

MOSCOW'S PRAISE STINGS U. S. REDS

**Favorable Report of Recent
Convention Draws Rebuke
by Editor of Worker**

By **PETER KIHSS**

Soviet officials have been praising the recent national convention of the American Communist party. Yesterday this drew a Communist reaction here that such praise was a misunderstanding and "unfortunate mistake."

The Soviet applause has reached here in the English-language monthly *International Affairs*, published in Moscow by the Soviet Society for the Popularization of Political and Scientific Knowledge.

T. Timofeyev, discussing the American group's February convention, wrote in the March issue:

"The convention acknowledged the vital force of proletarian internationalism. This fact is all the more important in the light of the efforts of reactionary Western groups to sow ideological dissension and vacillation in the Communist ranks in the hope of splitting the international Communist movement, undermining the principle of proletarian internationalism and setting fraternal Communist parties one against the other."

The American and other Western Communist parties, he said, were "repulsing the attempts of the reactionaries" and "vigorously opposing revisionist and liquidationist tendencies." Such tendencies, he said, had included the ideas of converting the party here into a "political association" and organizing "a 'mass party for socialism,' into which the Communist party would dissolve itself."

In the *Communist Daily Worker* yesterday, Alan Max, managing editor, said the Timofeyev picture was an "unfortunate mistake" that followed similar accounts in other foreign Marxist publications.

In an open letter to *International Affairs*, he said the published proceedings "read like an entirely different convention from the one discussed by your correspondent."

The Soviet story, Mr. Max wrote, gave not the slightest indication of the party's "new course" in admitting past erro-

neous "dogmatic application of Marxist theory to the American scene" and "abandoning the earlier idealistic and uncritical attitude toward the lands of socialism."

"Such an account, especially if it remained uncorrected," Mr. Max wrote, "could only tend to shake the confidence of your readers in the ability of your journal to give sound political estimates."