

The Soviet Communist party's Central Committee resolution did not appear to answer some key questions raised since publication of part of Nikita S. Khrushchev's attack on Stalin.

It appeared unlikely that Communists in free countries would take too kindly to the Soviet charge that they "are tolerating at times a wrong interpretation of" the anti-Stalin campaign.

The chief question the available text of the Soviet statement seems to leave unanswered is that which relates to the role of Soviet leaders while Stalin's crimes were being committed and their share of the responsibility for those crimes.

By inference the statement seems to argue that whatever role the present Soviet leaders played as Stalin's henchmen, their "courage" and rectitude in

**Continued on Page 7, Column 3**

**The New York Times**

Published: July 2, 1956

Copyright © The New York Times

# MOSCOW'S EFFECT MAY BE DIVISIVE

Continued From Page 1

exposing him and trying to undo his work proved they were good Communists to be trusted now and in the future.

In answer to foreign Communist's demands for a "Marxist explanation" of how Stalin's crimes had happened to occur and why he had not been removed, the Soviet explanation seemed to differ in part from what is generally considered a "Marxist" statement.

This deviation occurred in their assertion that it was impossible to remove Stalin because he was so popular with the Soviet people. This appears to be an "idealistic" explanation.

Moreover the stress in the statement on the importance of Stalin's personal characteristics as a ruthless ruler was viewed as an attempt to explain history in terms of an individual and his traits. A "Marxist" analysis is normally supposed to be in terms of vast economic forces and the actions of large groups of people, rather than in terms of any particular individual.

The Soviet statement appeared to show genuine concern in Moscow over the repercussions of the attack on Stalin in the non-Soviet world. The statement included a bitter attack upon "United States imperialist circles," which were charged with trying to use the anti-Stalin campaign as a means of "struggle against socialism."

At one point the statement seemed to aim directly at refuting an assertion by Italian Communist leader Palmiro Togliatti in his analysis published after Nikita S. Khrushchev's attack on Stalin had become public.

Signor Togliatti had said. "The true problems are unanswered, which are why and how Soviet society arrived at certain forms so foreign to the democratic system and legality even to the

point of degeneration. \* \* \* undoubtedly Stalin's errors were tied in with an excessive increase in bureaucratic apparatus in Soviet economic and political life and perhaps, first of all, in party affairs."

The Soviet party statement appeared to reject Signor Togliatti's assumption and to argue instead there was nothing in the Soviet social system which led to Stalin's crimes, and therefore might conceivably require change to guarantee against future repetition of such crimes.