WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

ENVER HOXHA

REFLECTIONS ON THE MIDDLE EAST

1958 — 1983

EXTRACTS FROM THE POLITICAL DIARY

THE INSTITUTE OF MARXIST-LENINIST
STUDIES AT THE CC OF THE PLA

THE «8 NËNTORI» PUBLISHING HOUSE
TIRANA 1984

THE NOVEMBER 8TH PUBLISHING HOUSE
OTTAWA 2023

ENVER HOXHA

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

The book "Reflections on the Middle East" by Comrade Enver Hoxha, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, deals with political and social events which are linked with the Arab and non-Arab peoples of two continents, Africa and Asia, and with what is called the "Middle East crisis" in the international arena. Like the two volumes of the book "Reflections on China," published in 1979, it is part of the series of books of extracts from "The Political Diary on International Issues."

The materials included in the book are some of the notes, outlines for articles, analyses and general reviews about the Middle East drawn from the "Political Diary" and refer only to events which belong to the period from 1958 to the end of 1983. These materials reflect some of the most important moments and events from the inhuman imperialist activities of the superpowers and Israel as well as aspects of the heroic struggle of the Palestinian people and other Arab peoples, the Afghan and Iranian peoples against the plots of the two superpowers. From time to time the author has recorded some of his personal ideas and feelings, the grief which he has felt over the misfortunes and injustices which have been inflicted on these peoples as well as his great joy over their exemplary struggle for their freedom and national independence against the savage Israeli, imperialist and social-imperialist occupiers and enemies.

* * *

For more than three decades the Middle East has been an arena of repeated acts of intervention and war. From 1948 to 1983 a number of wars, the one bloodier

than the other, have been waged there.

In the materials which are published in this new book by Comrade Enver Hoxha the reader will find correct answers to why so many wars have been waged in that region of the world during this relatively short period; why the Middle East crisis has assumed today such large proportions as to the dangers and consequences inherent in it that it influences the entire world situation; what has transformed the Middle East into an extremely dangerous hotbed of endless conflicts; who are the open and secret enemies of the Arab peoples; and a series of other acute political issues.

While following the events as they have developed in the Middle East and writing about them at the moments when they have occurred, the author makes an all-round analysis of them, based on historical materialism and the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, discloses their internal and external causes, their complexity and interconnection, and makes assessments and predictions the accuracy of which has been fully confirmed by the development of events in subsequent periods.

Although these analyses, assessments and predictions were made and written some years ago, many of them are of value for the present day. They include, for example, the notes analysing the content and true aims of the global strategy of American imperialism in the Middle East pursued by all the American presidents before, during, and after the Second World War down to President Ronald Reagan, the unprecedented arrogance of the United States of America which has proclaimed the Middle East a sphere of its national interests and treats it as its domain. Proceeding from this strategy and this policy, time after time the United States of

America has dispatched thousands of marines and hundreds of warships to the waters of the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, etc., in order to subjugate the peoples of the countries of the Middle East by military force.

Passing from one article to the other, the reader will also see what place Israel occupies and the role it has played and is playing in the context of the anti-Arab general strategy of American imperialism, what efforts the United States of America has made and is still making to ensure "secure borders," that is, borders which include all the Arab territories occupied by armed force, for its "pistol" in this region. The basis of the American-Israeli friendship and the political, economic and military alliances between them has always been and still is their common hostility and wars against the Arab peoples.

Also of great current value are the articles in which, through many facts and arguments, the policy of the Soviet social-imperialists in the Middle East is unmasked. They present themselves as friends and saviours of the Arab peoples but at the most critical moments have betrayed these peoples and left them in the lurch.

Many materials show what features the policy of the Soviet social-imperialists has in common with the policy of the American imperialists, what brings these two superpowers together, and what has impelled them to collide in fierce open clashes, before the eyes of the world or behind the scenes for many years, and to trample on the freedom, independence and national and social interests of the impoverished and hard-working peoples of the countries of the Middle East.

In the book "Reflections on the Middle East" a prominent place is given to materials which assess the

anti-feudal and anti-imperialist uprisings of the peoples of the Middle East, for instance the heroic struggle of the martyred Palestinian people, the Iranian popular revolution, the struggle of the Afghan people against the Soviet social-imperialist occupiers, etc. A special place in the book is devoted to the problem of the energy crisis and, in this context, to the role of the Middle-East countries which are some of the biggest oil producers in the world, in this crisis which has gripped all the capitalist and revisionist countries, and to stressing the power of oil as a weapon to defend the freedom and independence and assets of the Arab peoples from the imperialist powers.

* * *

In the materials included in this book the attitudes of the Party of Labour and of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania to all the problems which have to do with the Middle East crisis are expressed frankly; the firm principled stands of our country and people in favour of the struggle of the Palestinian people and other Arab peoples against Israel and the two imperialist superpowers, in favour of the Iranian people, the Afghan people and the freedom-loving African peoples are outlined. These stands have also been expressed in many other important documents of our Party and state as well as at various international forums such as UNO, etc., where our representatives have defended the struggle and the just cause of the fraternal Arab peoples. The esteem and assessments which are contained in this book are further proof of that warm and sincere friendship which has always linked the Albanian people with the Arab peoples and with all the freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples of the world.

SATURDAY
MAY 3, 1958

MEETING WITH ARAB FRIENDS

Today I met the Arab friends[1] who have come to Albania on the invitation of our preparatory committee for the formation of the association for friendship between Albania and the Arab countries.[2]

[1] Fat'hi Radwan, minister of National Orientation of the United Arab Republic; Ahmet Mohammed el-Shami, chargé d'affaires of Yemen in Cairo; Faisal bin Ali, first aide to the representative of the Imam of Oman in Cairo, and Khaled Ali, delegate of the National Front for the Liberation of Algeria.

[2] The formation of the association for friendship between Albania and the Arab countries was decided by the National Conference which met in Tirana on May 3-4, 1958.

KARLOVY VARY, SATURDAY
JULY 19, 1958

WE MUST SUPPORT THE PEOPLES OF LEBANON AND JORDAN

In a radiogram which I sent Comrade Hysni today,[1] amongst other things I instructed him that manifestations should be organized against the imperialist aggression of the United States of America and Great Britain against Lebanon and Jordan.

[1] At that time Comrade Enver Hoxha was on a visit in Czechoslovakia.

WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 6, 1960

TALK WITH THE DIRECTOR OF THE RADIO BROADCASTING SERVICE OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRAQ

This morning I received Khadhim al-Samawi, director of the Radio Broadcasting Service of the Republic of Iraq and chief editor of the newspaper "Al-Insania." He spoke about our country with great sympathy. He said he had been very pleased by the welcome he received everywhere. He asked for and I gave him an interview[1] for the newspaper "Al-Insania."

[1] See Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 18, p. 29, "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1975, Alb. ed.

TUESDAY
MARCH 20, 1962

WE RECOGNIZE THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT OF ALGERIA

We have recognized *de jure* the provisional government of Algeria.

Great joy in Algeria over the signing of the ceasefire with the French, but this is still not peace.

SATURDAY
APRIL 7, 1962

ABOUT THE SITUATION IN GHANA, EGYPT AND IRAQ

Kiço Kasapi[1] has returned from Ghana, Egypt and Iraq. He told me about the situation in those countries and the reception they gave him there. In general, the situation is good in Ghana, while in Egypt it is grave, the people there are oppressed, too. In Iraq, Kassem no longer has the support of the people, he told me. People there speak against him openly. The Communist Party of Iraq is illegal and carries on very little activity. In those countries Albania is known and admired. They hear and like Radio Tirana. In Ghana, in particular, our delegation was given a very good welcome, beginning from President Nkrumah.

The Soviet Union is being discredited, because of the policy of Khrushchev and his men in those countries. The ambassadors of the countries of people's democracy there are doing scandalous things.

[1] Then deputy-minister of trade, who headed the Albanian government delegation to Ghana, Egypt and Iraq, for the promotion and strengthening of trade relations with those countries.

PUTSCH IN IRAQ

Radio Baghdad has reported that a putsch has, been carried out in Iraq and the president of the Republic, General Kassem, has been killed. Time showed that Kassem relied neither on the people nor on the communists. The latter, following the treacherous line of Nikita Khrushchev and carrying out his specific advice, made no effort at all (and they had many possibilities, especially in the first days after the overthrow of the monarchy) to seize power. Kassem isolated and dissociated himself from the communists and forced them into illegality, while Tito continued his work and used his influence for the creation of a legal party in Iraq. Kassem on the one hand received weapons from Khrushchev and on the other hand imprisoned and killed the communists.

Now that the reactionaries of the "Baath" Party have seized power an unprecedented wave of terror will certainly burst upon our naive but well-intentioned Iraqi comrades. They will suffer severely, but this will serve as a great lesson to them and to others to see where revisionism and the treacherous policy of Khrushchev lead. The reactionaries everywhere are killing the communist comrades with Soviet weapons. The policy of Basil Zaharoff, the gun merchant, is being repeated here under the camouflage of coexistence.

THURSDAY
APRIL 23, 1964

THE FRENCH SOCIALIST CHIEFS ARE HATCHING UP NEW PLOTS WITH THE TITOITE CLIQUE

I had a final look at the article entitled: "The Leading Group of the French Socialists, Murderers of the Egyptian and Algerian Peoples, Hatch up New Plots with the Titoite Clique."[1] In this article, the outline and main ideas of which I had prepared at the beginning of April, we unmask the aims of the visits of chiefs of the social-democratic parties of West-European countries to Belgrade and Moscow.

Amongst other things we point out in the article: although Guy Mollet, Christian Pinot and their other collaborators are notorious for what they are, not only in their own country but also throughout the world, they were received with great pomp and ceremony in Belgrade. The evil reputation of these "champions" of "socialism and democracy" is closely linked with the aggression over the Suez Canal of 1956 and the oppression of the people of Algeria. It is not forgotten that Guy Mollet was prime minister and Christian Pinot foreign minister when the aggression over Suez broke out in 1956.

[1] Published for the first time in the newspaper "Zëri i popullit," April 25, 1964 (Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 26, "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1978, p. 322, Alb. ed.).

— Guy Mollet's visit to Belgrade is a grave insult by the Tito clique to the feelings of the Arab peoples and the memory of hundreds of thousands of martyrs of Egypt, Algeria and other countries of North Africa who fell in the heroic struggle for freedom from French imperialism. Thus the Titoite clique is showing its true features, its hostile stand towards the Arab peoples, against whom it operates cunningly, hatching up plots and subversion and supporting cliques in opposition to the lawful governments. The Titoites' warm welcome for such enemies of the Arab peoples as Guy Mollet and Christian Pinot proves that when they speak about friendship with the Arab peoples, in reality, they are profaning the blood shed by the peoples of Egypt and Algeria.

— The facts are still fresh and the Arab peoples can never forget the perfidy and monstrous actions of the French socialists headed by Guy Mollet. For example, the joint Anglo-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt in 1956, which was undertaken to defend their colonialist interests and to strangle the desires and struggle of the Egyptian people for freedom and independence, demonstrated what the French socialists were and showed what aims they really pursued. It was proved indisputably before the eyes of the whole world that the French socialists were not only opportunists and simple lackeys of the bourgeoisie for ideological and political diversion amongst the workers, but also the most ardent defenders of monopoly capital, colonialism and the most extreme reaction in general.

— Tito, who poses as a "firm friend" of the Arab peoples is welcoming this Guy Mollet and

Christian Pinot who bear heavy responsibility for the destruction of Egyptian cities, the grave crimes of the French colonialists in Algeria and the murders of Arab patriots. But however much Guy Mollet and his henchmen, the clique of Tito and Khrushchev and those who follow them, may try to conceal their treachery, it cannot be covered up. The world now knows what the chiefs of French social-democracy, Tito, Khrushchev and company really are.

SATURDAY
MAY 16, 1964

KHRUSHCHEV IS LINKING HIMSELF WITH THE MOST RABID ARAB ANTI-COMMUNISTS

During his visit to Egypt Khrushchev has linked himself openly with rabid Arab anti-communists, such as Aref of Iraq[1] and others of his ilk, whom he met during a cruise on the Red Sea.

[1] Colonel Aref, president of the Republic of Iraq from 1963 to 1966.

SUNDAY
JANUARY 31, 1965

"SOCIALISM" THAT HAS NO CONNECTION WITH SOCIALISM IN THE SCIENTIFIC SENSE

There is talk about an Algerian "socialism," but in reality this kind of socialism has nothing to do with our concept of the construction of socialism, with the scientific application of Marxism-Leninism. A bourgeois-democratic regime is being built there under the influence of foreign capital, especially French capital, which has deep roots there and is spreading them even now after the national liberation war. The problem is not simply that the regime of Ben Bella has liquidated the so-called Algerian Communist Party, because that party has never had a Marxist-Leninist line. Now, with the development of modern revisionism, that party has found its course, that is, the course of total liquidation and incorporation in the National Liberation Front. No economic, political and organizational reform, which is being worked out or applied by the Ben Bella regime, has the slightest flavour of socialism. The Algerians have adopted certain formulas and organizational forms of Titoite self-administration and have created some capitalist peasant cooperatives or state farms. There is talk there about agrarian reforms and alleged expropriations of French colonists, but these are far from substantial achievement. Algeria is trying to present itself as a Cuban-style development of "Cuban social-

ism," or "Cuban Marxism," and the Algerian communists, who are legal and incorporated in the National Liberation Front, are allegedly operating inside it, like the supporters of Blas Rocas in the Cuban Communist Party. They are engaged with the press and propaganda. And what a "lovely" influence they are exerting!! They have adopted Quranic eclecticism and are trying to show that the Islamic religion conforms with socialism on many moral issues. For their part, Ben Bella and those in leading positions, wanting to be on good terms with the Soviet revisionists, the Titoites, the Americans and the French and to get material aid from them, do not fail to say that they are for "practical socialism" and cannot be for scientific socialism, as if these two things were divided by a Chinese Wall. The revisionists are in complete agreement with these views and they support any demagogy, any diversion, any revision of Marxism, they are in favour of any variant, any sort of eclecticism which can be made of Marxism-Leninism, provided only that scientific Marxism-Leninism is combatted. Now in the period of Ramadan, religious terror is reigning in Algeria — they beat and jail those Algerians who do not observe Ramadan, have prohibited the restaurants from serving food to Algerians during the day, compel people to go to the mosque, or to pray wherever they happen to be. And they dare to call this "socialism." We shall say no more about other matters which result from the religious practice.

Of course, the Ben Bella regime must be taken as it is, but not as something which it is not. It must be supported and assisted for those positive aspects which it has, but not for those which it does

not have, boosting the regime as if it has them, and passing soap for cheese.

Theoretical issues have great political importance, too. Politics is not divorced from ideology, but it must not be confounded with the ideological principles and these must not be subordinated to the political needs of the moment, must not be diluted, corrupted or distorted, even for some long-term advantage that looks promising. Concessions and compromises can be made in politics, but never in principles. Principles must be defended. Patient efforts are required to make them clear, understood, and have them gradually adopted, but they must not be distorted.

THURSDAY
JUNE 24, 1965

THE OVERTHROW OF BEN BELLA AND THE ALGERIAN PROBLEM

Boumedienne, supported by the detachments of the army, has overthrown Ben Bella. In its outward appearance this seems like a putsch, and in fact that is what it is. However, that is nothing surprising in the circumstances through which Algeria has passed. The coming to power of Ben Bella, too, was done through an army putsch. Coming from prison in France, Ben Bella found himself at the head of the state in Algeria and, through putschist methods, eliminated all his opponents who had taken part in the war, irrespective of their political tendencies.

The war of Algeria, an heroic war of the people, truly threw the occupiers out of Algeria, but the fact is that the various nationalist factions that led this war did not manage, in the course of it, to create that sound unity of thought and action which the Algerian people needed so greatly on the eve of their liberation and before the great struggle to revive Algeria, which had emerged from heavy slavery as a sovereign state and was devastated by the war. The elements of the progressive Algerian bourgeoisie proved to be incapable, lacking perspective, divided into clans with pronounced careerist tendencies and, of course, secretly influenced by, or with vain illusions about, the trends and aims of various tendencies of French bourgeois political opinion. Algeria won the war and its po-

litical "independence" from France, but the influence of France continued to be felt in the policy of the new Algerian leaders and is still being felt after the war; faced with the instability of the Algerian leadership, that influence has begun to operate with greater force.

Hence, divorced from the "communists" who throughout the whole war played an infamous, cowardly, opportunist, revisionist, capitulationist and liquidationist role, worse than a bourgeois-democratic grouping, towards the personal power of Ben Bella, to whom they showed slavish obedience, the Algerian national bourgeoisie proved to be very vacillating, is still very vacillating and it is understandable and natural that it seeks to find the way out through putsches. In these circumstances, the situation in Algeria becomes even more complicated, because that country has become a field of intrigues between internal and foreign clans. The Soviet, Yugoslav and other revisionists are intriguing there under the cloak of "socialist" aid; Castro and the Americans are intriguing there; Nasser, Bourguiba and Hassan II are also intriguing there, not to mention France and all the other "independent" countries of Africa, which are influenced in their attitude towards Algeria according to the "rewards" they get from one patron or another. This is the basis of the complication and difficulty of the Algerian question. Many issues are involved there: territorial, economic, strategic, political, ideological issues of prestige, of tribes, of clans, of religion, and a heroic people have to cope with all these things, under a leadership which is not sound, stable and energetic and has bourgeois views!

All defend Ben Bella, apart from us, China, Korea and Vietnam. All of them are weeping over the downfall of their creature, Ben Bella, and are putting terrible pressure on Boumedienne and Algeria to free Ben Bella and restore him to power, or to make Boumedienne give full guarantee that he will be obedient to the French, the Soviets, the Titoites, the Americans, and so on.

Ben Bella is a typical present-day adventurer. He is a dubious character, a petty-bourgeois careerist and megalomaniac, ready to adopt any colour, a person who regards himself as "a great man of history," with not only Algerian, not only African, but world "perspectives." He dressed himself in the "toga" of the fighter without firing a shot, took advantage of the war to seize power and to become a "world figure," to follow the "road of Castro," etc.

Openly and secretly Ben Bella retained, developed and went on developing his connections with the French capitalists; he posed as a Khrushchevite and succeeded in getting from the Soviet revisionists the decoration "Hero of the Soviet Union," the Lenin Peace Prize and the Order of Lenin. All this shows the true aims of the Khrushchevites towards Ben Bella and Algeria. The Soviets did everything in their power to make Ben Bella their man and to this end they issued the directive to the Algerian revisionists to liquidate their communist party and place themselves under his orders. These "champions of the fight against the cult of the individual" supported the dictatorship of a bourgeois adventurer, intriguer and secret agent of imperialism. Hence, under the disguise of a certain amount of

aid and phoney social slogans, the Soviet revisionists sought, by means of Ben Bella and his men and to the detriment of the heroic Algerian people, to replace colonialist France in Algeria, to penetrate into Africa, to combat the revolution and Marxism-Leninism and to extract numerous advantages of all kinds. This was covered up ideologically with Ben Bella's declarations that he was "building socialism," a kind of socialism about which the French revisionist communists, such as Garaudy and others, began to concoct theories, describing it as a new form of "Islamic socialism."

Ben Bella became a close friend of Tito's and adopted the capitalist form of self-administration which, in the eyes of the revisionists, strengthened Ben Bella's "socialism." Tito boosted the personality of Ben Bella, built up his credit with the Soviets and the Americans, and set him up as an opponent to Nasser in the Arab League and in Africa. Hence, Ben Bella was a pawn for all the imperialists and the revisionists, a means of political blackmail in the hands of them all, while these savage beasts were rejoicing at the expense of the long-suffering Algerian people.

Castro considered Ben Bella his revolutionary double, and through him sought to penetrate into Africa, allegedly in order to activize "the struggle of the African peoples" for "socialism," as in Cuba.

Then, where was Algeria heading under Ben Bella? For disaster. Therefore, his overthrow is a positive act, irrespective of the forms in which it was done and who did it. It does not please the imperialists and revisionists. This shows that what was done was a good thing, therefore it should be

defended. What direction the country will take now depends on the progressive Algerian revolutionary forces, on the Algerian people, and the aid of the internationalist and revolutionary communist movement abroad.

Now, how far will Boumedienne and his group proceed on the revolutionary road? We do not know him, but he must be better than Ben Bella because he has fought and seems more modest. However, the basic question is what policy he is going to pursue and whether this policy will be supported by the masses of the Algerian people, will this policy be in the interests of the Algerian people, will it be a revolutionary policy? If so, if he takes this course, then the great difficulties on the question of the state power will be overcome, and the important internal and external problems which face the Algerian people today will be solved correctly on the revolutionary course. In addition to the internal difficulties and complications which were created for Algeria on the eve of liberation by the different political groupings in struggle with one another for power, there was the hostile work of Ben Bella, which resulted in new groupings, old and new feuds, all kinds of combinations of cliques, with different opinions and political sympathies.

In what way will Boumedienne harmonize these tendencies? On what will he base himself and to what extent will he rely on the creation of a unity of thought and action, to what extent will the true interests of the people be taken into account, how thorough-going will be the reforms of all kinds which have to be carried out in many directions —

this is the fundamental problem.

If Boumedienne and his associates establish and consolidate the alliance of the working class with the peasantry, that is, if they rely firmly on the people, with deeds and not with demagogy, if they have the army under their control and educate it to defend the true interests of the people and not of pro-imperialist bourgeois factions and combinations, if they strengthen the Front and make it a monolithic principled organization and not a field of intrigues and combinations, if they courageously carry out the agrarian reform and win the support of the poor peasantry, carry out bold social reforms and attack the foreign secret agency which is operating, without mercy or hesitation, then the Algerian revolution will be on the right course, the prestige of Algeria will be raised, and it will be able to foil the external intrigues and make the enemies respect it or fear to touch it.

A good example in this direction is socialist Albania. Although we were a small people, we emerged triumphant, while the Algerian people are bigger in numbers. The Algerians have difficulties, but we have had major difficulties, too, however we overcame them successfully, solely because we pursued a revolutionary course. They have many enemies, but our enemies were not and are not few even now, however, we have attacked them without mercy and routed them. We have had friends, have known how to choose and test them. Provided the Algerians know how to rely on their true friends, know how to distinguish true friends from false, know how to consolidate their alliances with their true friends, to benefit from their temporary alli-

ances and "friendships" without violating principles, know how to pursue a wise, dignified and principled policy, they will be able to defeat their external enemies and win good friends for Algeria.

The overthrow of Ben Bella took place before the 2nd Afro-Asian Conference, and this was a good thing, because at that conference Ben Bella would have created political capital for himself for new adventures and would have certainly created difficulties within the conference, would have played the game of the Khrushchevites, the French, the devil and his son inside it...

The Soviets counted heavily on him and, together with Tito, were basing their big gamble on this person. Now that he has fallen, the Khrushchevites are putting terrific pressure on the Algerians. This is clear to us. We can guess it even without knowing all the details. We have had bitter experience. We have had relations with the Soviet Union and know all about such things! If the Algerians like, they can learn vital lessons, from our experience! It is an open book. The big stick, used without fear, repels the dogs that bark and try to bite you. And since the Algerians are religious, let them learn from the saying, "The stick came from paradise."

The only way out is to fight back at the external and internal enemies with every means, this is the only way to have the people with you and to strengthen the independence and sovereignty of your homeland. If Boumedienne and his associates are good men, if they are revolutionaries and with the people, they must do this. With the Arab countries, of course, they must manoeuvre intelligently

because there are major differences in the stands they take. There are those who like them and those who do not like the new Algerian leaders, many are waiting, many are intriguing, many are hoping to make them their own "friends," their own "allies," in their specific Arab policy, whereas some others want to have them under their own leadership. The imperialists, the revisionists and other enemies, too, are awaiting the outcome of this business; in particular, they are operating behind the scenes through other Arab and African leaders, increasing their intrigues and promises according to the political gestures of these leaders. Some of them liked Ben Bella, because his game was in their interests, some did not like him, because they saw a threat to their power, to their prestige, a possibility of interference in the intrigues they hatched up repeatedly. Therefore, in this situation the Algerian leaders can manoeuvre successfully to emerge triumphant, provided they rely firmly on the people, and have the army under their control, strike hard where they ought to strike, manoeuvre where they ought to manoeuvre without violating principles, and provided they rely on their true and sincere friends, such as our people are.

We recognize the Boumedienne government and will assist our Algerian brothers on their revolutionary course with all our strength.

We shall carefully follow the development of events which are of great interest to all and will act consistently.

TUESDAY
FEBRUARY 28, 1967

NOTES FOR THE DELEGATION WHICH IS GOING TO EGYPT

The relations of Egypt with us on the plane of two states and two peoples.

1) **The traditional friendship between our peoples.** No disagreement either in the past or at present. Hence prospects to develop it.

2) **Mediterranean countries.** Our common interests require that the imperialist states of this zone or their allies should not violate our sovereign rights. The NATO bases, Israel, Cyprus.

3) **The historic importance of the Egyptian revolution against the monarchy and feudal lords, against the old and new colonialists** (Anglo-American).

4) **The world importance of the nationalization of the Suez Canal (this must be insisted on).** What it represents for us and the other peoples.

5) **On the policy of the Egyptian government within the country.** Naturally, we shall point out the positive and progressive aspects without prettification and without characterizing their ideological tendencies, **but as a result, our statements should serve the further strengthening of the friendship between our two peoples.**

6) On the foreign policy of the UAR we must stress most those aspects where, up to a point, we are of the one opinion in general, for example: the close and sincere friendship among the Arab coun-

tries, their unity against the ambitions of British and American imperialism and Soviet revisionism.

— The collaboration of the Arab peoples assists world progress.

a) **The vigilant stand of the UAR towards the new and old colonialists** is always greatly appreciated by our government; **also greatly appreciated is the support which the UAR gives the People's Republic of Albania** over the resolute stand of our people to defend their sovereignty, independence.

b) No problem on which our stand is contrary to theirs should be touched on and, of course, the problem of their objectionable ambitions towards others should not be touched on, either.

c) On the questions on which the UAR has had a proclaimed policy (towards Yugoslavia, Indonesia, India): If they ask direct questions then our opinion should be stated in the form of high level policy and backed with arguments.

(All these things come within the context of what we think of the policy of the UAR, presented in a way which will serve to strengthen our friendship).

7) **When we speak about our policy then the matter must be treated differently.**

a) We must speak warmly about friendship with the UAR, with the Arab peoples, the peoples of Africa and Asia, about the events in the Congo, Yemen, etc.

b) About the struggle against American imperialism, new and old colonialism, about peace.

c) Indonesia, Laos, Latin America.

d) Our attitude towards the Soviet revisionists. (Their main crimes as a state and the evil things

they have done against us.)

e) Our stand towards our neighbours (their evil doings against us, our struggle and our good neighbourly stand).

f) Our stands on world problems.

8) **Our excellent internal situation,** the progress in our country (this of course must not emerge as boasting, but as it is in reality), comparing it with the past, pointing out that the people themselves are building socialism with their own forces. Our people are pursuing their way of life, the socialist course they have chosen, successfully, and will always do so.

THURSDAY
MAY 25, 1967

THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST STRUGGLE OF THE ARAB PEOPLES IS JUST

Israel, a state spawned by imperialism and reactionary Zionism in the Near East, is like a pistol amidst the Arab peoples and states, in this zone of economic and military importance. This region has been a centre of clashes between British, French, American and various other imperialists. While oppressing the Arab peoples, trampling their freedom, independence, rights and sovereignty underfoot, all these wolves have mercilessly exploited the wealth of the countries which make up this region, and in order to perpetuate this exploitation they have built up a broad network of agents, some of whom they placed at the head of these peoples and defended with their colonial armies and their gunboat diplomacy. However, with the passage of time, through the struggle of the Arab peoples themselves, which is part of the general struggle against nazi-fascism yesterday and against imperialism today, these peoples won their freedom and independence, created and consolidated their sovereign states. Some of them, however, are headed by cliques of capitalists and medieval feudal lords, who not only keep their peoples under savage oppression, but are blind tools, sold out to the British and American imperialists. The king of Jordan, from a family traditionally agents of Britain, the former monarch and Imam of Yemen, the king of Saudi Arabia and others, are of this type.

Today Israel and Jordan are two allegedly independent states, but in reality they are two hotbeds of danger created by American and British imperialism, which hinder the Arab peoples in the development and strengthening of their independence.

Israel has continually provoked the Arab countries, has continually created armed border incidents, has attacked Egypt and Syria and has the tendency to expansion and domination. Recently it has provoked Syria and is preparing for war.

There is a smell of oil and gunpowder.

Whenever the interests of the imperialist monopolies in this zone are threatened, the provocateur Israel launches military actions. This is what occurred when the Suez Canal was nationalized by Egypt, this is what is occurring now when the interests of the Anglo-American monopolies and the routes to their oil concessions are threatened.

Herein, in the efforts of the big monopolies to plunder the wealth, especially the oil, of the Arab countries of the Middle East, lies the essence of the conflict between the imperialist powers and the Arab countries and peoples. Therefore, the struggle of the Arab peoples to throw off the savage political-economic yoke of imperialism as quickly as possible is just.

Egypt, Syria, Iraq and Algeria have risen against Israel and also against its allies. Will they come to grips? For known reasons this cannot be answered, but in any case, Egypt expelled the UNO troops, those international gendarmes who defended the Americans and Israeli's interests, from Sinai. It is threatening to blockade the Strait of Tiran which would leave Israel only one entry open,

that on the Mediterranean.

The American and British imperialists and the revisionist traitors are in diplomatic movement. All of them are waving the olive branch, all "wailing" about the defence of the freedom and independence of the peoples, all of them writing and sending telegrams and messages to this address or that, but all of them hide the truth that with all this deafening clamour, the American, British and French imperialists, the Soviet revisionists, the Titoites and the others, are defending nothing but their own dirty interests to the detriment of the Arab peoples.

Openly or behind the scenes, all of them are exerting and will go on exerting a thousand forms of pressure on the Arab countries, so that the latter retreat from the defence of their rights and capitulate! We shall see how this blackmail will end.

UNO and U Thant, Tito and Brezhnev continue to play their diabolical two-faced role, because they are afraid they are being exposed. Apparently, Tito has lost all credit in Nasser's eyes, since he is not making much noise on the basis of their former "friendship." Nasser has understood what Tito really is.

The Soviet revisionists, sometimes as allies of the Americans, sometimes as their rivals, will try to play the role of the two-faced intermediary, the role of arbiter between the Arabs and the Anglo-Americans, adjudicating on the proportions to which American and British interests should prevail. The vile role they are playing is obvious. Their main and only aim is to divide the spheres of influence, and to hinder the just national liberation and anti-imperialist wars of the Arab peoples.

We have defended and will continue to defend the just anti-imperialist cause of the Arab peoples who have seen, are seeing, and will see that small socialist Albania is not afraid of imperialists and revisionists and that it will always be a sincere and loyal friend of the Arab countries, in good times or bad.

TUESDAY
MAY 30, 1967

WE SUPPORT THE ARAB PEOPLES

Notes for an article

Support for the Arab peoples in their struggle against American imperialism and its tool, Israel, is important for the policy of our state because, regardless of the existing regimes, we support the Arab peoples and defend their independence and sovereign rights which are threatened by the American imperialists. We must support the Arab peoples because they have awakened and are proceeding towards the consolidation of their states. Today they live under democratic bourgeois regimes and some of them feudal. Their progressive sentiments are burgeoning, especially in the resistance they are organizing against the intrigues of and political and economic enslavement by foreigners.

Contradictions exist at present between Egypt and the Americans and it is clear that Nasser's correct action in connection with the expulsion of the UNO troops from Sinai and taking control of the Strait of Tiran has angered the Americans and the British, who are exerting pressure, but getting nowhere. On this issue Nasser won the unity of a number of Arab states, albeit only temporarily and on one issue. This, of course, can be considered a political defeat for the Americans and the British who, you might say, are left with Israel as their only firm foothold in this zone. For the time being it seems their struggle will be restricted to a struggle

of intrigues and pressures to disrupt the Arab unity which is being created and to break the encirclement of Israel. Later, if they triumph in these directions, they may raise their voices in opposition or undertake some adventure, but the adventure will cost them dear, therefore they are not rushing things. For the time being they will content themselves with keeping Israel undamaged.

The Soviets, too, are struggling for the same thing. In this direction they are collaborating with the American imperialists. Outwardly, of course, the Soviet revisionists pose as friends of the Arabs, but in reality they are striving for their own interests to the detriment of the Arab peoples.

However, the UAR and the other Arab countries know that the Soviets obstructed them and are advising moderation for the future. I believe that the Arabs themselves are cautious about this future moderation, otherwise this Soviet "advice" will cost them dear.

Our policy towards the Arabs is that they should see that we are their loyal friends who support them with all our might, even when things are going against them. And this they can understand. Nasser said so in his message to us. At the same time, our correct stand exposed the Soviets and the Titoites. The latter are saying nothing. Tito, once the "sincere friend" of the UAR, showed what he really is — a true friend of the Americans. Wherever the interests of the Americans are at stake, Tito keeps quiet or sides with them.

The UAR and the other Arab countries will not forget this just stand of ours and this has importance for us in the international arena.

TUESDAY
JUNE 6, 1967

A NEW WAR BETWEEN THE ARABS AND ISRAEL HAS BEGUN

Yesterday morning the war between the Arabs and Israel began. Each side is accusing the other of starting it. But without doubt Israel began the war.

It has made provocation its normal method. It committed provocations over the question of the Suez Canal and attacked first, even before its Anglo-French patrons. The Egyptians had nationalized the Canal and were, of course, in readiness.

The aims of the UAR and the other Arab states are known, because they have been declared openly. In fact Israel is a state created by imperialism and international Zionism, making use of the Israelite diaspora. No aims based on altruism or national sentiments impelled the British or American imperialists to create the state of Israel. Their aims were linked with their own predatory economic and strategic interests in the Middle East, to preserve their bases and to have a centre of diversion amongst the Arab states.

In these conditions the state of Israel was created, mostly with emigrants from Poland, the Ukraine, Romania and other countries, who joined the contingent of Jews born in the country.

The state of Israel is under the domination of Zionist and American reaction.

The aggressive tactic of Israel is typically like that of the Americans. They attacked first to break the "encirclement," to extend their borders and to

advance to the Suez Canal, the perpetual dream and ambition of imperialists. He who holds the Suez Canal holds Egypt, holds the key to a vital passage to three continents.

Our merchant ships, too, pass through the Suez Canal, but the liberation struggle of the UAR and the Arabs is a struggle of all of us not just for this reason alone.

Now we must follow the development of the fighting carefully and with vigilance. In the early stages Israel will have the large-scale but disguised assistance of the American and British air forces, which will attack the vital centres of the UAR and the other Arab countries without mercy.

On the other hand, there will be lots of resounding but worthless demagogy from the UNO, Moscow and the Vatican.

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 7, 1967

THE ISRAELIS ARE APPROACHING THE SUEZ CANAL

The aggressive military forces of Israel are approaching the Suez Canal and putting it in danger. The Egyptian military forces are retreating.

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 7, 1967

THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS LEFT THE ARABS IN THE LURCH

Undoubtedly, the Arabs were bound to taste the treachery of the Soviet revisionists. They have supplied the Arabs with obsolete fighting equipment and the Americans are fully informed about the Egyptians' military potential.

The Israelis struck what seems like a mortal blow at the Egyptian air force and, according to communiques, the Egyptians are withdrawing towards the Canal pursued by the Israeli forces. The American air force has given the Israelis powerful assistance because they, too, had losses. Nevertheless, they have someone who supplies them, long live Uncle Sam. As we foresaw, however, the Soviets have left the Arabs in the lurch, are not supplying them with aircraft, or supplying a few old "Mig-17s," which means "go and commit suicide in the sky."

An Egyptian ambassador sounded out one of our ambassadors by telling him that "the Egyptian government asked for the Soviet fleet to come out in the Mediterranean and the Soviets agreed to this, but said that 'we have nowhere to anchor except on the Albanian coast.'" Our ambassador gave him the proper reply.

It is possible that the Egyptian government will make this request, but we shall reject it and expose the aims of the Soviets. Yesterday I ordered the General Staff to be in complete readiness on the

coast for any unexpected eventuality from the Soviet revisionist bandits. Nothing must take us unawares. The guns and the torpedoes will come into action if they attempt any adventure; we will not allow them to touch the shores of Albania. Whoever attempts to do so will meet with death and defeat. Irrespective of these measures, however, I instructed the press to write two or three articles exposing the Soviets, as an indirect reply to Nasser, to cool his ardour, if he has in mind to make any such request of us.

The Security Council Resolution on a ceasefire, approved unanimously last evening under the full American-Soviet agreement, is a second Tashkent,[1] a betrayal by the Soviet revisionists, who make no distinction at all between the aggressor, Israel, and Egypt fighting for its sovereign rights in the Gulf of Aqaba. The Soviets are in full agreement with the Americans, but they are exposing themselves badly. Irrespective of the course this war takes and its outcome one thing is being gained from it: the United States of America and the Soviet revisionists are being unmasked, becoming hated and attacked by the peoples.

[1] In January 1966 the Soviet revisionists and the American imperialists, in agreement with each other, organized a "top-level meeting" of the representatives of Pakistan and India in this city of the Soviet Union. At the centre of the talks which were conducted under the patronage of the former Soviet prime minister, Kosygin, was the "settlement" of the Indian-Pakistani conflict which the Soviets themselves had incited, by hatching up and supporting the Indian aggression against Pakistan.

One thing is astonishing: the feeble defence of the UAR. It was shaken within one day. It seems to me the leaders of the UAR do more talking than genuine organizing, because the people are not lacking in courage. Now the 1956 attack on the Canal is being repeated point by point. At that time, too, the Egyptians were unorganized and alone. But now? What have they been doing during all this time?! Nevertheless, we defend the just cause of the Arab peoples. The closing of the Suez Canal by Egypt is causing us great damage, of course, and we don't know for how long...

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 7, 1967

THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS — BETRAYERS OF THE ARAB PEOPLES' CAUSE

The article "The Soviet Revisionists — Betrayers of the Arab Peoples' Cause"[1] has been sent to the newspaper "Zëri i popullit." The reason for the article is the approval by the Security Council of an anti-Arab resolution which calls for a ceasefire precisely when the Arab countries have been subjected to the military aggression of Israel. The Soviets, too, endorsed this resolution. In the article, we support the just struggle of the Arab peoples.

[1] Published on June 8, 1967 (Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 35, "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1982, p. 416, Alb ed.).

THURSDAY
JUNE 8, 1967

WHY THE SOVIETS ARE NOT HELPING THE UAR

Notes[1]

The Americans are supplying the Israelis with aircraft and are bombing the Arab forces with their own aircraft. The Soviets, those false and perfidious friends of the Arabs, are not supplying the UAR with aircraft, or themselves remain at the controls of the few they do supply.

Why? They are in complete agreement with the Americans.

They want the UAR and all the Arab peoples to bow their heads under the American-Soviet political, economic and military yoke.

The Soviets want to humiliate the UAR and take it into their sphere of influence, leaving the Anglo-Americans a free hand in Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, Yemen and elsewhere.

They want to quell the revolutions and liberation wars of the peoples of Africa, for which the Arab peoples are a considerable aid.

The Soviet revisionists have proved that they are capitulationists to the United States of America and saboteurs who try to quell the flames of just

[1] These notes were used for the article: "The Arab Peoples Will Continue the Struggle for Their Rights," published in the newspaper "Zëri i popullit" on June 11, 1967.

liberation wars.

The Khrushchevite revisionists betrayed Cuba and today are perpetrating a thousand and one dirty tricks against Cuba and the peoples of other Latin-American countries.

No, Arab peoples, put no trust in the revisionist traitors who have betrayed their own country so why should they not betray you.

Don't allow yourselves to become involved in their treacherous diplomatic combinations, because these are hatched up against you.

Don't accept the ceasefire. You will win, your valour is legendary. History will condemn your enemies and ours and we will bring about this terrible condemnation through ceaseless uncompromising struggle.

You triumphed in 1956 and Khrushchev's threat that he was allegedly going to attack the enemies of Egypt with missiles was a bluff. You yourselves won the war for the Canal with your determination and skill.

Khrushchev's gesture was false. Cuba proved this and the betrayal of Khrushchev's successors, who not only refuse to supply the Arab peoples with aircraft, but want to lure them into a trap as they are trying to do with Vietnam, also proves this.

Just liberation wars are not advantageous to the Soviet revisionists and the American imperialists, because they see in them the danger of their own exposure and death. Therefore, we, the peoples, must foil their diabolical plans. The revolution cannot be quelled and you Arab peoples, who are fighting now for the just cause of your freedom, independence and rights, are in revolution.

The revolution will wipe out our common enemies.

THURSDAY
JUNE 8, 1967

TITO, AN AGENT OF THE AMERICANS, FALSE FRIEND OF THE ARAB PEOPLES, HAS FOLDED HIS ARMS

I drafted some extended notes as the outline for an article which I think we should publish these days against the pro-imperialist and anti-Arab sabotage activity of the renegade Tito.[1]

— All Tito's clamour about his "friendship" towards the Arab peoples was a fraud from start to finish, but a fraud with predetermined aims.

— Tito, the old agent of the Anglo-Americans, had been charged by Washington with the mission of creating a "third force" and putting it in the service of the American imperialists.

— The aim of Tito and the Americans was that the free, independent and sovereign states which were fighting to consolidate their freedom won at the cost of bloodshed and sacrifice, should be subjugated politically, economically and militarily to the American neo-colonialists.

— Tito made boasts, engaged in trickery, summoned meetings and congresses, strutted like a fighting cock and posed as the friend of Nehru, Su-

[1] Published in the newspaper "Zëri i popullit" on June 13, 1967, under the title: "An Agent of the Americans and False Friend of the Arab Peoples" (Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 35, "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1982, p. 430, Alb. ed.).

karno, Nkrumah and President Nasser.

— Tito, under this disguise, all this time sounded out feelings, hatched up acts of sabotage and encouraged factions using two methods to achieve one aim, to get these states into the orbit of the Americans, either through treachery and illusions or through putsches and counter-revolution. With the former method the Americans succeeded in getting India under their dictate. With the latter the white generals overthrew Sukarno of Indonesia. In Ghana the conspirators organized a putsch under the direction of the Americans and overthrew Nkrumah. In all these events the role of Tito was that of an agent provocateur and organizer of putsches in favour of the Americans.

— That left President Nasser and the UAR. Here the plans of Tito and the Americans came unstuck. They were unable to deceive Nasser, to lure him into a trap, or to overthrow him.

— Tito began to cool off towards Nasser, who understood that Tito was a perfidious liar who hatched up plans to the detriment of the UAR and other peoples. In the UAR Tito's diabolical game was unmasked. There the Americans did not have the success they had in Indonesia and Ghana. So they temporarily discontinued playing the card of Tito and played the card of Moshe Dayan, the card of Israel, instead. The UAR and the Arab peoples were becoming a threat to American and British imperialism and that is why this time they employed not the Titoite diversion, but the armed attack of Israel.

— The facts and history have confirmed what our Party has been saying for decades on end, that

Titoism is nothing but an agency of the Americans...

— The United States of America, with its demagogic slogan about the "third force" succeeded in getting some countries under its domination, into its clutches. But the firm opposition of the Arab peoples to the American-Israeli imperialist aggression was a significant fact in this direction; it foiled the demagogy of the "third force" in an important zone.

— The United States of America has put the modern revisionists, headed by the Soviet revisionists, in its service, as the "second force," and together they have undertaken to deceive and enslave the peoples and to impose the law of two superpowers on the world.

— However, the peoples have risen to their feet and are fighting. The Arab peoples have risen against American imperialism and reaction, against Tito's employer. And Tito, cowering in his royal palaces in Brioni, is hiding his head like an ostrich, waiting for the first storm to blow over.

FRIDAY
JUNE 9, 1967

THE ARAB PEOPLES ARE FREEDOM-LOVING FIGHTERS

Yesterday the ceasefire with Israel was imposed on Egypt. In practice the war came to an end after the aggressive armies of Israel, powerfully supported by American imperialism and indirectly by Soviet social-imperialism, occupied the bank of the Suez Canal. Now the Egyptian people will suffer more than ever. The imperialist and revisionist powers will impose enslaving conditions on Egypt and divide their spheres of influence. The Soviet revisionists in Egypt and the Anglo-Americans in the other countries of the Orient will implant their claws as deeply as possible in the Arab countries.

We must continue to defend the fraternal Arab peoples in these difficult days. The Soviet revisionists openly played the dirty role of partners of American imperialism. In all their activity they assisted the Israeli aggressor and demoralized, discouraged and threatened the UAR.

The Soviet-American joint resolution taken in the Security Council solely on a ceasefire, without defining the aggressor, without condemning the United States of America and Britain for their joint aggression, and without demanding the withdrawal of the Israeli troops, is complete confirmation of the Soviet-American agreement. The demand of the Security Council for a ceasefire when Israel had achieved its predetermined objectives, meant the "capitulation of Egypt." And that is what it is. This

is a great lesson for the revolutionary peoples, which shows, first of all, that you must fight valiantly to the end yourself and, above all, have confidence in the strength of your own people and your own organization. This does not mean underestimation of internationalist aid (the genuine reliable aid of friends).

The Soviet revisionists behaved treacherously with the Arab peoples, just as they did with the Congo, Cuba and Santo Domingo. They will do the same thing with everybody, their line is clearly anti-revolutionary, capitulationist and imperialist. In the future the Soviets will become open aggressors[1] and no longer operate under disguise as they are trying to do at present. That is where the logic of their treachery will lead them.

In these difficult and complicated international situations for the peoples, China is not at all in order. It is in anarchy, in disorder, in civil war. The peoples throughout the world are indignant because they cannot have the support they ought to from China. China only wants you to say that "Mao Zedong leads all the revolutionaries in the world." In fact, however, he is unable to bring the counter-revolutionaries within his own country under control. When you cannot establish order internally, then how are you going to assist others, let alone claim to be "leading the world revolution"! This is very unfortunate, a big minus, but facts are facts.

Mao and the other Chinese leaders must make

[1] On August 21, 1968 the Soviet revisionists occupied Czechoslovakia and on December 27, 1979 occupied Afghanistan, both by armed force.

a change immediately, must abandon the tactic of sitting on the fence, because their stand is harming China and the whole world.

The enemies are making the most of this situation. I have the impression that the Chinese are not realistic and lack political wisdom, let alone skill. They give the impression that, and indeed say, "this will be protracted, we have time, the whole world has its eyes on us, they will turn to us, we are doing our work but this work will take a century, three centuries, and we can wait"! What a philosophy! There is nothing Marxist about it. The Chinese are our comrades, but we cannot accept these activities, these boastful and unfounded pretensions. We have told them of our opinions frankly, have made criticisms of them, but I have the impression that they do not like this.

Their ambassador here is following in the footsteps of his predecessors. He maintains no contact with us, does not come to ask us anything or allow us to ask him, and I think that he does not come for fear that we will ask what is going on in China, how things are going there, etc.

They make no attempt at all to keep in touch with Albania, their only ally. What is the explanation for this? There is no explanation other than that philosophy which I mentioned above. However, this is not right, neither in order nor comradely. Such a stand also blocks the way to more open talks and exchange of opinions on many acute problems of the international situation, which is not "marvellous," as the Chinese claim, and does not permit one to refuse to take a stand.

This has not stopped and will not stop us from

taking courageous and correct stands on everything. We shall fight on to victory against any enemy, will fight even if we have to stand alone. The Chinese are well aware of this, but this is not enough.

I admire and respect the Arab peoples because they are progressive, freedom-loving and militant. They have fought for their freedom and independence against imperialist colonizers. This defeat which they have suffered will be a great lesson to them, because they will be even better acquainted with the imperialists and their new games and tricks, and recognize the Soviet, Titoite and other modern revisionists even more clearly as betrayers of the peoples. These peoples will discard many of the illusions which have been created among them and the lies which others have told them. Their misfortunes will temper them. They will not lay down their arms. This is a temporary defeat. **The revolution is advancing and will forge ahead amongst the Arab peoples, in Africa and elsewhere.**

Hence, with all our might forward to the revolution! These defeats do not dishearten us, one must reckon on some defeats in revolution. They can never stop the revolution. The enemies are being exposed and defeated through our struggle and these sporadic victories they score automatically expose the ferocity and decay of the imperialists and revisionists.

The temporary defeat of the Arabs exposed the Americans, the Soviets, the British and their lackeys in the eyes of the peoples. Hence, this is a gain for the revolution and it will bring bigger gains tomorrow.

SATURDAY
JUNE 10, 1967

NASSER OFFERED HIS RESIGNATION AND THEN WITHDREW IT

Nasser's resignation is another retreat like that of his army before the pressure of the Israeli enemies. Is this resignation impelled by despair over the defeat, or is it the result of the internal pressure from his opponents? We shall see. Perhaps it is the result of both. However, his speech to the people, apart from other things, includes his admission of the military defeat and his excuses. Of course, these excuses have some basis in that Israel was assisted by the Americans and the British who were in cahoots with the Soviets. He said this openly. He speaks of the pressure from Kosygin, who told him not to attack first, because Israel was not going to attack. The fact is, however, that Israel attacked the UAR. The excuses about the surprise and the failure to take the necessary measures do not hold water. At the same time, the resignation linked with his past "revolutionary" activities brought about what Nasser was aiming at in his speech: the masses rose in demonstrations in his favour, the assembly was hastily summoned and did not accept his resignation. He withdrew it. I think that this was a good thing. Those who would have succeeded him would have been men of compromise, men of the Americans, the British and the Soviets.

Nasser fought also against the supporters of the

Israelis and got a bloody nose. He will not forget this defeat and will try to restore his personal honour. This does not mean that he will not come to terms with them later, but he has some pride...

It is important that he has recognized what the Soviets are, declares that they betrayed him, and now he will be more prudent and exigent towards them. The Soviets will have to pay a higher price.

It is important that Nasser should resist. The more he resists, the more the Soviet revisionists will expose themselves.

The revisionists met yesterday in Moscow, together with Tito. Today they issued a feeble communique which exposed them even more. The Soviet embassies in Algiers and Cairo are being attacked; in Algiers the crowds shout: "Kosygin resign." Kosygin won't resign, but the Soviet revisionists are being badly exposed. This is a victory...

We will continue to give the Arab peoples all possible aid.

MONDAY
JUNE 12, 1967

LESSONS WHICH EMERGE FOR THE ARAB PEOPLES

The Israeli attack on the Arab countries brought out very clearly the state of the armies of those countries of the Middle East. They are not properly organized armies and very far from being people's liberation armies. They were smashed by the Israeli army which, as a weapon of the Zionist bourgeoisie, proved to be more organized, stronger, more disciplined, with a better fighting spirit than those of the Arab countries, which, taken together, greatly outnumber it...

The defeat also highlighted the lack of any real unity between the different Arab states in the Middle East. Although the sense of being Arabs and the Muslim religion link them together, this has not been enough to establish unity among them. The alliances and friendships between Arab states have been sporadic, temporary, formal and momentary. The imperialists, through their agents, have done much to encourage this state of affairs in order to impede and damage Arab unity.

Of course, following the liberation of these peoples, the imperialists cannot operate with their intrigues as they did previously. Nevertheless, through their tools, they are operating continuously, directly or indirectly, to weaken the Arab unity which has begun to be felt as a necessity in the face of the efforts of imperialism to maintain the old "divide and rule" policy. Imperialism is

aware of this danger and that is why it attacked by means of Israel.

On the other hand, Israel, as a reactionary bourgeois state, is compact and well-organized for aggressive war. Irrespective of their internal contradictions, in face of the "Arab threat," the Israelis are compact. At all times and in everything they turn their attention to the "defence" of their state and leave no opportunity unexploited in their own interest.

The imperialists are well pleased with this line of Israel, which they nurture and assist, and have this state like a loaded pistol in their belts and fire it whenever they need, as the gangsters they are.

This defeat will teach the Arab states many lessons, first of all, about the need to build up the unity they desire against their common enemy, imperialism. Of course, from the very nature of the order of these states, this will not be achieved immediately, but the fact is that this time certain initial premises for it were achieved — all took part in the war, broke off diplomatic relations with the United States of America and Britain, cut off oil supplies to them, etc. If the Americans and Soviets impose a new Munich on the Arabs in favour of Israel, then the Arabs will become even angrier and the war will continue, the preparations for new attacks will continue and the unity of the Arab peoples against the imperialists and the revisionists will be prepared better.

TUESDAY
JUNE 13, 1967

THE REVISIONIST PALAVER WILL NOT DECEIVE THE ARAB PEOPLES

On June 9, the top leaders of the revisionist countries of Europe met in Moscow to examine "the situation in the Near East." The statement published after this meeting is evidence of their disgraceful capitulation to imperialism and reaction and their sabotage of the just struggle of the Arab peoples.

We sent an article on this to the newspaper "Zëri i popullit." It carries the title, "The Revisionist Palaver will not Deceive the Arab Peoples."[1] It will be published tomorrow.

Amongst other things the article points out:

— By coming out now with a bombastic statement about the Middle East the Brezhnev-Kosygin clique and those who follow them are trying to stop the rising tide of anti-revisionist hatred which is developing and assuming ever greater proportions day by day in all the Arab countries. They want to present themselves as innocent, pretend that they are going to do something in the future, that they are friends of the Arab countries, that they are anti-imperialists and so on and so forth. But this is a hopeless attempt.

— The Arab peoples are already convinced

[1] "Zëri i popullit," June 14, 1967 (Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 36, "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1982, p. 437, Alb. ed.).

from their bitter experience how much such "friends" are worth. And this experience has to do not only with what has occurred these days, but also with the future stands and aims of the Soviet revisionist leadership which wants to take advantage of the suffering of the Arab peoples to strengthen its collaboration and become a partner with the other great power or else to place itself on behalf of the Arab peoples at the head of the coming diplomatic and political struggle for the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

— The Arabs, like all honest people in the world cannot fail to see that the Khrushchevite revisionists have degenerated into unprincipled politicians who trample over the vital interests of the peoples, who buy and sell you like any ordinary commodity in the market. The betrayal by the Soviet leaders has been grave for the Arab peoples and has caused them major damage. On the other hand, however, it has also done them a good service — it has shown the peoples how wrong and dangerous it is to base even the slightest hope on the revisionists.

SATURDAY
JUNE 17, 1967

THE GUNBOAT POLICY OF THE AMERICAN AND SOVIET NAVAL FLEETS IN THE MEDITERRENEAN

Addition to the speech[1] which our representative will deliver at this year's session of the UNO

The Government of the People's Republic of Albania presents the issue and asks the Assembly of the United Nations a question: Why has the American war fleet come to prowl like an ogre around the Mediterranean, this region of peoples with an ancient civilization? What does it want in the Mediterranean and what is it doing there? Whom is it defending and from whom? What is the present Soviet revisionist leadership after in the Mediterranean, where it has part of its naval fleet deployed at this moment? What is it, too, doing there? Whom is it seeking to defend and from whom?

The imperialist and revisionist governments do not hesitate to describe both these naval fleets as "fleets of peace," "for the defence and security of the peoples," etc., etc. We can assert without the slightest error that, on the contrary, these fleets are sowing war, threatening the free, sovereign peoples

[1] This speech was held at the Special Session of the General Assembly of the UNO on June 26, 1967 and published in the newspaper "Zëri i popullit" on June 28, 1967.

and applying the gunboat policy to suppress the freedom of the peoples, to divide the spheres of influence and to share the booty which results from every plot which they hatch up to the detriment of other peoples.

We can assert, likewise, that the alliance between the Americans and the Soviets is so clear that if there were women on board their warships they would organize balls on the decks every night, at a time when the peoples throughout the world are fighting for freedom and their sons are dying on the battlefields.

We ask the question: Which are the states of the Mediterranean basin that are threatening Italy, Greece, France, Spain and so on? Moreover, some of the latter are linked with the NATO alliance. Can it be that Algeria, Albania, Morocco, Libya, Tunisia, Egypt, Syria, or Lebanon is threatening those countries? Ancient and very recent history provides the answer to who has been the victim and who the aggressor.

We ask a further question: Does not France have a fleet adequate to defend its own shores, and Spain, Italy, Greece and so on, likewise? Of course they have, indeed very much more than they need.

Then, what is the American 6th Fleet doing in the Mediterranean? It is there as a watchdog for aggression and to back up aggression and war.

No, American imperialists, you will not deceive any people or any honest government, which defends the interests of its own homeland and people, with your phoney olive branch, with your blood-stained demagogy.

Perhaps you will say that you are defending

yourselves against the Soviet Union in the Mediterranean, but you are close friends and allies with the present leaders of that country.

You know full well that the so-called aid of the Soviet revisionist leaders for the peoples of the Mediterranean basin is a great hoax. It is fair to say that the Soviet revisionist imperialists have the same aims as you towards the peoples of the world, and, particularly, towards the freedom-loving peoples of Albania and the Arab countries, and it is quite clear that you are fighting to suppress us and to put us in thrall. But you will not achieve this aim. Our peoples will defeat you. You are terribly afraid of your own peoples, that is why you have these weapons and these fleets to protect yourselves also from your own peoples who, together with us, will one day exact a fully deserved retribution from you.

We must make it publicly clear to you, American imperialists and Soviet revisionists, that you are unable to intimidate anybody, least of all those peoples who have shed their blood through the centuries in order to live free, and who, to this day, are determined to triumph again or to die fighting. One of these heroic and indomitable peoples has been and is the Albanian people. At no time will you catch us unawares. Not only have you never caught us unawares and never will, but neither has the treachery of Khrushchev or his lieutenants taken us by surprise.

The bandit Nikita Khrushchev, together with his associates, tried to strangle the new socialist Albania. He hatched up plots together with the 6th Fleet and the Greek Venizelos to partition Albania,

he tried to occupy the port of Vlora, he stole our submarines, and in the end even broke off diplomatic relations and established his savage blockade against new Albania.

The Albanian people, their Party and government, struck him such a terrible blow that it put him in his grave.

Anyone, whoever he may be, who dares to attack Albania, on his own or with accomplices, will suffer the same fate. Albania knows how to defend itself, knows how to fight and win. The sacred borders and ports of our Homeland are inviolable, they belong to us and to no one else. Whoever tries to lay hands on them will meet his death.

You should not think, either, Messrs. American imperialists, that Albania is isolated and alone. If the borders of Albania are touched a major conflict will ensue. And you, too, Messrs. Soviet revisionists, who from Radio Moscow drop hints and make appeals to Albania for unity with you in face of the imperialist threat, we tell you that we reject this friendship of yours with disgust, because we know from experience how you tried to stab us in the back. The Arab peoples and other peoples, also, have bitter experience of this so-called friendship.

Nevertheless, we have solemnly declared and we repeat that we are loyal friends forever with the fraternal Soviet peoples. They have never betrayed and never will betray any people, let alone the Albanian people whom they love and respect. The Soviet peoples will condemn you mercilessly and irrevocably.

The imperialist powers that hear the delegate of a small but indomitable people speaking here

openly, fearlessly, without kid-gloves and not in carefully chosen diplomatic terms, declare that this is a hardline speech and that the Albanian delegate is preaching in the desert.

I am not threatening anyone with atomic bombs, with napalm, or with naval fleets.

Likewise, gentlemen, I am not preaching in the desert. It is you who are isolated, not we. We are the majority here, we are the overwhelming majority in the world. We are those who smashed Italian and German fascism, we are the immortal heroes of Vietnam, Algeria, the Congo, Cuba, Latin America, China and Pakistan, the heroes of the Arab peoples, of the peoples of Asia and Africa, the heroes of the enslaved peoples of Europe and the whole world.

Therefore we will triumph over you, you will never defeat us.

WEDNESDAY
JULY 5, 1967

TRAGI-COMEDY AT UNO

The United Nations Organization has become an arena where many intrigues are hatched up to the detriment of the peoples, where treachery, pressure, blackmail, threats, cynicism, deception and many other evil means are employed without scruple.

All these things are personified, first of all, in the American imperialists and Soviet revisionists. **These two gangs of modern brigands have turned UNO into a field of intrigues to the detriment of the peoples, have made it a pseudo-juridical labyrinth of "international law," a demagogic cover for the ugly crimes of imperialists and revisionists.** Effectively, the meetings of the UNO have no value, they serve only to keep up appearances, because everything is done in the corridors. At public meetings you can frequently see the Kudchenkos and the Goldbergs hurling bombastic words at one another in a stage-managed "fight," but behind the scenes, after the performance, the "enemy brothers" are all sugar and honey!

Such a tragedy was played in recent times in this organization of "united" nations over the question of the Arab-Israeli war. The Israeli aggression is already known to the whole world, and those who urged and directly aided this aggression are known, too. Likewise, the treachery of the revisionists is recognized. After stabbing the Arabs in the back, the Soviet revisionists were obliged to do what they

could to enhance their lost prestige through demagogy. **During the period of the Israeli aggression, all the peoples of the world saw once again the dirty face of the Soviet revisionist capitulators, saw more clearly once again that the revisionists are friends of the American imperialists. The peoples saw that the United States of America acts, attacks, enslaves, while the Soviet revisionists beat the drum to conceal the aggression under the din.**

In order to compensate for the discredit which they suffered in betraying the Arabs during the Israeli aggression, the Soviet revisionists, "fuming with wrath and indignation" against Israel and the Americans, took the problem to UNO. "That is where the Americans will see what they can expect from us," trumpeted the revisionists, and "big brother" Kosygin set out for New York with all his "pots and pans," not forgetting to take along Zhivkov and Tsedenbal. All of them are rushing to the halls of UNO like the heroes of the legends in "defence" of the unfortunate Arabs. They are sharpening their swords, but they are made of cardboard.

Kosygin jumped up and walked out of the UNO chamber, because his close friend, Johnson, was awaiting him in Glasboro.[1] The whole affair took place in Hollybush, and what an affair it was! With smiles, with handshakes between criminals, murderers and colonialists, with secret meetings tête-à-tête.

The culmination of treachery and cynicism. Co-

[1] The imperialist deals between Johnson and Kosygin, arranged at this place in the United States of America, were held from 23 to 26 June, 1967.

lossal derision for the Arab peoples! Colossal derision for the peoples of the world! Derision for the UNO which waited for the solution to emerge from the "supreme will" of Hollybush, the star of Bethlehem. But at the United Nations Organization the speech of the delegation of our Government whistled over the heads of imperialists, revisionists and aggressors like a well-aimed bullet, and by unmasking the plots of the enemies of mankind, the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists, gave courage to the delegations of other small countries. Speaking with respect for small but indomitable Albania, friends and enemies said that "Such a strong, courageous and forthright speech had not been heard at UNO for 20 years on end."

At UNO the Soviet revisionists capitulated politically, too. For their part, the main aim of calling the UNO meeting was so that Kosygin and Johnson would meet, while the Arab question was a matter of no importance for the Americans or for the Soviets and, in fact, it was left up in the air: the Soviets and the Americans withdrew their resolutions. The henchmen of the two great powers both brought out stale alternative resolutions, neither of which was adopted. But this was precisely the whole aim: nothing was to be solved, the question was to be dragged out and handed over to the Security Council. During this period the Americans strengthen and consolidate the positions won through aggression in the Middle East, and the extinguishers of revolutions, the Soviet revisionists, work on the Arabs from the other side to suppress any uprising of them against the two main coloniz-

ers.

For the moment the Arabs are defeated and stunned and, in order to save themselves from drowning, they are clutching at any twig proffered to them and are still not grasping their solid support. They see this support, but time will be needed, the peoples of these countries will have to rise in order to say "Enough!" to intrigues and perfidy. We are convinced that this day will come. Our stands have had a great effect, especially in the Arab world. Everywhere the Arabs say: "You Albanians are our faithful brothers, you alone are loyal and brave friends, you are an example to us."

On this issue Romania adopted a stand as despicable and provocative as that of the Soviets. Maurer went to Johnson and de Gaulle, and tried to imitate Kosygin. This wretched politician went even further: after he returned from the West, he asked to go to China and the Chinese accepted him.

The Chinese leaders know nothing about politics. Either they do not know how to apply the principles properly or they violate them deliberately. On no account should Maurer have been received in Beijing, because he is the representative of a clique of renegades and the Chinese proclaim that they are against renegades. Besides this, he proved himself an enemy of the Arabs at a time when the Chinese declare that they defend the Arab cause. He also went to Johnson and kissed his hand at a time when the Chinese say they are sworn enemies of the Americans.

However, the culmination of the Chinese political short-sightedness was achieved when, allegedly to avoid giving importance to Maurer's dele-

gation, they gave it colossal importance in fact by not welcoming him publicly at the airport, by not publishing any report that Maurer had gone to Beijing, by shrouding this visit in mystery, at a time when everything ought to be clear and open. This is precisely what Maurer wants: let everything be shrouded in mystery, in suppositions, in order to lower the prestige of China and to imply to the world, "See, China is conspiring, too."

Such actions are suicidal for the Chinese. They must put an end as quickly as possible to this situation which is being contrived and used by the enemies. As always we shall point out to the Chinese these impermissible mistakes which they are making.

MONDAY
OCTOBER 7, 1968

NOTES ON THE SPEECH WHICH OUR REPRESENTATIVE WILL DELIVER AT THIS YEAR'S SESSION OF THE UNO

The situation in the world is developing steadily in favour of the peoples' liberation and the revolution. The imperialist world, with American imperialism at the head, and modern revisionism, headed by Soviet revisionism, this new imperialism, are in a profound political, economic and military crisis. They pose as world superpowers and are trying to intimidate the world and the peoples with their weapons, with their economic power and with their intrigues. But the peoples, who are opposed to them, are the decisive force in the world. The peoples have risen, are rising, or will rise and will strike ever more devastating blows at this handful of bloodsuckers, pirates and blackmailers. Proof of this can be seen in the liberation struggles on all continents, which will never be quelled. Some of these struggles seem to be suppressed, but they flare up again even more furiously. Evidence of this can be seen in the strikes and struggles of the workers and peasants in every capitalist country, in the rising tide of protests by the youth and students all over the world, who are fearlessly and ceaselessly attacking the crumbling capitalist fortress everywhere, and in the revolts of revolutionary blacks inside the citadel of American imperialism.

The revolution is advancing and there is no force which can stop it. Neither the talks and agreements at Glasboro, nor the future meetings and agreements of imperialist and revisionist chiefs, and their secret and open plans will alter matters in their favour. Everything will go against their desires and actions and in favour of the genuine freedom and independence of the peoples. New, great, sensational and final defeats are in store for the imperialists and revisionists.

You, Messrs. American imperialists and Soviet revisionists, are well aware that the words of the representative of a small people are not spoken in vain, here in the Assembly, and even less outside the Assembly, amongst the peoples of the world, because hundreds and hundreds of millions of others are saying what we are saying here, and we are in solidarity against you with all those millions on all continents, to the end. But even here, in the Assembly, you Messrs. American imperialists and Soviet revisionists, have only the outward appearances, the facade, of most of the delegates, while we have the hearts of all those patriotic democrats of their countries to whom the great cause of the people is dear. We fight for their living hearts, you hold their corpses.

In the introduction to his annual report, the General Secretary, U Thant, made the proposal that the so-called Big Four should meet to arrange peace in the world, etc. Everyone has the right to make proposals and we do not deny this right to the General Secretary of the United Nations. But we oppose this inappropriate proposal of the General Secretary, made precisely on the eve of the opening

of the General Assembly.

We ask the General Secretary: Which has the greater value, the meeting of the Assembly, or that of four of its members?

We ask the General Secretary: Why is this Assembly meeting? Is it not meeting to examine and solve the most important international problems, and does this Assembly not have the strength to control two or three powers which have trampled on the Assembly and the rights of the peoples?

Why, Mister Secretary, did you have to set the tone with the proposal which you made before opening the Assembly, that everything depends on the four and not on the one hundred and twenty-five? Do you think, Mister General Secretary, that what the two great powers are doing in the Assembly, in the Security Council, in the corridors, at Camp David, at Glasboro, to the detriment of the Assembly and the peoples, are minor matters?

We would be in agreement with you if you were to come out here and speak openly from this tribune, telling the Americans to get out of Vietnam, telling the Soviets to get out of Czechoslovakia, telling the Israeli aggressors to get out of the occupied Arab territories, and the American and Soviet imperialists to get out of their aggressive, land and sea bases in foreign territories. You may say that diplomats do not speak in these terms, but the American and Soviet rifles, aircraft and tanks do not speak in diplomatic terms, either. However, there is one thing of which I am convinced, that the fraternal people of Burma, whom we love and respect, speak in the same way as we do on this question.

We, who have gathered here as representatives of our respective countries, call ourselves the "United Nations." In fact, we are not united, but divided.

The "United Nations" is considered universal. This is not true at all. Every year the imperialist powers do everything possible and exert disgraceful pressure to keep major nations and states of the world out of the United Nations by scandalous methods.

On the basis of the Charter, all of us present here have the right to speak as long as we like, as we like and when we like. This is the appearance, while in the case of many democratic delegates, patriots of their own countries, their hearts speak one way and their mouths another, not through any fault of theirs, not from lack of courage or firm democratic and anti-imperialist beliefs, but because of the disgraceful pressure exerted by imperialists and revisionists.

The imperialists of the United States of America and the Soviet revisionist imperialists dominate the "United Nations," dominate the stage and behind the scenes, not only in this chamber, but from top to bottom of the Glass Palace and wherever this organization operates.

Representatives of peoples and states speak here, make suggestions, criticize, denounce aggressors against peoples, raise problems vital to mankind, but the two imperialist powers and those who follow them in their criminal deeds make the law here and strive, although in vain, to impose their barbarous laws on the peoples of the world outside the organization, too.

Here, we listened to the speech of Dean Rusk, the representative of blood-stained American imperialism. That speech could deceive no one. Rusk defends the power of American imperialism in the world, defends the enslavement of peoples, defends cruel imperialist predatory wars. He represents the policy of blackmail and the threat of a third world war, takes into consideration only the joint actions with the Soviet revisionists for the division of spheres of influence in the world and the preparation of a third world war undertaken jointly with the Soviet Union against the freedom-loving and sovereign peoples. Dean Rusk made the barest mention of Czechoslovakia, about which his partner in sinister actions, the foreign minister of the Soviet Union, Gromyko, did not deign to reply to him.

But what did Gromyko say? The American imperialist press described it as "a speech in a very moderate tone," while the world capitalist press described it as "a conciliatory speech."

Of course, both of them were aiming at one point: to consolidate their alliance and to calm their partners in NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, respectively. They have to create the atmosphere among their partner cliques that the Soviet-American alliance is strong; must create the feeling among them that their salvation depends solely on the greatest possible submission to the United States of America and the Soviet Union, must convince them that the danger which threatens them comes from the revolution, the peoples' national liberation struggles, the broad democratic masses of the people and the powerful world proletariat.

Both before and after he spoke, Gromyko met Rusk and talked and ate with him like a friend or brother. With the greatest counter-revolutionary shamelessness he told us here in the Assembly, in other words: "You can make speeches in this hall, but Rusk and I decide everything elsewhere." And from this hall we tell Rusk and Gromyko that there are very few who believe their words, and while they may take decisions outside, the revolutionary peoples of the world will smash their plans. The peoples will triumph, socialism will triumph, imperialism and revisionism will be smashed.

The imperialists and revisionists speak many bombastic words about peace, democracy, freedom, a world without weapons, without wars.

We have the duty to raise our voice and make every honest person in the world aware that American imperialism and Soviet revisionism are preparing for a third world war, meanwhile they need limited local wars in order to suppress the peoples and divide their spheres of influence.

Peoples, we must be vigilant! Either we have to accept the heavy enslavement of new fascists, or we must prepare for struggle against them. The Albanian people have fought against political and social enslavement through the centuries. They are ready and armed to reply blow for blow to any aggression and to triumph over any aggressor.

Each people knows its own duty and the measures which must be taken in these threatening situations, but we are convinced that the peoples cannot be deceived by the imperialists and the revisionists, who are already armed to the teeth and continue to arm themselves, when they say, "You

disarm because we are defending you." In other words, "Become our slaves, because we will defend your freedom, independence and sovereignty." This means to invite the wolf to guard your sheep.

A typical example is the speech of the representative of Czechoslovakia, the talented democratic and progressive people of which has recently been martyred by new invaders who, quite shamelessly, without even attempting to disguise the fact, make the law not only there, but even here, in this chamber. The Czechoslovak representative mounted this rostrum, concealed the feelings of his heart, and speaking with the tongue of the invader, attempted to persuade us not to speak about the rights, the freedom, the independence, the sovereignty of Czechoslovakia and socialism in that country, because the interests of the occupier, Yakubovsky, require him to do this. No! Neither Yakubovsky, nor his artillery, nor even his atomic missiles can close the mouths of us Albanians. The Albanian people will ardently defend their own rights and freedom, and those of other peoples of the world.

The two imperialist powers, the United States of America and the revisionist Soviet Union, have not only divided the world into their spheres of influence, but have coordinated their strategy and tactics. They are both acting intensively, wherever and as much as they can, to gain control of the world markets, to exploit peoples barbarously, to put them under their economic domination and to fleece and exploit them to the bone. This is the new colonialism. Any so-called aid or credit from them also has the character of economic and political

subjugation. Any resistance by the people or their national democratic leaders is attacked with arms or suppressed by putsches hatched up by the new colonialists.

The United States of America and the revisionist Soviet Union combine in such operations which are carried out, not only individually, but on a continental scale. The attack on the great Arab revolutionary movement was done in a combined way, with arms by the Americans and Israelis, while the Soviets stood by and watched.

Now the Soviets are allegedly assisting the Arab peoples with weapons to liberate their territories. This is a hoax. The aim of the Soviet revisionists, in agreement with the American imperialists, is to keep the progressive and revolutionary impulse of the Arab peoples under control. The Soviet Union is not a friend of the Arab peoples, but, like the American imperialists in the Near East, is striving to establish its own influence in that zone. When the Arab peoples decide to go ahead to win their legitimate rights, you may be sure that they will find themselves confronted by the Soviet revisionists, as well as by their longstanding enemies.

The Soviet revisionists, too, are imperialists. They are opposed to the unity of the Arab peoples. They have the same motto as the others: "Divide and rule." We love the Arab peoples. We know the Soviet revisionists and their aims only too well and, like the Arab leaders, we are well aware of the threats which Nikita Khrushchev made against them. They should never trust his disciples who hide the dagger under the cloak of their "aid."

On the South American continent the Soviet re-

visionists and their local lackeys preach coexistence with the cliques in power, while American imperialism attacks the revolution, which is seething everywhere, with weapons. The one disarms the revolution ideologically, the other attacks it militarily.

In Vietnam the Soviet revisionists advocate shameful capitulation, while the Americans carry out bombardments day and night and are extending the war, etc.

MONDAY
JANUARY 6, 1969

THE MIDDLE EAST — A HOT ZONE

The Middle East is populated by various peoples and tribes. They all call themselves Arabs, but do not all have the same origin. The religion that allegedly unites them is Islam, but an Islam divided into various sects of ancient origin which have fought one another for centuries, caused bloodshed among the peoples and became the banners of various leaders in medieval and modern times and, indeed, in our time. Today, the religion which still inspires these peoples in the Middle East, does not present itself so divided by the sects, although these exist and have their followers. There is, you might say, a certain coexistence among them under the general cover of the Muslim religion. However, modern development, the spread of materialist ideas and science, have greatly weakened the influence of religion and have obliged it to preach general ideas and to retain only the formal application of its traditional practices. Nevertheless, we are far from being able to say that the Arab peoples in the Middle East have escaped from the religious belief.

Living amongst these peoples, there are also followers of the Orthodox faith (the Copts) and the Jews. The latter, with the aid of the Anglo-American imperialists, have created their state of Israel, the spawn of the manoeuvres of international capital and Zionism.

The Muslim religion has been tolerant and liberal towards other faiths and, in the course of his-

tory, there have been no burning problems amongst them, although I am referring to modern times and not the times of the Crusades. Now the Arab-Israeli conflict has become an acute problem in the Middle East.

In my opinion, however, the main cause of the crisis in the Middle East is not the existence of the state of Israel. The state of Israel as a dynamic, aggressive, capitalist state, has lined itself up actively with the enslaving plans of world imperialism, especially of American imperialism to keep the whole Middle East in bondage. From this standpoint, the state of Israel, and this is not the only one, has become the "arrowhead" of American imperialism. Israel is a satellite of the Americans, which follows and applies the American strategy, in general, although in some cases it seems as though Israel "acts on its own," but this is only tactics and pressure which it uses, relying on the support of big Zionist capital and the large numbers of Jewish voters in the USA.

The main reason for the crisis in the Middle East is the striving for domination of American imperialism and other colonialist forces which are struggling to retain their old domination in this zone, their colonialist economic, political, military and other domination. In the past it was easier for these imperialist powers to make the law in the Middle East countries, not only because they were in complete control of their economies but also because, from the political standpoint, the monarchs and the feudal lords were all theirs and, as well, they had their armies of occupation.

Today the imperialists find it more difficult to

exercise their domination in these countries, therefore their manoeuvres are more varied and sophisticated. Now the states which form the zone called the Middle East have organized themselves more strongly than before, have more clearly defined borders, and more organized state apparatuses, economies and armies. Outwardly, these states pursue "independent, democratic and sovereign" internal and foreign policies, specific to this or that state. It is precisely on the basis of these facts, these transformations, this new situation, that imperialism and modern revisionism are manoeuvring, manipulating and intriguing. These manoeuvres and intrigues between major colonialist powers have become very complicated and express the antagonism between them; they are struggling to consolidate the bourgeoisie in each state of the zone, to conserve feudalism and its old representatives, against the awakening of the Arab peoples, against the revolution and uprising of the masses, to consolidate the spheres of influence by the major imperialist-revisionist states, for oil, for strategic military positions, with a view to a new capitalist world war to redivide the world.

This whole complex of problems is the cause of the crisis in the Middle East, which is nothing but a hot zone of acute tension stemming from the grave crisis which the capitalist-imperialist world, headed by American imperialism and modern revisionism, headed by Soviet revisionism, is experiencing.

The present Middle East crisis is like the Balkan crisis, with the difference that during the latter, which was incited and caused by the big European

imperialist powers, hence, was the prelude to the great European crisis which had the 1914-1918 war as its logical conclusion, the borders of the Balkan states were not so relatively clearly defined as those of the present states in the Middle East.

The Balkan peoples, enslaved by and included in the Turkish and Austro-Hungarian Empires, launched their uprisings and wars both against the yoke of major occupiers and against the chauvinist-imperialist aims of local chauvinist cliques, which strove to grab the maximum territorial concessions at one another's expense. The European imperialists had turned the Balkans into a field of intrigues, and that is why the Balkans could not but be a "powder keg," as they called it. The Balkans was the powder keg, but the biggest torch which ignited the powder was held by world imperialism and, especially, by the big capitalist powers of Europe. At present, some leaders of the Arab states of the Middle East and North Africa do not see, do not want to see, or are unable to see clearly this main issue, that their main enemy is imperialism and modern revisionism, American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, British and French imperialism. They are unable to see this and fight properly, because, irrespective of the disguises and labels they employ, many of the local feudal chiefs and the big comprador bourgeoisie defend the interests of their own strata and not the interests of their peoples. The interests of these strata coincide with the interests of world capitalism, or more correctly, have been merged with the interests of world capitalism; these anti-popular strata live under the patronage of various imperialists, conduct a class

policy according to circumstances and situations, and link themselves with one or the other imperialism up to complete dependence, even outwardly. Their allegedly independent policy is a walk on the tight rope, an acrobatic performance, and when they fall or are brought down, they are immediately replaced, by their own stratum or by the foreign overlord, with other acrobats.

Hence, in the Middle East the problem is to fight American, British, and French imperialism and their tools, one of which is the state of Israel; to fight Soviet revisionist imperialism which, under the camouflage of socialism, is seeking its place in the sun of the Middle East and the African continent. The peoples of the various Arab states cannot emerge from this struggle with success if they do not distinguish their main enemy and if, in their liberation struggle against their main enemy, they do not take account of the things within their own countries, that is, if they do not purge their leaderships of those adventurers sold out to foreigners, or representatives of anti-national, anti-democratic and anti-social, capitalist strata. To arrive at this situation in the Arab countries requires a long struggle by the peoples of this region, which is in great political-ideological confusion at present.

Arab unity, that is, the unity of the forces ruling in the Arab states, has proved to be non-existent, and this is natural, because these forces have opposing antagonistic interests and are manipulated by imperialism. The Arab unity in the war against the state of Israel lasted no more than five or six days and collapsed together with their so-called military unity. This proved that the internal organ-

ization of the Arab states themselves was exceptionally weak.

The victory of Israel, the imperialist "arrowhead," struck a heavy blow at the facade of Arab unity which was only talk. World imperialism, the American and Soviet imperialists, needed this to strengthen their colonialist positions in this region again, to redivide their spheres of influence, to smash the possible genuine Arab unity, to attack the revolution, to remove the threat of it, etc.

Now they are all trumpeting that the main danger to the Arab peoples is Israel, and allegedly, their revenge is being prepared under this slogan. In fact, under such slogans new, heavier chains are being prepared for the Arab peoples. To prepare his "revenge" Nasser is relying on the Soviet revisionists who are now established in Egypt, Syria and elsewhere. The allegedly independent policy of the UAR is controlled by Moscow which supplies it with some weapons which the UAR is unable to use as it likes and when it likes. Hence, the UAR is at the mercy of the Soviets, like a liver hung around a wolf's neck. Israel is secure from this aspect, because it is stronger militarily, more compact, because it is based firmly on the victory which it achieved, because it is supported by American imperialism and indirectly by Soviet social-imperialism. **Israel knows that as long as the United States of America and the Soviet Union, which decide everything in the Middle East, have not decided to attack one another, its cause is triumphant. In this situation, any settlement in the Middle East will be made by the Soviets and the Americans first in their own interests, second, in the interests of Israel, and**

always to the detriment of the Arab states and peoples...

At present everybody is presenting plans for the settlement of the Middle East problem. These plans carry the name of the "settlement" of the state of war between Israel and the UAR and other countries. The Soviet revisionist diplomacy is in action. Gromyko personally went to Nasser to impose the Soviet plan, of course, coordinated with the Americans. In the final analysis, this plan will be in favour of Israel which will gain rights and concessions. Whether or not the Arab chiefs submit to it depends on Israel's demands. The demands of Israel, too, are coordinated with the immediate and long-term interests of American imperialism. The Soviets are trying to get the whole thing concluded quickly, because they are afraid of possible complications, of the Israeli attacks, and if there are complications the Soviet revisionists will be exposed in the eyes of the Arabs for the second time, because they will certainly leave them in the lurch, as usual. On the other hand, the Soviets want to consolidate the positions they have gained in the UAR and elsewhere, and they can do this rather in "peace and quiet" than in a minefield. However, Nasser and others like him, in themselves, are people who vacillate this way and that, and they might turn their backs on the Soviets and make approaches to Washington. Since they will be making concessions to Israel, Nasser and company would prefer to have guarantees from the patron of Israel, that is, from the United States of America. The Soviet revisionists see this danger and that is why Gromyko hastened to Cairo and, of course, others

more important than he may follow him.

Nasser, who had cooled off towards Tito, has now begun to move closer to him. This is a bad sign for the Soviets. The Yugoslav agent of the Americans does not go into action without aims and objectives set by his patron. For the United States of America the problem is not simply one of gaining rights for Israel, but also of securing and strengthening its own positions, and even clearing the Soviets out of the whole territory of Africa.

The United States of America wants to repair the mistake it made in leaving the way open to them. This is what the struggle is all about. In this struggle the cliques in the Middle East are mere pawns in the tragic game of American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism to the detriment of the Arab peoples.

TUESDAY
APRIL 8, 1969

IMPERIALIST-REVISIONIST DEALS BEHIND THE SCENES AGAINST THE ARAB PEOPLES

Apart from the Israeli military aggression, the Arab peoples also have to cope with the grave plots which the United States of America, the Soviet Union and their tools hatch up one after the other. An article which I prepared in recent days entitled "Imperialist-Revisionist Deals behind the Scenes Against the Arab-Peoples"[1] has been sent to the newspaper "Zëri i popullit." It is to be published tomorrow.

The article makes three main points:

a) The heads of American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism have held a series of meetings and talks behind the scenes during which they prepared the terrain for holding a four power conference (The USA, the Soviet Union, France and Britain) at the rank of their permanent representatives to the Security Council. Their first meeting was held on April 3 in New York. The official communique published after this meeting points out amongst other things that "they commenced the examination of the problem of how they (the four powers) could assist the peaceful political settlement in the Near East."

[1] "Zëri i popullit," April 9, 1969 (Enver Hoxha, Works, vol. 40, "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1983, p. 395, Alb. ed.).

b) The imperialist-revisionist propaganda is giving a great deal of publicity to this meeting as an "important event," as "an expression of their desire" for the establishment of peace in the Middle East, etc. It is trying to create the impression among the Arab peoples and among public opinion in general that this initiative of the two powers, the USA and the Soviet Union, is allegedly intended to establish peace and stability in the Middle East and to put an end to the conflict between Israel and the Arab countries.

c) The secret four-party talks in New York have nothing at all to do with any "desire" of the imperialist powers for peace and stability in the Middle East. They are nothing but imperialist and revisionist bargaining to lure the Arab peoples into a trap and to impose the neo-colonialist plot on them. Therefore Arab public opinion has rejected the "foreign guardianship" and has condemned the so-called peaceful settlement of the Middle East question by the four great powers. Life is more and more convincing them that for the realization of their aspirations they must not base their hopes on the phoney aid and support of false friends, the Soviet revisionists, or on the unprincipled imperialist-revisionist talks.

MONDAY
JANUARY 5, 1970

WE WILL NEVER REDUCE OUR AID TO THE ARAB PEOPLES

We, of course, will not take part in the international parliamentary meeting which the Arabs propose (on the urging of the Soviets). We must justify this to them and tell them that we are not going to reduce, but will increase our aid to the Arab peoples who are fighting for their freedom against Israel and imperialism.

FRIDAY
JANUARY 16, 1970

"AL-FATAH" MUST NOT FALL INTO THE TRAP OF THE SOVIETS

The struggle of the Arab peoples against Israel has been reduced simply to the partisan war which the Palestinians are waging against the occupiers of their homeland. The others, you might say, are only talking, delivering "fiery" discourses, holding conferences and meetings at every level, taking and rescinding decisions, but Israel and the United States of America learn what they decide immediately and thus everything is nipped in the bud.

Israel is poised over the Arab countries like a hawk: the Arabs kill one Israeli, the Israelis kill twenty in reprisal, the Arabs damage one Israeli aircraft, the Israelis burn 50 aircraft on the ground, the Arabs capture one Israeli border guard, the Israelis capture twenty-two Arabs on the following day. A 7-ton modern Soviet radar locator on the shores of the Suez Canal was dismantled, loaded into helicopters and taken to Tel-Aviv.

Nasser has placed himself under the orders of the Soviets just as the kings and heads of state of Jordan, Saudi Arabia, etc. are under the order of the British and the Americans. Hence, the only ones who are really fighting in the Arab world are the Palestinian partisans. They have become dangerous to all, therefore some want to fight and exterminate them, while others want to get them into their clutches. The Nasser group is smiling at them but wants to run them, because by means of them

it wants to show that it is fighting, but it also wants to dominate them because they may upset the opportunist deals which that group is making. The Soviets, who work to extinguish national liberation revolutionary wars, want to get tight control of "Al-Fatah" and the other Palestinian partisan groupings, and direct them, in the interests of their imperialist policy as they are doing in Egypt. This is what occurs wherever national liberation wars are being waged: when the aggressors are being smashed and defeated and the peoples are triumphing, the Soviet revisionist intervene with demagogy, promise alleged supplies of arms and other aid, but they do this to extinguish the war, to ensure that the victory is lost and to rescue the aggressors. This is what the Soviets are doing now with "Al-Fatah." Allegedly they are on the side of the Palestinians, allegedly they want to help them, but without doubt they want to dig their grave. We must expose them in this anti-Palestinian activity. "Al-Fatah" must never fall into their trap.

TUESDAY
JANUARY 20, 1970

THE ARMED STRUGGLE OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE IS INVINCIBLE

I re-read the article, "The Armed Struggle of the Palestinian People Is Invincible." I added a paragraph in which I pointed out that, while providing some weapons, the Soviet revisionists, among other things, will try to take over the leadership of the Palestinian national liberation war, because the arms will be supplied on conditions and these conditions will be accompanied with their "advisers," "specialists," spies and saboteurs. The article will be published tomorrow in "Zëri i popullit."[1]

[1] "Zëri i popullit," January 21, 1970 (Enver Hoxha, "Against Modern Revisionism, 1968-1970 (Collection of Works)," "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1979, p. 565, Alb. ed.).

TUESDAY
FEBRUARY 10, 1970

THE REVISIONISTS ARE INFILTRATING INTO THE RANKS OF "AL-FATAH"

The Soviet revisionists are infiltrating into the "Al-Fatah" movement of fighters for the National Liberation of Palestine, too. Yesterday, Yasser Arafat, the leader of the Palestinian organization "Al-Fatah," went to Moscow at the head of a delegation, to seek aid in weapons, as the leaders of this organization inform us through our ambassadors. These leaders tell our ambassadors that they know the Soviets and their aims, and that they will be vigilant: This is just talk. If they begin to make deals with the Soviet revisionists, this is the beginning of the end of the partisan war of the Palestinians. The Soviet revisionists will not fail to supply them with some weapons, but by means of them they will dominate the Palestinians and lead them towards capitulation, as they are doing with the leaders of those Arab countries which have become pawns in their game.

DISCREDIT FOR THE SOVIET UNION

By continually bombarding the Egyptian positions, the Israelis, at the same time, are discrediting the Soviet Union, which poses as the defender of Egypt and the Arab peoples. In fact, the Soviet Union is supplying the Arabs with obsolete defensive weapons and not offensive weapons, and in each aircraft, there is a Soviet airman who does not allow the aircraft to take off without the orders of the Soviet staff in Egypt. Of course, such control is exerted in the Egyptian military detachments, too.

DURRËS, TUESDAY
JULY 28, 1970

OUR CORRECT POLICY ON THE MIDDLE EAST MUST CONTINUE

I gave instructions about our stand in connection with the beginning of the compromise between Nasser and the Americans over peace with Israel. Our propaganda work must continue in defence of our earlier theses for the exposure of the "Rogers Plan" and the Soviet-American plot, and to defend the liberation war of the Palestinian people for their rights. We must portray the conflict between Egypt and the other Arab countries as it is.

WEDNESDAY
JULY 29, 1970

WE HAVE SYMPATHY AND RESPECT FOR THE ARAB PEOPLE OF PALESTINE

A delegation of "Al-Fatah," Movement for the National Liberation of Palestine, is coming to our country these days for an official visit. Yasser Arafat personally asked our embassy in Cairo for permission to send a delegation.

We have sympathy and respect for the Arab people of Palestine, because they are a brave people who are suffering. At the moment they are the only Arab people who are fighting all round the borders of Israel, while some Arab leaders, from those of Egypt to those of Lebanon, are merely talking, holding conferences, preparing... for compromises, etc.

The Palestinians, expelled from their land by the British colonialist government and from UNO in favour of Israel, are living in tents, in great hardship, in camps in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and elsewhere. The latest Israeli aggression increased the number of Palestinian refugees, so the only road of salvation left to them was that of the partisan war. And they began it, attacking the Israeli aggressors from outside, from Jordan, Syria and Lebanon, and from inside, in the territory occupied by Israel. Thus, thanks to the struggle of the Palestinians, the Palestinian question has become an important national and international issue, which both the

friends and the enemies of the Palestinian people are compelled to bear in mind and cannot fail to take into account.

Despite its nationalist tendencies, the "Al-Fatah" organization is progressive and democratic and the biggest and most powerful organization which, at the moment, has a correct line of struggle for the liberation of Palestine and the defeat of the anti-Arab, annexationist policy of the state of Israel, concocted by international Zionism and supported by the imperialists. This organization is not against the masses of the Jewish population whom, in its program, it accepts as citizens of the new Arab state of Palestine.

However, although the representatives of the feudal bourgeois cliques ruling in some Arab countries pose as pro the Palestinians' struggle, they do not look kindly on this movement of resistance and, since they are unable to liquidate it, want to have it under control. The resistance of the Palestinians has become a serious political and military obstacle, which these cliques are obliged to take into account.

The King of Jordan, an agent of the British and the Americans, has made two or three attempts to liquidate the Palestinian partisans, who are stronger than this sold-out king. At these dangerous moments for the Palestinian guerrillas they ought to fight him to the end, to unite with the people of Jordan, in order to continue the war against Israel and American imperialism.

The Soviets and the Americans are making the law in the Middle East. The Egyptian leadership has fallen completely under the influence of the So-

viets. Hussein of Jordan is a dyed-in-the-wool traitor, the Syrians are posing as somewhat "concerned," while the Lebanese trim their sails to the wind.

Nasser agreed in general to discuss the "Rogers Plan," which means to enter into negotiations and compromises and, in the end, "to make the peace" so greatly desired by Israel, in favour of that country and its American patron and in disfavour of the Arab peoples, especially the Palestinian people, against whom the savage attacks of the gendarmes of the ruling cliques sold out to foreigners, will commence later. With the signing of the "peace" the Soviets will turn this into a "colossal victory" for themselves. They will try to remain in Egypt and to dominate it. There is the danger that the Egyptian ports may become the ports of the Soviet Mediterranean fleet which emerged from the Black Sea. From the Mediterranean the Soviet revisionists intend to extend their colonies in Africa "in peaceful ways," in order to cross the seas and reach India. This is how they dream of achieving the empire of Alexander the Great, by conquering the peoples through the threat of arms from land and sea, through rubles and through their demagogy of a falsified socialism.

The "Soviet-American peace" in the Middle East will be a defeat for all the Arab peoples and an especially great obstacle for the Palestinian people. This kind of "peace" is a victory for the Soviet-American imperialists in general and for Israel in particular.

What will happen with the Palestinian people will be what happened with the Albanian people

before the First World War. As is known, at that time large parts of Albania were divided by the imperialists of Europe among Serbia, Montenegro and Greece. And after they had thoroughly dismembered our Homeland at the Conference of London and through secret treaties, the Tsar's Minister, Sazonov, in order to satisfy the appetite of Prince Nikola of Montenegro demanded that the city of Shkodra be handed over to the latter. On this occasion, one of the other wolves, the representative of French imperialism, said something which went down in history: "Sazonov wants to set fire to Europe to fry an omelette for Montenegro."

The enemies of the Arab peoples, the American imperialists and Soviet revisionists, will act and speak in a similar way when it comes to the question of the territorial rights of the heroic Palestinian people.

Only the armed struggle through to victory settles accounts with the wolves who attack peoples.

VLORA, MONDAY
AUGUST 3, 1970

MEETING WITH THE "AL-FATAH" DELEGATION

Today I received the delegation of the "Al-Fatah" Movement for the National Liberation of Palestine.[1]

[1] The delegation was headed by a member of the Supreme Central Committee of the "Al-Fatah" Movement and member of the general leadership of the "Al-Assifa" forces, Abu Jihad, See: Enver Hoxha, Selected Works, vol. 4, "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1982, pp. 576-600, Eng. ed.

MONDAY
SEPTEMBER 21, 1970

A MAJOR PLOT AGAINST THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND THE REVOLUTION OF THE OTHER ARAB PEOPLES

Events in the Near East are occurring and developing just as I outlined in my discussion with the "Al-Fatah" delegation that I met in Vlora.

King Hussein of Jordan, an agent of the Anglo-Americans, is preparing the coup and attacking the Palestinian partisans. He is known as a tool of the British. His grandfather Abdullah, his father Talal, his brothers and relatives were brought by the British colonialists, through Lawrence and Allenby, from the desert tribes of the Arabian Peninsula and placed at the head of Arab kingdoms to hold as their estates. It is clear that the Soviets and Hussein have agreed that the war with Israel had to be stopped, agreed with the Americans and the "Rogers Plan" that the resistance of the Palestinians had to be placed under control and suppressed.

Hussein, the Soviets and their Arab friends undertook the suppression of the Palestinians. The prisons and concentration camps were filled with Palestinians. Several times Hussein tried to disarm them, but in vain. The Soviets exerted powerful pressure on them and on the Algerians, Syrians and Iraqis. Then the provocation of the hijacking of a number of aircraft was hatched up. This was a provocation arranged by the CIA and the Anglo-

American secret agency, to provide a trump card so that their agent Hussein could attack the Palestinians. And he attacked the forces of the Palestinian resistance in Amman and wherever they were concentrated in Jordan. He unleashed his tanks on the Palestinians. The United States of America moved its 6th Fleet towards the Syrian coast and is threatening armed intervention in defence of King Hussein if the Syrians continue to assist their Palestinian brothers who are defending themselves. The international gendarme also appealed to its acolyte, the fireman of the Kremlin, to quell the resistance of the Palestinians and stop the Syrians from giving them aid. The Soviet revisionists issued repeated communiques in this direction, leaving no doubt that they support King Hussein, his reactionary clique and the "Rogers Plan."

Clearly, this is a major plot. The question is that the Palestinians must not lay down their arms, but must continue the fight on two fronts. On the internal front against armed Arab reaction, and on the external front against the sworn enemies of the Arab peoples, the American imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists, Israeli Zionists, and so on. The question is, also, whether Syria, Iraq and Algeria will stand to the end in defence of the common Arab cause or will retreat. If they are going to stand, the consciousness of the Arab peoples will develop towards the revolution, whereas if they are going to retreat, to be split, then the movement and the revolution of the Arab peoples, and especially the Palestinian resistance, will suffer a grave blow.

I discussed with the comrades at the Foreign Ministry that in the speech of our representative at

the UNO we must bring out these ideas and ardently defend the Arab and Palestinian cause and expose the plot of the Americans, the Soviets and Arab reaction.

WEDNESDAY
SEPTEMBER 30, 1970

THE DEATH OF NASSER AND ITS CONSEQUENCES IN THE MIDDLE EAST

On September 28, Radio Cairo announced the death of President Gamal Abdel Nasser from a heart attack. Gamal Abdel Nasser was an important personality of the bourgeoisie. He gained popularity through the liquidation of the Farouk monarchy and of British colonialism in Egypt and the Suez Canal. Nasser was an Egyptian nationalist who acted to incite Arab nationalism and establish himself as the leader of the Egyptian people. He suffered defeat in his attempts to bring about the unification of Egypt with Syria. His internal policy weighed heavy on the people, to whom it brought no economic advantage. On the contrary, the Egyptian bourgeoisie made the country still more poverty-stricken by plunging it heavily into debt to the various imperialists. The defeat of the Egyptian army by Israel in the last war lowered Nasser's prestige. During this period, however, Nasser knew how to manoeuvre between the Americans and the Soviets and to enhance his own authority among the colourless and unstable leaderships of the other Arab countries. The defeat in the war with Israel threw him into the lap of the Soviets. When he died he was their man overall, but undercover he had manoeuvred with the aim that at the opportune moment he could give them the slip.

Nevertheless, his death has left a considerable gap with many uncertainties in the Middle East, which is involved in a grave crisis. The Soviets have lost one of their supporters. Who will Nasser's successor be? Certainly not of the people or of the revolution, but of the bourgeoisie, of Arab reaction and sold to one or the other imperialist power. The whole of Arab reaction will be in movement to suppress any uprising and establish the "Rogers-Gromyko peace," so that the respective patrons of these two can strengthen their strategic positions in this zone.

Anything "revolutionary" in Arab nationalism will suffer a grave blow through the death of Nasser, not because he was a revolutionary, but if some such shred could be detected in him, it is totally non-existent in the Arab kings or the cosmopolitan leaders of Lebanon and some other countries.

Some Arab leaders have waged the liberation war, are more revolutionary than Nasser, but whether or not they will impose themselves on the Arab world and inspire the Arab masses in the fight against imperialism, this we must wait and see. What they do, their struggle, their stands, will indicate this. The Palestinians are in a difficult position, not because Nasser defended their cause, although he was obliged to take account of them if only to avoid being utterly unmasked. Now, with the death of Nasser, it is self-evident that the position of Israel is strengthened, while the position of the Arabs, and especially the Palestinians, is weakened.

At this grave juncture the only thing that could

work a sudden miracle is the popular uprising in the Arab countries and the unwavering militant resistance of the Palestinians, Syrians and Algerians, first of all, and the other peoples following their example.

THURSDAY
OCTOBER 1, 1970

WORLD REACTION IS WORKING FOR THE LIQUIDATION OF THE PALESTINIAN MOVEMENT

The barbarous attack of the "little" king and agent of imperialism, Hussein of Jordan, was undoubtedly organized by the CIA and Israel. The Soviet agency had certainly been informed about it. This whole gang was interested in making the Palestinian fighters cease their armed resistance. Of course, the means and methods which each of them employed to achieve this aim differed according to the particular circumstances and interests, but the objective was the same — to eliminate the Palestinian resistance which opposed the "Rogers Plan" and the Israeli-American aggressor politically and with weapons, inspired the awakening of the Arab consciousness and kept the Arab uprising alive.

If this revolutionary situation were not ended the positions of American imperialism in the Middle East would be endangered, while if the war with the Arabs had continued for a long time, not only would Israel be in danger of losing the war, but its very existence as a state would have been at risk. The throne of King Hussein and the power and existence of Jordanian reaction would also be in danger. That is why this whole group chose "the course of the complete physical liquidation," in barbarous ways, of the whole Palestinian resistance.

Hussein launched artillery, tank and infantry

attacks on the partisan camps in Amman and to the north of it. Savage fighting went on day after day and thousands of people, partisans, women, children and Hussein's soldiers were killed and wounded indiscriminately. Nevertheless, the Palestinians resisted and fought bravely in Amman and the other zones to the north of the Jordanian capital, on the border with Syria, which came to their aid. Iraq, which also had its military forces in Jordan, maintained a very dubious stand, mostly pro-Hussein.

The opposition of Arab and world opinion was aroused. The reactionary king and murderer Hussein was exposed. He was unable to achieve his aim. Indeed, as the conflict dragged on, the hopes of reopening the discussion of the "Rogers Plan" were lost, the "ceasefire" was in danger of collapsing and the war recommencing, and Hussein's throne was in jeopardy. The United States of America exerted blackmail, threatening armed intervention in aid to Hussein. This terrified the Soviets who were in favour of the complete disarming and subjugation of the Palestinians, but knowing that this would not be achieved, they silently approved Hussein's action, as was proved subsequently. Meanwhile Nasser wanted to have the Palestinians under his command as a means of active blackmail against Israel and a means of bargaining with the Americans. The total liquidation of the Palestinians by Hussein would also have been harmful to Nasser's personal prestige in the Arab world.

All these things and, first of all, the failure of the CIA-Hussein plot, along with the American

blackmail about intervention, compelled the Soviets and Nasser to exert pressure on the Palestinians, Hussein and the Syrians to stop the fighting in Jordan and hold the Cairo meeting at which the "ceasefire" was signed between the fedayeen of "Al-Fatah" and Hussein.

The Soviets threatened Syria and compelled it to stop its "armed intervention" in favour of "Al-Fatah," an intervention which the Syrians did not publicly acknowledge as true or untrue. Nasser replied to the Syrians that in case of an intervention of the Americans in Jordan, he would not involve himself in the complications that might arise.

It is clear that the Arab national bourgeoisie is wavering and ready for compromise. Arab reaction, supported by the Soviets and Americans, is reacting strongly, but the Arab revolutionary movement has not laid down its arms. The living proof of this is that the Palestinians are fighting, resisting and are in the vanguard of the struggle. The "ceasefire agreement" with Hussein was concluded at a difficult moment for them, but it seems they are not going to observe it. In fact, they are continuing their attacks on Israel; they are carrying on their fight. Of course, this will exacerbate the conflicts with Arab reaction and clashes with it are inevitable. The fact is that the Arab masses are courageous, but divided, not of a high political level, and unorganized for war, because there is no progressive, revolutionary leadership, although this will certainly emerge from the revolutionary struggle.

SOCIALIST ALBANIA REMAINS OPPOSED TO THE "ROGERS PLAN"

The representative of the UAR at UNO, on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic, went to our representative at UNO and told him: "If you do not vote for the Rogers Plan which the UAR supports, we shall not consider Albania a friendly country."

We notified our comrade to tell the representative of the UAR: "Albania has opposed the 'Rogers Plan' and will vote against it, because it is an imperialist plan to the detriment of the peoples of the world, to the detriment of the Arab peoples and to the detriment of the UAR, in particular. You ought to know that the People's Republic of Albania has no fear, it detests blackmailers of any type and there is no force in the world that can stop it from proceeding on its correct and sovereign course. Regardless of what you think or intend to do, the People's Republic of Albania and the Albanian people have fought and will continue to fight with all their might against the American imperialists, Israeli Zionism and the Soviet revisionists, and will always be close comrades-in-arms of the Arab peoples, especially of the Egyptian people. You ought to know, also, that Gamal Abdel Nasser greatly and justly valued our stands at the UNO."

MONDAY
NOVEMBER 30, 1970

A NEW GOVERNMENT IN SYRIA

The Syrian government headed by Assad, which came to power recently by overthrowing the Atasi government through a coup, seems to be not favourably disposed towards the Palestinian fighters, whereas Atasi at least assisted the Palestinian movement and was against the king to Jordan reaction, Hussein. Besides, Assad went to "join the Egypt-Libya-Sudan confederation" which I believe will never be achieved.

The governments in the Middle East have become like those of Latin America, but with a difference because in this zone of the world there are "two masters of the house," the Americans and the Soviets, who have implanted their claws, make the law and bring down and form the governments of these countries, while continuing the refrain of "peace and compromise with Israel."

WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 13, 1971

WE MUST CONDEMN THE CRIME OF JORDANIAN REACTION AGAINST THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE

I asked for a draft of the telegram to be prepared in reply to the Palestine-Albania Friendship Association about the crimes which Jordanian reaction perpetrated against the Palestinian fedayeen.

FRIDAY
JANUARY 22, 1971

WE MUST EXPRESS OUR JUST STAND WITHOUT FALLING OUT WITH OUR EGYPTIAN FRIENDS

I instructed the comrades to notify our delegate to the Pan-African Congress of Trade Unions not to quarrel with our Egyptian friends, the organizers of this congress, who do not want us to attack the Soviet revisionists in our message of greetings. Whether or not we like their stand, we have to understand the Egyptians on this occasion, the Soviets are their "allies." He should not deliver any greeting and avoid harming our friendship with the Egyptians. Everyone knows our line, but there are other ways in which to express it so that the Egyptians will have no opposition.

SUNDAY
FEBRUARY 21, 1971

THE RE-OPENING OF THE SUEZ CANAL

From the development of the situation in the Middle East, it seems that the Suez Canal is going to be re-opened.[1] Of course, there will still be negotiations, bargainings and discussions inside and outside UNO, with or without Jarring,[2] and so on. The opening of the Suez Canal in the present conditions will certainly be done more in favour of the United States of America and Israel, than of Egypt. Apart from this, this step threatens to lead to other repeated concessions to Israel and to the benefit of American imperialism in the Middle East...

Economically, the opening of the Suez Canal concerns us, too. But what is the stand of the two superpowers and what is their interest in the opening of this Canal?

The opening of the Canal is of economic, military and political interest to the Soviet Union. It wants to make the law there like the former Suez Canal Company. On the other hand, however, the opening of the Canal also means the perpetuation and further consolidation of the victories Israel has achieved at the expense of the Arabs as well as the

[1] See p. 133 of this volume.

[2] Gunar Jarring, then ambassador of Sweden to the Soviet Union, was charged by the UNO with implementing the resolution 242 of the Security Council on the Middle East.

application of the policy of holding endless talks and discussions. This the Soviets are little concerned about.

The Soviets have a stranglehold on Egypt and through it are trying to strengthen their influence and domination in the Arab countries, especially Syria, Libya and the Sudan, that is, the so-called federation of these four countries. The question of the "war with Israel" is a "marvellous" trump card for the Soviets and they are making the most of it. The weapons which they supply to Egypt, and keep firmly under their own control, are only defensive and not offensive weapons, while Israel is not only well prepared for war, but its weapons are both offensive and defensive and it is playing the card of the threat of war cleverly, making Egypt accept the conditions of the ceasefire and the Soviets afraid of an armed confrontation with the Americans, or even with Israel, because this brings them great political, economic and military difficulties. Therefore, **the Soviets are not for military involvement in the Middle East, but for coming to terms, unconcerned that these terms are to the detriment of Egypt.** The Soviets are the main authors of the Egyptian concessions and the sacrifice of the vital interests of the Arab peoples, especially the Palestinian people. They want peace on any condition in the Middle East in order to consolidate the positions they have gained and, by avoiding complications with the Americans, to preserve and further consolidate the alliance with them.

As for the national liberation war of the Palestinians, the Soviets want to liquidate it at all costs like any other liberation war, to disarm the Pales-

tinian partisans and expel them from the other Arab territories, to send them into Israel under Israeli bondage, allegedly to continue the partisan war there from inside.

The re-opening of the Canal is of economic and military interest to France, Italy and Greece, in short, to all the capitalist countries of Europe. By this means they want to reduce the Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean. Therefore, these states are putting pressure on the United States of America so that the Suez Canal is re-opened, a thing which that country, too, wants very much. Of course they are interested in seeing a good part of the Soviet Black Sea fleet dispersed over the seas and oceans so that it is not concentrated in the Mediterranean off the shores of Africa. At the present juncture, however, the presence of the Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean is a threat to the members of NATO, especially to all the Mediterranean countries. The United States of America, too, is interested in seeing this fleet move into the Indian Ocean and the Pacific, far from its supply and repair bases. Such a thing would make it easier for the Anglo-American fleet to attack it in case of a conflict. At the same time, however, the United States of America is using the presence of the Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean also as a powerful means of blackmailing the Western states allied in NATO, in order to keep them bound to and under its leadership. Thus, the re-opening of the Suez Canal, which belongs to Egypt, has become a move in the game of chess, which is being made not in Egypt's interest, but in the interests of the Soviets

and the Americans, for the sake of their immediate and long-term interests.

Apart from what I said above, the United States of America, of course, is aiming, first of all, to strengthen its dominant positions in the Middle East, to ensure its oil supplies and to have the way open for expansion in Africa.

The objectives of the Americans are to seriously undermine, if not totally eliminate, the positions gained by the Soviets in Africa and the Middle East. Therefore, the United States of America will increase its smiles in the direction of the UAR now, while these efforts are going on, and even more later.

In its anti-Arab plans, the United States uses Israel as its pistol, which it fires whenever it needs without getting its own fingers burned directly, and Israel has been trained and organized for war, has been educated in an aggressive fascist spirit such that it cannot exist except under the rules of a gangster life. Israel, for its part, has found both the patrons and the partners appropriate to realizing its aims.

Naturally, in this situation, when the two imperialist superpowers, which are deeply involved in the life and running of different Arab countries, are predominant in the Middle East, for the time being it is improbable that the United States of America, Israel and the Soviet Union will be confronted with a coalition of Arab peoples, that can cope with and foil their plans.

The Egyptians and all the Arab peoples are being shamefully betrayed by the representatives of

the feudal-bourgeois forces in power, who have acquired particular skill in changing their patrons as readily as they change their shirts and pose as "rabid nationalists," but when this "nationalism" is put to the test it proves to be nothing but a camouflage of actions detrimental to the interests of the peoples and their countries.

The Arab peoples must organize the struggle against the American imperialists, their Soviet pseudo-allies and those who brought these pseudo-allies to their countries and sold their souls and the homeland to them. This correct line, which ensures the truly free and sovereign future of the Arab peoples, cannot be achieved except by armed struggle, by fighting the United States of America, Israel, the social-imperialist Soviet Union and all their open and secret allies. The victory will not be won without great sacrifices and without further losses and defeats. But the armed struggle and the defeats will also bring the great and final victory, the victory of the people and not the victory of reactionary cliques...

THURSDAY
MAY 13, 1971

POLITICAL CRISIS IN EGYPT

Ali Sabry was a personality of importance second only to Sadat, but the latter liquidated him on the pretext of his participation in a conspiracy to seize power and "put the Egyptian people in bondage."

This took place when Rogers, the American Secretary of State, was in the course of a visit to many states of the Middle East, including Egypt and Israel. It was clear that Rogers went to Egypt to arrange the terms of a compromise between Israel and Sadat on the settlement of their differences. Hence, this was something new. The United States of America, the friend of Israel, was becoming the direct intermediary for a compromise with the Egyptians, officially eliminating the Soviet Union from these negotiations.

This was a political defeat for the Soviet Union. It would no longer be the main partner which would bargain with the United States of America on behalf of Egypt while the two of them manoeuvred in the Middle East over Egypt, the Palestinians and the other Arab peoples. El-Sadat emphasized this political slap in the face for "his ally," the Soviet Union, by his sensational elimination of Ali Sabry, the man of the Soviets, from the political scene. Anwar el-Sadat acted like Khrushchev who eliminated Molotov precisely when Tito was on his

way to Moscow.[1] Through this act Khrushchev told Tito. "I am opening the way to friendship and alliance by eliminating the Stalinist Molotov, by labelling him as an anti-party element; later I will purge all of them." While Sadat told Rogers, "I am clearing the way to our friendship and alliance by getting rid of the pro-Soviet element, Ali Sabry; later I will purge the others."

It was reported from Cairo this evening that six ministers, including the minister of the interior and the minister of defence, have tendered their resignations and, together with them, three other personalities have resigned from the leadership of the ruling party. Without any doubt they are all associates of Ali Sabry. So they have a crisis. El-Sadat is to make a speech on the evening of the 14th. We shall see what he will say.

Neither the Sadat group nor Ali Sabry is for struggle. As it seems, however, Sadat is outmanoeuvring the Soviets who are trying to topple him.

---

[1] "This took place on June 2, 1956. That day the newspaper 'Pravda' carried a huge photograph of Tito on the front page and the *dobro pozhalovat!* to the head of the Belgrade clique arriving in Moscow, and page four ended a report of daily events with the 'news' about the removal of Molotov from the post of foreign minister of the Soviet Union. The report said that Molotov had been released from this position 'at his own request,' but in fact he was released because this was a condition laid down by Tito for his coming to the Soviet Union for the first time since the breaking off of relations in 1948-1949." (Enver Hoxha, "The Khrushchevites" (Memoirs), The November 8th Publishing House, Ottawa 2023, p. 158.).

Hitherto Sadat has triumphed. We shall see what strength the Soviets have to plot and undermine within Egypt and what aid and support Washington and Israel will give el-Sadat. The Soviets are in difficulties in Egypt, because they are losing their men. whom it is difficult for them to defend openly, in conflict with the official Egyptian leadership which, while manoeuvring to avoid accusing them openly, will get rid of all the supporters of the Soviets.

The Soviet Union is unable to intervene in the open and secret negotiations which Sadat is holding with Washington and Tel Aviv and neither can it prevent the agreements and compromises which might be achieved without it. The Soviet revisionists are desperately playing their last card to avoid losing the political, economic and military positions they have captured in Egypt and in the whole of the Middle East, which the United States of America is wresting from them. We shall see how the situation develops, but it is clear that American imperialism will make every effort, while there is still time, to eliminate the Soviet Union from the Middle East and Africa, to prevent it from continuing to strengthen its political, economic, colonial and military positions, especially in Egypt, Syria and the Mediterranean in general, under the disguise of the defender of the Arab peoples.

The Arab peoples have no special sympathy either for the Soviet revisionists, or for the American imperialists, indeed they hate them. However, the Arab ruling cliques sell themselves to the highest bidder. The United States of America reckons on providing fat credits to Egypt, of course to achieve

its purpose. It is to be expected that Tito will make a move to this end, if he has not done so already. Likewise, it is in the interests of Israel to get international guarantees for its borders before it is too late, to make some minor concessions for the time being, and "promise" further concessions in return for Egypt's breaking with the Soviets, the liquidation of the Palestinian problem in favour of Israel, etc.

The Americans will try to leave the Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean like a fish out of water, by depriving it of the bases it uses at present in Egypt and Syria. The question of NATO and the Mediterranean basin are important to the American strategy. Here there are conflicts with the Soviets...

FRIDAY
JUNE 2, 1972

WE MUST FURTHER STRENGTHEN OUR FRIENDSHIP WITH THE ARAB PEOPLES

They reported to me about the work which our youth delegation did at the Syrian youth congress. The speech of our delegation, which expressed open opposition to the Soviet revisionists (who had a delegation in the hall), was received with great enthusiasm and a standing ovation. Our Albania has won the sympathy of the Arab peoples on account of its correct stands. We must further strengthen this friendship!

DURRËS, WEDNESDAY
JULY 19, 1972

A HEAVY SLAP IN THE FACE FOR SOVIET SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM

Last evening the Egyptian president, Sadat, delivered an "important" speech in which he stressed the conflict between Moscow and Cairo. He has sought Soviet offensive weapons "in order to declare war on Israel," and in order to keep Egypt under their control and completely exploited from every angle, the Soviets, of course, have refused. So Sadat is exerting political blackmail against them, demanding the withdrawal of Soviet advisers from Egypt (and there are no less than 20,000 of them) by July 27. This is a heavy slap in the face for the Soviet social-imperialists, which ruins their plans and is a very important event. We shall see what the Soviets do, what manoeuvres they will employ to avoid leaving Egypt, because, if they are kicked out, it will be hard for them to get back quickly. Moreover, their expulsion puts an end to their lies and demagogy about "defending the Arab peoples," and their fleet in the Mediterranean is left like a fish out of water. On the other hand, we shall see how determined Sadat is to stick to the decision he has taken.

The fact is that the expulsion of the Soviets is a victory for the Egyptians, notwithstanding that it will take a long time to liberate the territories occupied by Israel. With the Soviets within the country, however, the Egyptians could never liberate these territories and, moreover, they would lose the

independence of their country.

Our correct and resolute policy has helped the Arab peoples to safeguard their freedom, which they must protect from the United States of America, too.

DURRËS, FRIDAY
JULY 21, 1972

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST REMAINS DISTURBED

The speech of the Egyptian president, Sadat, continues to echo around the world. The expected reaction of the Soviets was given in a communique of the TASS news agency. Of course, their reaction was as if nothing alarming to them had happened, that what had occurred was "a normal, usual thing," a "cordial" agreement arranged previously between the two states. The Soviet specialists had gone to Egypt to instruct the Egyptians and now that they have successfully completed their task they will quietly go home. Nothing has changed in the profound and sincere friendship between Egypt and the Soviet Union. The latter will continue to give Egypt its fraternal aid against Israel for the liberation of the occupied territories, etc., etc.

This is the language in which TASS is speaking after the public slap in the face which the Soviet Union received from Egypt. The Soviet revisionists have to minimize this defeat, but the reasons which Sadat gave for the expulsion of the Soviets are so clear that it cannot in any way be thought that the Soviets were in agreement about the removal of their specialists whose mission, according to Sadat's statements, was not simply "to train the Egyptian soldiers in the use of the new weapons," but also to command and run the Egyptian state.

After the TASS communique large sums of Soviet rubles for Egypt must have arrived, because

the Egyptians began to soften, both in the communique of the Egyptian embassy in Moscow and in the leading article of "Al-Ahram," which extol the Soviet friendship, Soviet aid, etc., which mean, "We are lining up with the tone of TASS."

Apparently, the Egyptian leaders expected a violent reaction from the Soviets, but their fears have been calmed and now that they have got away with their blackmail, they are operating through talks with the Soviets, with the Americans, with the French and even with the Israelis behind the scenes. In this situation Sadat is swimming "at his ease"; in his speech he told his people and the public at large that "the attack on Israel was not made because the Russians did not supply us with weapons, so we have to find them elsewhere, therefore, you must wait until other sources are arranged."

It is said that the Soviet specialists have begun to leave, but it is not known how many, who and when they will leave. We shall see. The situation in the Middle East has been and remains disturbed. American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism each have a foot stuck in the door there. Sadat's resounding declarations are hardly likely to make them go away.

SUNDAY
OCTOBER 7, 1973

THE EGYPTIANS AND SYRIANS AGAIN AT WAR WITH THE ISRAELIS

Yesterday the war of the Egyptians and Syrians against the Israelis began. As it seems, the Arabs launched the attack, although this has no importance because they are within their rights, and Israel was taken by surprise. The Egyptians crossed the Suez Canal and, according to them, established themselves on the right bank of it, capturing the Israeli fortifications of the Barlev line. The Syrians, likewise, assaulted the Golan Heights and Hebron and occupied the Israeli positions there. A great air battle is going on between them. You cannot put much trust in the communiques.

Now the question stands as follows: the Arabs have the advantage. Are they going to retain and develop it, and how? Has the Six-Day War of 1967 served as a lesson to them? So far Israel has not taken them by surprise as before. As to what will happen later, we shall see. Likewise we shall see the level of the Arabs' preparation and their tactics and strategy, as well as those of Israel. The Arabs seem less alarmed than the Israelis. Can it be that there is some major coordinated joint manoeuvre afoot? The Arabs launched an offensive to win certain positions from which to return later to "the UNO dance" and fall into the traps of the United States of America and the Soviets. All gain a little; in order to avoid losing everything all must lose a little and continue the "no war, no peace" situa-

tion, continue the discussion! This we shall see. We are following events vigilantly. We shall defend the Arabs with all the means of our propaganda and expose Israel, the United States of America and the social-imperialist Soviet Union.

FRIDAY
OCTOBER 12, 1973

THE WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST CONTINUES

The Egyptians are advancing in the fighting in Sinai and up till now no wavering is apparent among them. The Syrians, too, are fighting well, with attacks and counter-attacks. Both sides say that fighting is going on in the Golan Heights about 45 km from Damascus. Israel is boasting that it "will take Damascus, has destroyed the Syrian army," etc., but it has achieved neither of these objectives and is suffering heavy losses in tanks and aircraft. In fact the Syrians have taken and are holding on to the Israeli's first line of defence.

The myth of the "blitzkrieg," of Israeli "invincibility" has been smashed. Israel is in difficulties and the direct aid which the United States of America has begun to give it shows this.

The unity of the Arab countries seems better than at other times, but the agencies of American and Soviet imperialism are at work within their ranks. They are trying to extinguish the fire, which is not to their advantage, because it threatens their dominating and exploiting interests. The two superpowers are in a fix and are afraid this situation will become more complicated, fearing that the victory of the Arabs or the Israelis may endanger the domination of the Americans or the Soviets. Therefore, both of them are pretending to help, but are preparing "the big pumps to extinguish the flames," because in this way they preserve the sta-

tus quo of "neither peace nor war" and strengthen their domination.

What the Arabs are doing now is positive and revolutionary. Brezhnev, Tito and all their ilk, along with the whole capitalist world, are against the Arab peoples. Therefore, we and the revolutionaries all over the world must help these peoples in their struggle.

THURSDAY
OCTOBER 25, 1973

THE GREATEST ENEMIES OF THE ARAB PEOPLES

Tomorrow the newspaper "Zëri i popullit" will publish our article exposing the two superpowers, entitled: "American Imperialism and Soviet Social-Imperialism — the Greatest Enemies of the Arab Peoples."[1]

In the article we denounce the new Soviet-American agreements on the Middle East which were concluded in the Moscow talks between Brezhnev and Kissinger and which subsequently took the form of a Security Council resolution on a ceasefire between the combatants in the Arab-Israeli conflict. They are another dangerous plot of the two superpowers against the Arab countries and the peoples' liberation movement.

The actions of the two superpowers are so arrogant and brutal that no disguise can cover them and no demagogy can embellish them. The "concern" which they allegedly showed for the solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict is concern to protect their hegemonic interests.

We go on in the article to point out that the liberation struggle of the Arab peoples, like all the peoples' revolutionary movements, is contrary to

[1] "Zëri i popullit," October 26, 1973 (Enver Hoxha, "Against Modern Revisionism, 1971-1975 (Collection of Works)," "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1980, p. 466, Alb. ed.).

the imperialist interests of the two superpowers which will, therefore, try to snuff out these movements by means of diplomacy, pressure and dictate and if these means are insufficient, even by means of force. Objectively this liberation struggle is aimed not only against the Zionists, but also against the American imperialists who finance, arm and throw the Zionists into attack as well as against the Soviet revisionists who want to take advantage of the situation to get a firmer foothold in the Middle East. Therefore the Arab peoples are fighting not only for the liberation of the territories of which Israel has robbed them, but also for liberation from the interference, pressure and dictate of the American imperialists and Soviet social-imperialists.

The stand which the American imperialists and Soviet revisionists have taken now is further evidence of a notorious fact, which has become even more obvious, that the American imperialists and Soviet revisionists are the greatest enemies of the Arab peoples.

WEDNESDAY
FEBRUARY 13, 1974

THE PALESTINIANS MUST CONTINUE THEIR FIGHT

Today I was informed about the talks which our comrades held with the Palestinian delegation of "Al-Fatah."[1] The talks were cordial.

The Palestinians must continue to fight ceaselessly and in conditions which are very difficult for many reasons:

Although they are fighting for a common cause, they are divided. Naturally, the various currents which exist within their ranks are unable to coordinate even their minimum common program on this war and its aims. From what we hear, because they have published nothing, their program is to liberate Palestine from the Jews. What is to become of the Jews and the state of Israel?

At present the Palestinians are fighting from the territories of others, since these others are at war with Israel. Nevertheless, even now they cannot fight properly or as they would like to. They are obliged to submit to the policy of the Arab state from whose territory they operate. But what are the Palestinians going to do when these Arab states cease the war against Israel, as they undoubtedly will? The prospects are gloomy and difficult for this war which must be continued in new conditions.

[1] The delegation came to Albania on January 31, 1974.

THURSDAY
JUNE 5, 1975

THE SUEZ CANAL HAS BEEN RE-OPENED

Today the re-opening of the Suez Canal, which was closed on June 5, 1967, because of the Israeli military aggression, was announced.

It is good that the Canal is re-opened because we, too, will benefit from it; the route to the Indian Ocean will be shorter for our ships. However, the conditions in which it was re-opened are onerous, to the detriment of the struggle of the Arab peoples and in favour of Israel and the two superpowers.

THURSDAY
MARCH 18, 1976

A VERY CORRECT DECISION OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF EGYPT

News agencies have reported that the National Assembly of Egypt unanimously ratified the decision on the annulment of the "Egyptian-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Collaboration."

A very correct measure and completely in favour of strengthening the national independence of Egypt against the Soviet social-imperialist neo-colonialists.

TUESDAY
APRIL 20, 1976

AN IMPORTANT STEP TOWARDS STRENGTHENING THE INDEPENDENCE OF EGYPT

Notes for an article[1]

In recent days Sadat declared that Egypt cancelled the rights of the Soviets to utilize Egyptian ports for their naval fleet in the Mediterranean. After the denunciation of the treaty this step was expected.

Many years ago, in the time of Nasser, our government officially informed the Egyptian government in a friendly way about the dangers to the independence of Egypt and the other sovereign Mediterranean countries inherent in the policy of granting bases and port facilities in Egypt to the naval fleet of the Soviet social-imperialists in the Mediterranean. Life has proved that no people can base their hopes of defending the freedom and independence of their homeland on the United States of America, the Soviet Union and their war fleets. Any illusion in this direction is fraught with real dangers which lead to the loss of national freedom and independence.

---

[1] The article of the newspaper "Zëri i popullit" of April 30, 1976 "The Expulsion of the Fleets of the Superpowers from the Mediterranean, a Significant Action for the Consolidation of Independence and General Security."

The denunciation of the "Soviet-Egyptian Treaty of Friendship and Collaboration" and the expulsion of the Soviet fleet from the United Arab Republic is an act which shows that the Egyptian people and government have clearly understood the danger that the granting of port facilities to the fleets of the superpowers poses to the freedom and independence of the country.

The fleets of the superpowers avail themselves of the moments of crisis to offer their so-called aid to defend the interests of the country which is "attacked" by another power. In this way, they come disguised as friends, but turn into enemies of the peoples.

We supported the decision of the government of Egypt and hope that the Egyptian people and their leaders will not allow any kind of fleet of either superpower, disguised as an ally or friend, into their ports.

We think that this action of Egypt's, which is in the interests of all the countries of the Mediterranean, should be followed by others, so that the warships of the imperialist and social-imperialist warmongers will not be given access to their ports in any form at all.

We have expressed these views, which constitute one aspect of the foreign policy of the People's Republic of Albania, years ago.

Time confirms that the refusal to accept foreign fleets is in the interests of the country which makes no concessions, and at the same time, in the interests of other countries, in the interests of the peoples who desire to live in good neighbourly relations with all the other peoples and, in the concrete

case, the peoples who live on the shores of the Mediterranean.

Each sovereign state is free to develop its policy in the way it sees fit and deems suitable to protect the interests of the country. We think that it is impermissible that the defence of the interests of one country should be achieved by damaging the interests of another. Even less do we accept that in order to cover up such actions which endanger peace, pretexts should be found and slanders concocted against those states which have a correct defence policy, a policy which is in the interests of the respective countries and the adjacent countries with which they desire to live in peace as good neighbours. We have openly expressed our opinion that the granting of concessions by the Yugoslavs, under whatever conditions, to the Soviet warships which are prowling the Mediterranean like wild beasts, allegedly so that they can do repairs, etc., is an act dangerous not only to Yugoslavia, but also to Albania. We are not interested in the conditions on which Yugoslavia has granted them these concessions, but we know that these warships constitute a great danger to the independence of Yugoslavia's neighbours and, concretely, to the People's Republic of Albania.

The Yugoslav government can say what it likes, but if in a time of crisis the Soviet revisionists decide to attack, it is easier for them to come to attack the People's Republic of Albania from the ports of Split, Dubrovnik, Kotor, etc., than to come from the Mediterranean, passing through the Strait of Otranto. Yugoslavia is unable to stop such acts of aggression of the Soviet naval fleet. At the appro-

priate moment the Soviet ships, which may be in the ports of Yugoslavia, for repairs or visits, can put to sea in fighting readiness and attack Albania.

The Yugoslav government may say that it washes its hands of this! But we do not allow it to wash its hands of it, therefore, we condemn this action. An attack by the Soviet social-imperialists might also be aimed against Yugoslavia itself, perhaps not when the ships are in ports disarmed, but when they leave the ports armed.

The Yugoslavs claim that they keep these actions under control, but they were unable to control one of their own ships which attacked an Albanian fishing boat and killed its captain.[1] This is an act demanding condemnation which no palaver and justification by those who committed it can cover up. The Yugoslavs cannot wash their hands either of this matter or of the others like this...

The People's Republic of Albania has maintained an open and principled stand: it has respect for the just actions of the so-called non-aligned or third world countries, but it cannot accept that states which are linked by a thousand threads with the American imperialists or the Soviet social-imperialists should pose as non-aligned and, especially, in the case to which we are referring, when they permit and grant concessions to the fleets of warmongering superpowers which have as their aim to suppress the peoples and incite world war. We respect the peoples and love our friends, but it is our custom to speak to them frankly, without

[1] This took place on December 15, 1975, in the territorial waters of Albania.

kid-gloves, because sincerity is the most reliable and irreplaceable weapon for strengthening the true friendship and collaboration between peoples...

Lenin teaches us that treaties ought to be open and he denounced secret treaties.[1] Hence, every treaty should be subjected to the judgement of public opinion of the country and the world as to the advantages which this treaty might bring the particular country and mankind.

The denunciation of the Soviet-Egyptian treaty is a positive step which protects the sovereignty of Egypt, exposes the policy of the Soviet social-imperialists and tears the mask from the false friendship of the Soviet Union with the Arab peoples, therefore, we, too, have supported this denunciation.

This act of the Egyptian government once again demonstrates the truth of our Party's theses about the aims of the imperialist policy of the Soviet Union towards the Arab peoples, about the purpose of "treaties of friendship" and the "aid" which the Soviet social-imperialists offer other peoples, about their efforts to sabotage the struggle of the Pales-

[1] In the Decree on Peace endorsed by the 2nd Congress of Soviets on November 8, 1917, it is said: "*The government abolishes secret diplomacy and, for its part, announces its firm intention to conduct all negotiations quite openly under the eyes of the whole people. It will immediately proceed to the full publication of the secret treaties endorsed or concluded by the government of the landlords and capitalists...*" (V.I. Lenin, Selected Works, vol. II, Moscow 1951, p. 330, Eng. ed.).

tinian people and other Arab peoples and to establish Soviet domination in the Arab world.

However, Egypt's act in denouncing the Soviet-Egyptian treaty should not be overestimated. The problem should be seen in the context of Sadat's whole policy. While he has taken a correct decision regarding relations with the Soviet Union, he is making approaches to the United States of America and opening the doors of the country to American imperialism, thus creating new dangers for the freedom and independence of the Egyptian people and the other Arab peoples.

The development of events shows that the Arab peoples must be very vigilant. They can ensure their genuine freedom and independence, the liberation of the territories occupied by Israel and the rights of the Palestinian people, only by resolutely opposing the aggressive, hegemonic policy of the two superpowers.

MONDAY
SEPTEMBER 19, 1977

THE ENEMIES OF THE ARAB PEOPLES MUST BE STERNLY DENOUNCED

Theses for an article[1] about the visit which Anwar el-Sadat is to make shortly to Israel

...The aggressors must be isolated, must be exposed and combatted. One such aggressor against the freedom, independence and territorial integrity of the Arab peoples is Israel. It has shed the blood of the fraternal Arab peoples and occupied their territories. Every day Israel is relentlessly attacking, killing and massacring such a glorious people as the fraternal Palestinian people, whom the Zionists, supported by the American imperialists, have left without a homeland. Today the heroic Palestinian people are scattered and living the miserable existence of the homeless given shelter by their Arab brothers. Although fragmented and massacred, this nation has a high awareness of the need to fight and a fine fighting spirit. It has never given up the fight to win its freedom and rights and regain its homeland. The Albanian people nurture a great love, respect and admiration for this long-suffering but valiant people, and have unshakeable confidence in their ultimate victory.

[1] Published in the newspaper "Zëri i popullit" under the title "The Just Cause of the Arab Peoples Is Invincible," November 24, 1977.

To come to terms and reach a compromise with Israel, to neglect and violate the interests of the Arab peoples, especially the interests of the Palestinian and Syrian peoples, deserves condemnation. The Albanian people, as close and faithful friends of the Arab peoples, consider this to be a pro-imperialist activity which is aimed against the interests of the Arabs, and encourages the imperialist-Israeli aggression.

All the sound elements amongst the Arab public, the Palestinians, Syrians, Algerians, Iraqis, Libyans and even the Egyptians, have expressed their opposition to the agreement and compromise with Israel. Likewise, all who are genuine fighters against American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, against reaction and oppression, all who are for the freedom of the peoples and their liberation struggle, have unequivocally condemned and criticized the surrender to Israel and have taken a clear-cut stand against the compromise with Israel.

It is noticeable, however, that the card of the "non-aligned" is not being played at all. This is not accidental. The concrete events, the development of the class struggle, have brought out clearly the falsity of "theories" or "movements" intended to deceive the peoples. What can the partisans of the "non-aligned" movement say when the protagonists of such compromises, who are also the standard-bearers of "non-alignment," display openly that they are committed to and dependent on imperialism, that they are playing its game, that the policy which they pursue is formally independent, but in reality is dictated by others and defends in-

terests alien to the Arab peoples.

Likewise, there is no activity apparent from the so-called third world. The supporters of this theory, who loudly proclaim and try to prove with quotations that they are helping the struggle and the interests of the peoples of the world, are not showing that they defend the just cause of the Arab peoples, not coming out in support of them. Why is this? Can it be that the interests and the territories of the Arabs, the future and the existence of the Palestinians must be sacrificed for the sake of the alliance with the "second world" and the United States of America? Or perhaps, this is required by the supreme interests of imperialist superpowers, which the small nations and ordinary people are quite unable to understand?

Our Party and the Albanian people scornfully reject all the imperialist calculations. Our people have always supported the just cause of the Arab peoples and will be beside them in any situation, good or bad, in their rejoicings and victories, as well as in their griefs and temporary defeats. Ours is a small nation, but it is an unwaveringly loyal brother to those who are fighting for freedom and justice, like the Arabs and the peoples of Africa.

We observe that the overall policy which the imperialist superpowers are pursuing has been constructed in conformity with their interests as each tries to establish its own hegemony over the peoples and continents more firmly and quickly. Each of the imperialist superpowers struggles to impose its own policy on other countries or groups of countries, both when it has its claws deeply implanted there and when it is taking just the first

steps in its expansion.

The Soviet social-imperialists are working to deceive the leaderships of various African countries by presenting themselves as champions of freedom. They sell arms to these leaderships and gain the right to establish military bases for their own interests of imperialist domination. This is what occurred in Somalia. At the same time, however, another imperialist power, the United States of America, manoeuvred rapidly and by means of its agents, credits, weapons and dollars did everything possible to upset the plans of the Soviet social-imperialists a little later.

It is the peoples who are the victims of these dangerous games of imperialist interests. We see that the peoples of Ethiopia and Somalia, two freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples, each with an ancient culture, who have suffered every kind of atrocity at the hands of the Italian colonialists, have gone to war and are killing each other. Do these peoples want this war? Not at all. Could they solve the disagreements between them without the need for war? Of course, they could find suitable ways to settle them. Then, why are they fighting? It is clear that they are urged to fight by others, the imperialist powers and superpowers, for their predatory and hegemonic interests.

While the blood of suffering peoples is being shed and hatred built up between them, there are imperialist and capitalist powers which sometimes take one side and sometimes the other, sometimes applaud one country and sometimes the other, without making the slightest gesture to help these long-suffering peoples to attain peace and the pos-

sibility to build their lives in complete freedom and independence.

The policy of our Party is clear. It supports the interests of the peoples and their national liberation struggle. We speak to the fraternal peoples openly, telling them candidly how we judge matters. They must guard against the intrigues of the imperialist superpowers, who usually come pretending to be friends and well-wishers, while their real aim is to dominate and lay the foundations for the establishment of their hegemony. This is going on in Angola, Zaire and elsewhere. It has been going on for a long time in the Middle East where a grave tragedy is being played with the destinies of the fraternal Arab peoples. In this region the imperialist superpowers are pulling all the strings, alternating with one another, to fulfil their ambitions for expansion and exploitation.

Can the policy of the American imperialists, who are defending and supporting their most aggressive satellite, Israel, be considered a non-aggressive policy of retreat? At the present time an aggressive war is being prepared step by step, by means of regional wars, by inciting isolated acts of aggression and local wars. If the American imperialists declare they are for the status quo, this does not mean that they have given up their aggressive expansionist aims, but that the status quo is in favour of the interests of American imperialism and its ally, Israel.

We oppose and condemn Carter's attempts to camouflage his aggressive policy. We unmask all those who want to present the policy of the status quo as a policy, not of aggression, but of defence.

American imperialism has still not lost its teeth and its claws have not been clipped.

SATURDAY
DECEMBER 10, 1977

THE TRAGEDY OF THE ARAB PEOPLES

It is truly a great tragedy for a series of Arab peoples in the Middle East that they have long been the prey of American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. They have been continually caught up in the intrigues of the Warsaw Treaty, represented by the Soviet Union, and of NATO, represented by the United States of America, that aim to have spheres of influence, markets and military bases in those countries. The aim of the two superpowers is to keep these peoples divided and, in fact, for the time being they have achieved this aim.

As I have said on other occasions these peoples are not entirely Arab but, irrespective of this, they can be called Arabs. One thing is true, however, they are linked by the one religion, which plays a major role in these countries. Regardless of the name of their states, in most cases the Arab peoples are under the rule of monarchs, shahs and emirs who, despite their outer trappings, in many aspects run their countries with the methods characteristic of medieval feudalism and are linked with the big imperialist powers. Therefore, we cannot say that these peoples have won complete freedom and real democracy.

All these states and peoples from Mauritania, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, Egypt to Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and

the Emirates of the Persian Gulf, form "the great family of the Arab nation," as they call themselves. However, the times and events have broken up this big family, therefore this name is not of much use today. Each of these states may be, or may consider itself, part of the Arab nation, but all these states together cannot and do not form a single Arab nation. They have affinities with one another, each of them has its own independent and sovereign state; they have common interests, but these common interests are not and can never be in accord with the interests of each separate state. Why? Because their economies and assets are unequal. Moreover, some of these states are led by individuals, groups or parties that are not in the least democratic. Their main assets, large in some cases and less so in others, especially their oil resources, have been put up for auction, and the American monopolies, that is, the American imperialists have gained great superiority in the plunder and exploitation of their oil. As for the Soviets, for the time being they are trying to keep this zone unsettled, trying to exert political and ideological influence on the governments and parties of the Arab countries so that they can have military and strategic bases in this region. The rivalry between these two superpowers for political, economic and military superiority in this region is the cause of the deepening of the present division amongst the Arab peoples and Arab states.

Apart from these peoples, there are also the Palestinian Arab people and the Israeli people in this region. In the past there were not many Jews in this region, but with the passage of time, especially after the creation of the state of Israel, their

numbers grew fairly considerably. If I am not mistaken, today Israel has over 3.5 million inhabitants, but the Israeli psychology and inspiration, especially in the field of organization, have led to the strengthening of this state from all standpoints, not only economic and financial but also military. The main support of the state of Israel is American imperialism, without overlooking the other imperialist states.

Apart from Israel, through the big oil monopolies, American imperialism has Saudi Arabia — the country richest in oil in this zone, the Emirates of the Persian Gulf and Iran, under its influence. In practice American imperialism has the oil-fields in all these countries under its control. American imperialism is ready to go to war in order to hold on to this great wealth, but before becoming involved in war itself, it embroils others to fight for its interests. Thus, when it saw a possible threat to its sphere of influence in the Middle East, it sooled on Israel, which launched several successive military attacks on Egypt and Syria, which relied on Soviet social-imperialism, allegedly to conquer Israel, because it had occupied some of their territories and had driven the Palestinians from their own territories, forcing them to live as refugees in other Arab countries, as they are doing to this day. This was in the interests of the policy of the Soviet social-imperialists, because their true aim was to get control of the great oil wealth in the Middle East by means of Egypt and Syria.

Nasser fell into the trap of the Soviets, he advocated the total liquidation of Israel and, under a false pretext, established himself in North Yemen.

His policy of dependence on the Soviets brought Egypt and its people the damage we know.

Anwar el-Sadat followed the policy of Nasser, linked himself more closely with the Soviet Union and continued to threaten Israel. This enabled the Soviet Union to establish itself firmly in Egypt and brought things to the point in which it thought that no one could get it out. Basing himself on the arms he received from the Soviet Union, Sadat carried out a political manoeuvre, with an eye to the future, assessed the Israeli forces in Sinai and attacked them, but without any great success. Nonetheless, the Egyptian armies crossed to the east side of the Suez Canal and entered a part of Sinai which had been occupied by Israel in Nasser's time. In this situation the United States of America intervened and a ceasefire was established through the Security Council. Sadat called the crossing to the east bank of the Suez Canal a great victory of the Yom Kippur War,[1] as this war was called. But Israel, too, played its part in the political game, crossed to the west side of the Suez Canal, accepted the ceasefire, the talks for which were held precisely on that part of the Egyptian territory that was occupied during this war. After the ceasefire Israel still holds the Egyptian territories in Sinai and other Arab territories it occupied, has the Palestinian forces outside its territory and is launching continued attacks on their bases which are situated close to the occupied territories.

Israel is also keeping the Golan Heights of Syria under occupation and at the same time, to-

[1] The war of October 6, 1973.

gether with the American imperialists, it is working "to calm things down" in this region. This tactic is aimed at deepening the split between the Arab countries and to achieve at least a temporary and separate peace with Egypt, the main Arab country, if a permanent general treaty is not possible. The United States of America is manoeuvring with all its means and in every way to assist the Israeli strategy.

Egypt is the most populous Arab country. At the head of the Egyptian state today is Anwar el-Sadat, a wealthy Arab, who, as he himself has recorded in his memoirs of the Second World War, was in the service of the Hitlerite field-marshal Rommel. Recently Sadat went to Jerusalem where he talked with Begin, the prime minister of Israel. They reached agreement to live in "peace" henceforward, of course, on certain conditions. These conditions are favourable to Israel and also to the United States of America which is behind this great anti-Arab manoeuvre.

But Sadat's gesture in going to Jerusalem "revolted" the other Arab countries which called him a traitor to the Arab nation and gathered at a meeting in Tripoli of Libya to judge and condemn him. Besides Qaddafi of Libya, Boumedienne of Algeria, Assad of Syria and a representative of Lebanon were present at this meeting. Iraq was in agreement but apparently did not send anybody. Hence, not all the Arab countries attended the meeting in Libya at which they threatened and condemned Sadat.

In fact Saudi Arabia stands behind Sadat and supports him, although it does not declare this

openly. The Emirates of the Persian Gulf also support the action of Sadat, who certainly did not take this step without the approval of certain others, especially of the countries mentioned above.

Thus, the state of relations between the Arab countries has become an even more profound tangle. At the moment we see that Algeria, Libya, Iraq, Syria and Lebanon stand on one side and Egypt on the other, but behind Egypt stands the Hashemite King of Jordan, Hussein. Likewise, as I said, the King of Saudi Arabia and the sheikhs of the Persian Gulf, that is, the wealthiest individuals of the Arab world.

Tunisia is sitting on the fence, not taking a stand on either side, expressing itself sometimes for and sometimes against.

In order to oppose the Tripoli meeting, Sadat immediately broke off diplomatic relations with all the countries that took part in it. At the same time he called a meeting in Cairo of the interested countries of this zone, with the participation of the Americans, Israelis and Soviets, too. The latter, in their attempt to avoid being put offside altogether, refused to take part in the meeting, while the Americans agreed, and the Israelis, too, are ready to go there. Sadat is expressing his determination to hold this meeting, with or without the other Arab countries.

In other words, American imperialism wants and is going to achieve its aim of achieving a *modus vivendi*, even if just a temporary separate "peace" between its satellite, Israel, and Egypt. However, the United States of America would like the other Arab countries, especially Syria, to take part in this

"peace" agreement between Israel and Egypt and is working to bring this about because it is greatly in its interests.

Does the Soviet Union have a finger in the pie? I think it does. Despite its outward stand, the Soviet Union is interested in deepening the split between the Arab countries and peoples so that it can benefit more.

Angered by the deception in the whole stand of the Soviet Union, Sadat expelled all the military and civilian advisers and technicians of the Soviet Union and its allies of the countries of "people's democracy" from Egypt and reduced the staffs of their diplomatic representations to a minimum. Consequently, the Soviet Union changed its tune and is now openly supporting the countries which met in Tripoli. It is taking this stand in order to defend its policy in the Middle East, especially the military bases it has in Libya, Syria, etc. The advantages which the Soviet Union has gained in these countries of the Mediterranean region are of a military-strategic character, but it hopes to extend them to the economic field, too, in the future, not only in the countries on the Mediterranean Sea but also in the interior of Africa and the Middle East. In this situation the Soviet Union is pretending to be a close and sincere friend of all the Arab peoples, with the exception of Sadat and those who support him.

At the moment, then, we see that American imperialism has more or less achieved its objectives, i.e., it has consolidated its economic and strategic positions in this zone and divided the Arab peoples. The most populous Arab countries, those

with the greatest economic and military power, are on its side, while, at the same time, Israel, its real weapon in times of war and disturbances is also on its side. Meanwhile the Soviet Union is trying to hang on to those positions it still has because it has lost Egypt. Nevertheless, the Soviets have not lost all their hopes.

Clearly it must be concluded that this is a real tragedy for all the Arab peoples whose countries are on the shores of the Mediterranean, the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. China thinks that these countries and peoples of the "third world," "the main motive force which is leading the world and mankind to the proletarian revolution," will be on its side. What a scandalous theory, when it is known that most of these countries are ruled by feudal monarchs and representatives of the big capitalist bourgeoisie who are gambling with the fate of their peoples and are closely linked with one or the other of the imperialist powers!

There is nothing Marxist-Leninist about the Chinese policy. Life is showing that the theory of "three worlds" has no basis and has no influence in these countries, to say nothing of the other countries in the so-called "third world." Moreover, the stands that China has taken in this situation have placed it in an extremely weak and ludicrous position. It cannot and does not know what stands to adopt: to be pro Sadat or against him, to be against or pro Israel, to be for peace or for the continuation of the struggle of Arab peoples and especially of the Palestinian Arab people against Israel which has robbed them of their territories.

China can make no pronouncement on these

problems and this is natural on account of its ridiculous, inconsistent, baseless reactionary policy. All the Arab peoples see that China is a "great" power but one which has no strength to intervene at least by taking a stand on these very great problems which arise from the game the two superpowers are playing and which are worrying the world. Thus, although it does not say so openly, China is pro Sadat's agreement with Israel, pro the sacrifice of the freedom and independence of the Palestinian people who are demanding their homeland.

SATURDAY
DECEMBER 17, 1977

THE MIDDLE-EAST QUESTION IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT EVENTS

As is known, the American imperialists have implanted their claws in the Middle East and have undertaken to arrange an American-style peace in this region, leaving out their main rival, the Soviet Union. In this situation we see a further sharpening of the contradictions between American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. These two vultures are in strife over the division of their spheres of influence in this region.

It is known that the Middle East is a region of great strategic importance because of its oil and other natural assets and its markets, as well as from the standpoint of military strategy in connection with a major war in the future. Both the American and the Soviet naval fleets in the Mediterranean are trying to establish permanent bases in the countries around this zone.

As we know, the Soviet Union tried to establish itself in Egypt and in Syria, and it succeeded for a time, but the United States of America got it out of Egypt through Sadat who took action and expelled the Soviets from Egypt. However, he kicked out the Soviets only to bring the Americans into the country. Now the Soviets are left in Syria to which they continue to supply aid in order to have a powerful naval base there. After the loss of Egypt, the Soviets, of course, tried to establish other bases in the Mediterranean Sea and they achieved their aim:

they linked up with Qaddafi of Libya which they are arming, get oil and dollars from it, and at the same time, found the possibility to establish military, air and naval bases in that country.

The Soviets are trying to win over Algeria, too, in order to have some gain of political, if not of great strategic, importance. They want to take advantage of the conflict of that country with Morocco and Mauritania over the question of Western Sahara. Algeria supports the POLISARIO Front, while the United States of America supports the King of Morocco and Mauritania. On the other hand, as we know, American imperialism has strong links with Saudi Arabia, the Shah of Iran, the Emirates of the Persian Gulf, Israel and now also with Egypt and King Hussein of Jordan.

Thus, we see two blocs in struggle against each other as each tries to establish its own hegemony in this region at the expense of the Arab peoples. The whole policy of the superpowers is intended to split the unity and alliances of the Arab peoples, to hinder the realization of their aspirations. Each superpower is trying to dominate these peoples as completely and as easily as possible.

Egypt and Israel are the two main protagonists in the military events that are taking place in this region. Another and less important involved party is Syria. Sadat won the support of the Americans and, without the public approval of other Arab countries with which he claimed to be closely linked, undertook a "bold" action. As I have written before, he went to Israel, met the prime minister of Israel, Begin, and the members of the Knesset, the Israeli parliament, and there began the

"peace" negotiations. Sadat was warmly welcomed by the Israelis. On the surface, of course, the talks were cordial.

Sadat, Begin and Carter had reached general agreement in advance not on all the problems, but on the main ones. These main problems are under discussion at present in Cairo, Washington and elsewhere. Now the experts of Egypt and Israel have gathered in Cairo and are holding talks. As yet we do not know much about what they are discussing because the foreign news agencies are not letting out anything important.

The little bit they are saying implies that the friendship between the Egyptian and the Israeli statesmen is developing steadily. This is apparent from the fact that the Israelis are speaking with great admiration about Egypt and its leadership. It is apparent, also, from the exceptionally warm welcome which the envoys of Israel received in Cairo, where one of the streets which leads to the pyramids has been re-named the "Road of Peace."

During all this period Begin has been making many trips abroad. He went to France where he had cordial talks with Giscard d'Estaing who supports this "peaceful line." Begin also went to West Germany which, likewise, supports this "peaceful line." In recent days he went to Washington. Of course, he has been summoned to the American capital by Carter to receive even more precise instructions about what the United States of America wants achieved in these negotiations. And apparently Carter and Begin have reached a satisfactory agreement. Thus, as news agencies report, Begin will go to meet Sadat in Egypt and conclude an

agreement with him. What sort of agreement will this be in the present conditions? It is most likely to be a bilateral peace, that is, between Egypt and Israel, and efforts will certainly be made later to get Syria and, perhaps, even the other Arab countries which at present are opposed, to accept it. In this case Sadat may be given the Sinai Desert, of course, according Israel many rights confirmed and guaranteed by the United States of America, such as unimpeded free passage for its ships through the Suez Canal to the Red Sea and through the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb and the Gulf of Aden to the Indian Ocean, while the Canal will be left completely free or under the management of both parties.

On the other hand, this bilateral "peace" agreement might also lead to the settlement "in principle" of the Palestinian question. This settlement "in principle" of the Palestinian question will, of course, be to the liking of the Americans and the Israelis and will be accepted by Sadat. Hence, the aim is that the west bank of the Jordan River and the Gaza Strip on the shores of the Mediterranean be included in a "Palestinian state," or rather not an independent Palestinian state, but an entity just sufficient to acknowledge the existence of the Palestinians, united with the Hashemite kingdom of Hussein.

This could be the essence of the bilateral accord or peace agreement between Egypt and Israel, hatched up by American imperialism. Naturally, Saudi Arabia. Iran, Morocco and the Emirates of the Persian Gulf will be among the first to accept this agreement. The other Arab countries may accept it later, after some sort of settlement is found

for the question of the Syrian Golan Heights. As to what solution this bilateral treaty will provide for the question of the Syrian Golan Heights, this will be seen later, but the tendency of the Americans is to win Syria to their side, too. In other words, the United States of America will try to get the Soviet Union out of Syria and, in order to achieve this objective, it will have to give Syria some rights and privileges. This, I think, may be done later, after many negotiations on this problem between Carter, Sadat and King Saud of Saudi Arabia.

If they manage to get Syria under their control, too, then what other country is left there? Iraq. At the moment it does not support Sadat, but is not on good terms with Syria, either, because of nationalist territorial ambitions. The two "Baath" parties which are ruling in these countries are opposed to and struggling against each other. However, Iraq can easily be neutralized by American imperialism. This leaves Algeria, Libya and Lebanon. The latter is a cosmopolitan state. The bourgeoisie of Lebanon is a bourgeoisie which wants to trade, to gamble, to make deals and speculate with all sides. Therefore, you can say that Lebanon is under the thumb of American imperialism and Israel. In these conditions American imperialism reckons that neither Libya nor Algeria will put up any great opposition to complicate its plan in the Middle East.

The United States of America has control of Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Israel, the main pieces in this game of chess. Naturally, the United States of America is very interested in preventing the Soviet Union from having a foothold either in Libya or in

Algeria and, of course, it will try to achieve this.

In a recent statement to the press Carter said he is going to visit Europe. He is going to France where he will hold talks with Giscard d'Estaing. "I am very interested in talking with Giscard d'Estaing," he declared, "because France is a country which, although not in NATO, supports NATO, which is a reliable defence in which we must all be interested. But I am going to talk with Giscard d'Estaing especially about Africa," continued Carter, "because France has great knowledge of this continent accumulated over many years, and the question of Africa is of great interest to the United States of America." American imperialism could not have stated its position more clearly. It wants to strengthen its economic, strategic and political positions on the African continent. It will struggle to prevent the Soviet Union from finding any place in which to establish itself there and wherever it has been able to establish its bases or spheres of influence in Africa, these must be liquidated by the United States of America. Of course, in this activity American imperialism will protect the interests of France and Britain in Africa until it can gradually overwhelm them, too, through its own influence.

We see that now the United States of America has got rid of the Soviet Union from Somalia, the president of which, who was pro-Soviet, has now become pro-American and has gone to Washington, where he has certainly come to an arrangement with Carter. In fact, for a very long time fighting has been going on between Somalia and Ethiopia. Ethiopia, which emerged from the deplorable me-

dieval situation of Haile Sellassie's time, has still not achieved stability. Precisely this lack of stability has been seized on by the Soviets, who dive in at once wherever they find a rat hole open, to provide armaments, in the first place, as well as some minor economic and technical aid. They have landed a Cuban army and Soviet and Cuban officers and instructors in Ethiopia where they are organizing the Ethiopians and throwing them into war against the Somalis.

Despite the grave and complicated situation that is developing to the detriment of the Arab peoples and which constitutes a great danger to world peace, Hua Guofeng's China is simply looking on and doing nothing. It is looking on with anxiety in its heart, because it does not know what position to adopt, because it is stunned and confused by its own grave internal situation and its rotten theories.

In these major deals in which American imperialism is involved in Egypt with Sadat and in Africa, there is no doubt that China is pro the United States of America and pro the bilateral peace treaty. Indeed, it is very pleased with the bilateral policy, but in this it is exposing itself before the eyes of the world, because it does not state openly whether it is for or against these events performed under the "baton of the American conductor." The Chinese ambassadors everywhere are being asked about these matters, and without the slightest shame they reply, "We have nothing to say, we do not take part, because these problems are complicated." Those who hear these replies are scandalized and say, "How is it possible to maintain this stand? How has such a big state, which calls itself

socialist, been reduced to such a situation that it shuts its mouth and says that it does not meddle in such important questions because they are complicated?" In other words, everyone understands that China has sunk into the mire of a capitalist state and order, but of a chaotic and disorganized capitalist state, in such a situation that it is unable to take a stand, to have its own views and express these views as every capitalist country, even a small one, does.

That is the situation to which the anti-Marxist, revisionist line of Mao Zedong has reduced the great China, which we believed was going to fight consistently against American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

SATURDAY
MARCH 4, 1978

EACH COUNTRY HAS A RIGHT TO DEFEND ITS OWN SOVEREIGNTY

The conflict between Egypt and Cyprus over the dispatch of an Egyptian airborne commando to that country continues. Egypt has broken off relations with Cyprus. Which of these two states is at fault in this? Of course, Egypt is at fault. I see a moderation in the stand of the Cypriots and Kyprianou and a desire for understanding on their part. They want to establish diplomatic relations and have a state of peace between the island of Cyprus and Egypt. Despite the moderation in the stands of the Cypriots, who have made many conciliatory approaches to the Egyptian government, in my opinion, the latter has taken no steps in this direction.

There can be no doubt that the Egyptian government is being urged by imperialist powers to keep the conflict ablaze, a conflict which has been caused not by Cyprus. The Cypriots did their duty, they fought in defence of the sovereignty of their country. Why should Sadat send an aircraft packed with a commando of soldiers to land without permission in Cyprus and attack an aircraft on board which were two Palestinian "terrorists" who had assassinated the editor of the newspaper "Al-Ahram"? Such a matter could not be settled and it was impermissible to attempt to settle it by the methods which Sadat tried to use. Indeed, recently he has declared that he "will use weapons to protect the life of any Egyptian in any part of the world"!

FRIDAY
SEPTEMBER 22, 1978

THREE POLITICIANS AND THE PROBLEMS OF THE MIDDLE EAST

On September 18, the Associated Press news agency released from Washington the text of the agreement achieved at Camp David in the meeting between Jimmy Carter, Anwar el-Sadat and Menachem Begin on the problem of the Middle East, a problem which is of vital importance to the Arab peoples and, at the same time, also of great interest to American imperialism.

American imperialism has implanted its claws deeply in the Middle East and is pursuing a policy to split the Arab peoples, who are unable to find a common language with one another even at such difficult moments for the whole Arab community... World reaction is making every effort to keep this region split so that the various Arab states are always at loggerheads with one another, that is to say, it is the aim of world reaction to keep these peoples in bondage, in poverty and medieval slavery, in the interests of the dynasties reigning in those countries and to compel them to sell their great wealth, oil, so that reaction can draw fabulous profits from it.

In these circumstances the United States of America, which is the main gendarme and, you might say, overlord of this zone, consistently pursues the policy of "divide and rule." It sets one state against the other, groups some states against others, incites and participates in local wars be-

tween Israel and Egypt, between Israel and Syria, between Syria and the Lebanese puppets, between the Iraqis and the Syrians and between Saudi Arabia and North Yemen against South Yemen, creates disagreements in the Persian Gulf and other such diabolical plots.

American imperialism has employed Israel, in particular, as a real gendarme in its service. This gendarme has gone so far as to cause bloody wars with Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, etc. American imperialism supports Israel powerfully with the most modern weapons, indeed it is said that it has given Israel the atomic bomb. The United States of America has assisted Israel from the logistic aspect, also, because of the dominant weight which the reactionary Zionist financial circles have in the economy of the capitalist and imperialist world. Hence, American imperialism has made Israel its most suitable tool. At moments when the United States of America is in difficulties with the Arab countries over the question of supplies and the price of oil, through its tool, Israel, it precipitates bloody incidents going as far as war. These wars have enabled Israel to occupy Egyptian, Syrian and Jordanian territories, such as Sinai, the West Bank, the Golan Heights and the Gaza Strip, from which it will never budge unless it is driven out.

Despite the innumerable resolutions which have been taken in the United Nations Organization against the activities of Israel, despite the fact that the states of the world have raised their voices loudly against it, Israel has continued its aggressive activity. Not only has it occupied Arab territories, but by accepting Jewish emigrants from Poland,

Romania and especially the Soviet Union, as well as from other countries of Europe it has created Jewish colonies in them.

Of all the Arab peoples the heroic Palestinian people, who for decades on end have borne the greatest burden of misery that mankind has ever seen, are suffering the most. They are living as refugees, sheltering in makeshift homes and tents in the desert, because they have lost their homeland, which the Israelis have occupied and refuse to give up. Therefore, the Palestinian people have risen in merciless struggle, with no compromise up till now. Notwithstanding that within the Palestine Liberation Movement there are groups with different views, in general they all desire the liberation of their country from the Israeli Zionists.

The Palestinian people can be found living scattered in all the Arab countries: in Lebanon where they are established in villages which are fighting centres; in Egypt where they have lived as refugees and fighters; in Syria where sometimes they are allowed to fight, sometimes not; they have lived and some live still in Jordan where they have been barbarously oppressed; in Iraq, in Saudi Arabia, in Yemen, in the Emirates of the Persian Gulf and even in France and elsewhere. They are a valiant fighting people who have never ceased their resistance for one day...

Now, in these difficult and more or less peaceful conditions which the United States of America has created between Egypt and Israel, after many discussions and manoeuvres and countless deals behind the scenes, the three of them have met at Camp David allegedly to settle the question of the

Middle East. For thirteen days they were engaged in tête-à-tête discussions. Moreover, Jimmy Carter became an active participant in these talks so that they were held not just between Sadat and Begin, but between Carter, Sadat and Begin. Thus, Carter was considered a third partner in these talks allegedly to establish peace in the Middle East. The outcome of all this, of course, was that "the mountain laboured and brought forth a mouse." This mouse represents what the Palestinian people and the Arab peoples, in general, "gained" or did not gain. According to the communique, at Camp David, American imperialism managed to "conclude" a sort of agreement between Begin's Israel and Sadat's Egypt for a temporary peace, for a temporary settlement covering the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Negev Desert.

In reality, nothing concrete was achieved. We can say that all that was settled was that within five years Israel is to partly withdraw from the West Bank of the River Jordan and from Gaza, with the alleged aim of establishing there the autonomous state of the Palestinians of these zones. The autonomous Palestinian administration, of course, is "to be guaranteed" by the United States of America and will always be indirectly under the rule or supervision of Israel, Egypt and Jordan.

Egypt was given some other minor satisfaction. For example, an agreement was reached about some sort of Israeli withdrawal from part of the Sinai Peninsula. The whole thing is a diabolical manoeuvre of American imperialism and its agents. It is, so to say, a temporary victory for American imperialism, because, as I said above, it has been de-

cided that they will work towards the establishment of a so-called "self-governing state on the West Bank of the River Jordan and the Gaza Strip within five years. During this period this so-called self-governing state will have some kind of independent police force of its own but there will always be Israeli military and police forces there to protect the borders, as well as Jordanian forces. Thus, the Palestinians will have only nominal independence. And if a status quo such as that decided at Camp David is achieved, then a peace agreement between Egypt and Israel may be signed. The whole aim is that during this five-year period American imperialism will be left in relative peace to milk the Arab "cow" thoroughly so the oil flows without hindrance into the American tankers and pipelines, while the United States of America conducts a campaign of intrigues in all the Arab states so that they accept the decisions of Camp David and arrive at a common conclusion about an alleged overall peace. However, the Palestinian people, quite rightly, accept no part of this deal between Sadat, Begin and Jimmy Carter, because in fact they gain nothing. Their homeland is occupied, therefore, quite rightly they will fight to the end for the liberation of the territories of their homeland and the establishment of a genuine government of the Palestinian people without interference and tutelage from their permanent enemies.

It is astounding, however, that the communique states with utter shamelessness that the agreement reached was attained with the participation of Jordan, which was not represented at all at Camp David. Although everyone knows what they are, King

Hussein and the Jordanian government have declared that they have no commitment in regard to what was decided at Camp David.

The Camp David agreement has not been accepted by Syria, which describes Sadat as a traitor to the Arab nation, or by Algeria, Morocco, Libya and all the other Arab countries, indeed even the King of Saudi Arabia has spoken against it. Hence, this whole swindle was cooked up between just three persons.

Of course, during the next five years the United States of America will engage in countless other manoeuvres to persuade those who oppose the agreement, and indeed these manoeuvres have begun. In fact after the publication of the communique, Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance, set off for the Middle East to hold talks with King Saud, King Hussein, Assad and others, with the aim of convincing them at all costs by exerting pressure on them, or by bribing them with the promise of some "concession," to accept the temporary solution which Jimmy Carter has given this question. This is how things will go.

In the midst of all this China published a report in its press about the Camp David agreement. For the moment it is not taking an open stand, but obviously it stands on the side of American imperialism and Sadat. Later its support will be expressed more openly, because China is fighting for the existing status quo in the Middle East, that is, for American imperialism to rule there, and not only there, but everywhere in the world, even nearby China, in Japan, Korea, Taiwan and elsewhere, while China takes advantage of its handouts and

credits in order to become a superpower, And all this allegedly in order to combat Soviet social-imperialism.

Of course, Soviet social-imperialism, too, benefits from this situation and is automatically on the side of other allegedly strong regimes which oppose the Sadat-Begin agreement...

SUNDAY
JANUARY 14, 1979

GLORY TO THE IRANIAN PEOPLE!

The people of Persia[1] have ancient progressive traditions, great culture and an extensive idealist philosophy. Writers, poets, philosophers and scientists who have astonished the world have emerged from their ranks. Even today their works carry authority in the great world treasury of culture.

The history of the Persian people and their outstanding representatives is one of the most glorious parts of world history. Many of these great men, philosophers and poets, such as Sa'adi, Ferdousi, Omar Khayyam, etc., etc., were from the common people and their writings had their source in the people, notwithstanding that they were supported by the Shahs of various empires. The tradition of this knowledge, of this science, has been handed down from generation to generation.

In modern times Iran became the prey of imperialism, especially British imperialism, which was the first to discover the oil in that country and secured from the Shahs and princes of Persia great concessions for the "Anglo-Persian Oil Company" almost for nothing. Later, when it realized the enormous extent of this oil wealth, the British Admiralty took control of it, because without it Britain could not have had a fleet which would domi-

[1] In 1935 Riza Shah Pahlavi changed the name of Persia to Iran.

nate the seas and could not have developed an advanced industry in its metropolis.

Therefore, the "Anglo-Persian Oil Company" greatly extended the territories in which it exploited oil around Abadan on the Persian Gulf and beyond, covering the country with wells, from which it drew the "black gold," and it built big refineries there. From Abadan the oil was transported by specially built tanker ships to the metropolises and elsewhere, where it was sold for yellow gold. All this served the strategy of imperialism in its aims to dominate the world.

Later everything in regard to the extraction, processing and the transport of oil was perfected in order to ensure the greatest possible profits for the colonizers and increase to the maximum the poverty of the Iranian people.

In Iran the ample crumbs which fell from the great table of the British Empire were shared amongst the various Shahs who gave a little also to other princes in different regions of Persia which had plenty of oil-fields. The representatives of the dynasty of Hajars, and after them the Pahlavis, became the wealthiest families of Persia and, indeed, of the world, because Persia took second place in the world for the extraction of oil.

There, as we know, civil disturbances and conflicts have occurred which have had their source in the resistance of the people both to the Shah and the princesses who led a fabulous life, and to British imperialism, which mercilessly exploited the people who had no food to eat, no shoes on their feet, no shirts to their backs, in the cities, let alone in the villages.

Of these many conflicts let us speak only about that between the "Tudeh" Party, combined with the democratic land-owning bourgeoisie of Mossadeq, on the one hand, and the British Empire, represented by the great British petroleum concession, on the other hand. As a result of this conflict and uprising, Mossadeq seized state power at the beginning of 1951. The government he created nationalized the oil, so that the British Empire and other empires which got oil from Persia were in danger of being left with nothing, because the overwhelming bulk of the oil income would go to the Iranian people, in other words, the situation would change again to the disadvantage of Shah Pahlavi. The victory of the uprising of the forces that Mossadeq represented and the "Tudeh" Party, which had, you might say, communist inspiration, forced the Shah to make a hasty departure by aircraft for Rome. But then the CIA intervened and, in collaboration with the Shah's generals, deceived the scum of Tehran, got it out in the streets allegedly to defend Mossadeq, although in fact it surrounded the palace in which the members of the government were located, arrested them together with Mossadeq, ruthlessly crushed the "Tudeh" Party, executed or imprisoned its members and drowned in blood this democratic uprising of the people. The centre of the revolt, which did not have a great development all over Iran, was Tehran.

Through the intervention of the Americans, of course, the lion's share of the oil was awarded to the United States of America which played the decisive role in suppressing the popular uprising. Of the remainder, a part was left to Britain and a third

portion, which was still a huge amount because the oil wealth was so great, was given to the Shah Mohammed Riza Pahlavi. In this way he became a powerful monarch, a great megalomaniac, an emperor who traced his origin back to the Assyrians of remote antiquity. Indeed, he celebrated the 2500th anniversary of the founding of the first Persian state in the desert where he erected silk tents and invited heads of governments from all over the world, from Tito to the Chinese, who went and took part in the feast, praising to the skies the fame of the Shah of Iran, that barbarous medieval feudal ruler who sucked the blood of the Iranian people who were left to languish in utter poverty and ignorance.

The Shah became the lackey of the United States of America. The Americans were the overlords who ruled, appropriated the bulk of the oil and made the law in Iran. The Shah invested the income he received outside the country on behalf of himself and his family. He invested in the big steel companies in Germany, the United States and elsewhere, bought whole streets of residential flats and hotels in the main countries of the world and deposited gold and precious stones in the banks of the United States of America and Europe to have as his personal wealth in bad times. Within the country he had created SAVAK, a merciless weapon that maimed and killed anyone who dared oppose or even utter one word against the bloodthirsty Shah.

This time not only the oil, but the whole country as a territory was sold to the Americans politically and militarily. To protect himself from the

people, the Shah had bought from the United States great quantities of the most modern weapons which that country has sold abroad, had formed an army of hundreds of thousands equipped with all kinds of weapons, including machine-guns, tanks, aircraft and the most modern missiles and had built many airstrips. All these things were done to defend the property of the Americans in Iran and the wealth of the Shah, as well as to keep the people in misery.

Of course, such a state of affairs could not go on forever, despite the material, military and political assistance for the Shah that came from all parts of the world. Amongst others, the new Chinese Empire threw rose petals at the Shah. Hua Guofeng in person went to Iran[1] and spoke with the greatest warmth about a "great and sound" friendship with the Shah of Persia and wished a long life to this powerful supplier of China's great friends: the United States of America and world capitalism.

Hua Guofeng parted with the Shah of Iran as his greatest friend, but it must be said that these links of China's with the Pahlavi empire had been established prior to the advent to power of Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping. Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai had become close friends with the Shah of Iran. Main Chinese leaders like Li Xianian and others visited that country whenever they liked. Even the Shah's sister, one of the wealthiest persons in Iran, adviser to her brother in his plans for the enslavement and oppression of the peoples and a notorious intriguer, was given a magnificent re-

[1] On 29 August 1978.

ception in Beijing. This was Princess Ashraf who was welcomed with great honours by Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai.

Although the forces of reaction, of imperialism, revisionism and world capitalism acted together, they were unable to suppress the heroic people of Iran. The sentiment for freedom and independence was seething among them like a great volcano, the rancour was increasing, the hatred and anger among the people were mounting higher and higher until at last they erupted. For three months the whole people of Iran, the Iranian proletariat, all the workers of the oil industry, have been in open revolt. Hundreds of thousands of people filled the streets of all the cities of Iran day and night, shouting: Death to the Shah! Down with the Shah! Out with the Shah! Out with American imperialism! The sound of machine-guns firing on the Shah's orders echoed through the streets where hundreds of people were killed, but nevertheless hundreds of thousands of others came out the following day carrying the dead on their shoulders, with their clenched fists raised, protesting ceaselessly day and night. Neither the army, the tanks, nor anything else intimidated this heroic people.

Such a state of revolt had built up in the ranks of the Iranian people that no American, Chinese, Soviet or British tank could stop its outburst and the attack on the barbarous exploiting and enslaving medieval empire of the Shah Mohammed Riza Pahlavi, a lackey of imperialism and world capitalism.

This shows that the objective conditions in Iran had matured. Of course, an uprising of the people

with such great force was guided by a subjective factor. What was this subjective factor? Some try to say that it was the sense of Islam, or Ayatollah Khomeini who lives in Paris whence he issues instructions to the people in revolt. The fact is and it must be acknowledged that this person and his Shia sect are playing a role at present as a subjective factor in the revolt of the Iranian people, but he and his sect are by no means the only decisive force. The Iranian progressive, indeed non-religious bourgeoisie as well as communists and genuine patriots are also at the head of this revolution with bourgeois-democratic features, which we can call an anti-imperialist revolution the slogan of which is "Death to the Shah!" For months on end, day and night, fearlessly and with exemplary courage, the insurgents are smashing through the barriers of the enemy like a *rouleau compresseur*[1] completely unafraid of the bullets of the Shah's army, unafraid of death. The throne of the Pahlavis is tottering and is expected to topple and fall any day now. The Shah of Iran will be driven out, if not today, certainly in the near future. He has declared that he is going away for a while allegedly for a rest, but he will go never to return. The Shah pretends to be leaving at his own pleasure, but pleasure has nothing to do with it. It is the force, the resistance, the uprising of the people which compel him to choose — either stay and be captured alive or killed by the people, or get on an aircraft and go to the United States of America. Indeed, he has sent all the members of his family there, while he himself is hanging

[1] Steam roller (French in the original).

on a little longer, until he can create some kind of *modus vivendi*, a government which will allegedly be accepted and a regency, that is, it must be considered that the Shah has not abdicated and that later his son will have pretensions to the throne; to this end he has appointed a person who has been disowned by his own party, the party of Ayatollah Khomeini.

The main thing is that the great revolt of the heroic Iranian people against world imperialism, against the Shah, against innumerable modern weapons, against that monster which seemed invincible, has triumphed. Although unarmed, the people with the great force of their will, which was displayed everyday in confrontation with the armed forces of the Shah, demonstrated that they are invincible, a thing which has shaken the United States and compelled tens of thousands of foreign specialists to leave Iran. The aircraft carriers of the United States of America have been ordered into Iranian waters, but without hope. So, this time the CIA lost out in Iran, was unable to triumph as it did in the Mossadeq uprising, because this time the uprising has assumed colossal proportions. The oil of Iran is no longer flowing into the British, American, Chinese and other tankers.

This shows what a colossal force the people comprise. The Iranian people overthrew the empire and imposed defeat on the great military and political might of American and world imperialism. This is a very important fact which serves as a great example for the other peoples of the world who must draw conclusions from the uprising of this heroic people...

Hence, as I pointed out, all that has occurred in Iran exemplifies the strength of the people and shows that the objective and subjective factors for the revolution have been created. It must be understood, however, that in these events the subjective factor is not simply the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of Iran alone, because there are other progressive, democratic, bourgeois, anti-feudal and anti-imperialist forces which are operating there. The Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of Iran must draw lessons from this and go deep amongst the people, must be in the forefront of the situation, create links with the people, with the proletariat, and show them what great victories they have scored, and be able to build alliances with those elements, with those democratic strata, which took part actively in the uprising, and advance together with them from stage to stage.

The peoples, the Marxist-Leninist parties and progressive elements must draw correct conclusions from the uprising in Iran. American imperialism and especially Soviet imperialism, which are vying with each other for spheres of influence, usually accuse each other of having organized uprisings and revolts in those countries where the peoples are fighting for their national and social liberation. They do this in order to denigrate these uprisings and revolts, to belittle their true value and to sabotage them more easily. They are employing this tactic in regard to the great revolt of the Iranian people against the Shah and imperialism. The charge is not true. However, they do have a finger in this revolt, but in another direction, and concretely: U.S. imperialism wants to protect the priv-

ileges it has had in Iran and is doing everything in its power to hang on to them. Soviet imperialism is trying to seize the opportunity to secure privileges for itself. For this purpose Carter has spoken two or three times in support of the Shah of Iran and the Soviet Union has not lagged behind, declaring that it would not allow the intervention of other states in Iran.

* * *

The fact is that American imperialism has suffered a political, economic and military defeat in Iran, its alliance with the Shah has received a staggering blow. But has American imperialism washed its hands of Iran? It is wrong to think or say that it has completely washed its hands of Iran. No, it will employ new tactics, tactics in allegedly democratic forms and ways, will try to enter into agreements, to come to terms, of course less favourable than those of the time of the Shah, with that bourgeois-democratic state which will be established in Iran after the departure of the Shah.

Soviet imperialism also has its own elements in Iran through whom it operates for its own interests in opposition to those of American imperialism. Soviet imperialism has not fought much against the Shah; on the contrary, the Soviet Union has handled him with kid-gloves. However, we can say that in Iran the Soviet Union has influence among the Kurds and the people of Azerbaijan, as well as in the "Tudeh" Party, which it will continue to use for its own ends. It will exert its influence, also, after the creation of another bourgeois-democratic government, such as Ayatollah Khomeini predicted

will be established in the interview which he gave in Paris.

It has been declared that after the fall or removal of the Shah and with the proclamation of the republic, as Ayatollah Khomeini has promised, certain reforms for the people will be carried out: SAVAK, the Shah's terrible secret police which oppressed the people, will be liquidated, or the big Iranian army will be liquidated, some people will be put on trial, a thing about which we have no doubt, and the wealth of some individuals who have committed the most scandalous abuses will be confiscated.

From the current news agency reports we see that before his departure the Shah created a regency council, which includes the prime minister, the chief of the general staff and others. This prime minister, Shapour Bakhtiar, is the Shah's man, hence the man of the Americans. Will he be able to seize power or carry out a coup d'état? This we shall see. But at the moment he is not accepted either by the masses of the people or by Ayatollah Khomeini in Paris, who has declared that he is going to form a government of his own which will take a neutral stand, neither with the Soviet Union nor with the United States of America.

As far as can be seen, the two imperialist superpowers are trying to make deals to the detriment of the Iranian people, to the detriment of the blood that has been shed, although apparently neither the Americans nor the Soviets have been able to get round Ayatollah Khomeini as yet. If the Americans manage to come to terms with Khomeini and his followers, then there will certainly be a bloodbath

in Iran and the people's uprising will be suppressed. As to what the Soviets will do, this we shall see. Perhaps, they will try to get around Ayatollah Khomeini, making him form a government which will have regard for the interests both of the Soviet Union and of the United States of America. This will be a middle course and we shall see whether it will be achieved. Nevertheless, everything will continue to be at the expense of the people because the democratic regime which will be established after the departure of the Shah will be like all the other regimes of the oil basin, of the Middle East zone.

Many intrigues will be hatched up so as to prevent this revolution from carrying out deep-going reforms. In this very important strategic country it will still take a long time for the people to become even more conscious of their great strength and this consciousness must be created by a genuine Marxist-Leninist party. At present this party is almost non-existent or is a very small force, the influence of which is still felt little if at all. Soviet influence might make itself felt through the government which will be established in this country, but this will certainly be felt in the interests of the imperialist Soviet Union and allegedly in the forms of a democracy for the people. The Soviet Union wants to get a foothold in the Persian Gulf as it is trying to do in Iraq.

Therefore, in this zone of such importance to the whole world, from both the economic and the strategic aspects, many tactics and strategies will be employed and we must watch them, because they have great importance for the future of the

world in the sense that this region might be the starting-point of a world war, but at the same time might also be the starting-point of a chain of revolutions, bourgeois-democratic revolutions, which could develop into genuine revolutions...

The Middle East is ablaze. At the moment Iran is in the vanguard, while the other countries of this zone are in confusion, involved in innumerable intrigues. The peoples in these countries are downtrodden, under the yoke of local capitalists linked with various other foreign capitalists. One thing links these countries with one another: the war allegedly against Israel, while their other links are obviously with one or the other of the imperialist powers which are operating there much more freely than they are operating in Iran at present.

There at present the people are on the move and have become a great force. But how and where, in what direction this great force will be channelled and what will emerge concretely from this great popular movement, we shall see later. It is a positive fact that the people in Iran are rising for the second time against the monarchy, against feudalism, in an anti-imperialist struggle and for a progressive, bourgeois popular democracy.

TUESDAY
JANUARY 16, 1979

THE SHAH HAS BEEN KICKED OUT OF IRAN. A GREAT HISTORIC VICTORY OVER THE MONARCHY

News agencies report that the Shah Mohammed Riza Pahlavi has been kicked out of Iran. The throne of the feudal monarch, an agent of American imperialism, has been overthrown by the great popular uprising of the Iranian people and the proletariat of the oil industry. This is a great historic victory.

On this occasion I gave Comrade Ramiz Alia the theses for an article[1] to be written for the newspaper "Zëri i popullit" in which the i's should be dotted to show the strength of the people, the strength of the proletariat in the struggle against the monarchy, feudalism and imperialism and for the triumph of democracy, a triumph which must be carried through to the end. It should be stressed that the people must persist in this struggle in order to achieve even greater victories through profound reforms. Of course this will take time, but the struggle must be continued.

Irrespective of which individual figures led the popular uprising, it must be said that they are progressive elements of the bourgeoisie who have thrown themselves into the struggle against the

[1] "A Great Historic Victory of the Iranian People," "Zëri i popullit," January 19, 1979.

feudal monarchy internally and against American imperialism, against capitalism which exploits the Iranian people, and that this uprising is based on the people and the proletariat. In these events the subjective factor is not the Marxist-Leninist party which, of course, has its own part, although still weak.

The people and the proletariat must continue the struggle for profound and far-reaching democratic reforms and for greater vigilance against the various imperialists who will not give up their diabolical plans in regard to Iran and will try to manoeuvre with every kind of intrigue, utilizing various individuals in order to keep that country in perpetual bondage, in new forms, in order to exploit it and its wealth.

Therefore, the Iranian proletariat and people must be vigilant both against American, British and French imperialism and against Soviet social-imperialism, because the "Tudeh" Party is sure to be revived there and will support the Soviet Union in the infiltration of its influence into Iran. The United States also will turn over the page and will try to find a Bakhtiar or someone like him in Iran who should come to power with a "democratic" government.

WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 24, 1979

CHINA IS SILENT ABOUT THE EVENTS IN IRAN

In Iran the uprising continues. The broad masses of the people are coming out in even bigger demonstrations in the streets of Tehran and other cities. Likewise, the strike continues in the oil-fields.

The Shah has left the country, or rather has been swept out. He went to Aswan in Egypt where he had contacts and long talks lasting for five days with Sadat. Sadat did not consider his acceptance of the Shah's visit as interference in the affairs of Iran because, allegedly, he did not receive the Shah to show that he supported him, but as a personal friend who had taken the side of Egypt in the war against Israel. All this is a concoction.

Just "by chance" at the time when the Shah was in Egypt, Ford, the ex-president of the United States of America, arrived there. Allegedly, he, too, had not come to see the Shah, but since "he happened to be there," Ford set off for Aswan and there in the big residential hotel where Sadat and the Shah were staying, the three of them spent two to three days talking tête-à-tête. Ford left. It was announced that after staying five days in Egypt, the Shah would go on to the Sherifian monarchy of Morocco as a friend of King Hassan II and from there to the United States, allegedly to take a brief holiday.

The Shah's travels to Egypt, the African regions

and, perhaps, a visit to the King of Jordan later, contain some threat, although not very large, of intervention or disturbances inside Iran.

The situation in Iran is this: the Bakhtiar government continues to exist and calls itself the constitutional government. The United States of America has defended the Shah as much as it could: Carter himself spoke in his support over the radio more than once, but when it was seen that everything was lost in regard to the person of the Shah, the United States considered what it must do to save the future, the dynasty, to have it in its service. Therefore, the United States of America, through its president, is giving powerful support to prime minister Bakhtiar.

The manoeuvre of the Americans and the Shah's supporters was that on the departure of the Shah, a regency should be created in Iran, as was done, and if possible, this regency was to calm the tempers and after a time, after making some fraudulent changes and proclaiming some false democratic rights, would bring back to power, not the Shah, but his son. In other words, the United States of America would return to its omnipotence in Iran and retain the big oil concessions.

The situation is becoming more and more difficult each day for Bakhtiar, hence, the end is coming for him, too. The rising tide of the insurrection of the people has shut him in the presidential palace whence, through Tehran Radio, he is threatening the Iranian people that if law and order are not established, he will resign and will take the matter to the army, which will no longer be bound by its oath of loyalty to the power of the regency and the gov-

ernment which has emerged from this regency. In other words, he is threatening that the imperial military caste might carry out a military putsch in Iran. In fact this threat is an expedient which the United States of America is trying against the Iranian people, after attempting many other actions which failed. We must realize that the United States has a very large number of military specialists and advisers and others disguised as oil experts or managers of various companies in Iran. Therefore, within Iran there is a force of nearly 40,000 Americans, so that the 1,000 or 2,000 Americans whom the newspapers say have left, are of no significance.

Let us turn now to the leader of the Shia Muslim sect, Khomeini. His stand has been and is against the Shah of Iran. He has declared that he is against American imperialism and any other imperialism, that he will return to Iran on Friday, that is, the day after tomorrow and, with a broad popular consensus, will overthrow the Bakhtiar government and the Regency Council and proclaim the formation of an Islamic republic.

Hence, it is obvious that Ayatollah Khomeini has powerful support in Iran. In fact he also has an organization. This means that the big capitalist and feudal bourgeoisie, now separated from the regime of the Shah, is organized in a national front, but with pronounced religious tendencies. By means of this organization, about the nature and strength of which we have little concrete information, Khomeini has managed to eliminate the corrupt power of the Shah and Bakhtiar and, according to reports, Islamic committees, that is, committees of state power, have been created and these have assumed

the guiding role in the life of the country and the administration, while the army is still waiting to see what happens. What will it do when Khomeini returns to Iran? Will it attack, carry out a coup d'état, or will it place itself in the service of Ayatollah Khomeini and his Islamic organization? We shall have to wait and see. However, it is possible that the attack by the army will be avoided because American imperialism is afraid of a civil war in Iran. A civil war in Iran would be in the disfavour of the United States of America and all the other imperialist powers. It would be another major conflagration in the Middle East.

For this reason, the former American Secretary of Justice, Clark, went to France allegedly on a private visit. After a very long talk with Khomeini, Clark returned immediately to Washington. Hence, Ford, on the one hand, and the former American Secretary of Justice, on the other hand. It seems to me that the thesis that the Shah's army will submit to Khomeini is the most likely. The United States will set all the people of its vast secret agency in Iran in motion and will try to infiltrate into the Shia organization of Ayatollah Khomeini. While offering him its advice, the United States will accept whatever Ayatollah Khomeini decides. In Paris he declared that there will be no leftists, no communists taking part in any government he forms, but only progressive popular elements who are for reforms, etc. In other words, Ayatollah Khomeini has under his command a very strong party, organized in illegality, which has now emerged in the light and which may refuse to accept people from the "Tudeh" Party, which is under So-

viet influence, especially in the leadership of the state.

The "Tudeh" Party also came out with declarations and placards and, in street demonstrations, indicated that it accepted the points of Ayatollah Khomeini's program and would support it with its activities. Therefore, it is likely to demand from Ayatollah Khomeini that it, too, should participate in the government. Whether or not Ayatollah Khomeini will accept it, this, of course, we shall see later, in practice.

As to the Marxist-Leninists, that is, those who are inspired by the Workers and Peasants' Communist Party known as "Tufan," or other groups around this Marxist-Leninist party, the news agencies say that they, too, have come out in demonstrations in the streets, and their slogans are correct. They support the people's uprising and demand that it should go further, that the people should strive for profound bourgeois-democratic reforms, for the total liquidation of the fascist monarchic regime of the Shah and that the future regime should have sound democratic features.

Towards this very powerful movement in Iran which is having great repercussions in the world, the China of Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping remains dumb and has completely shut its mouth. It has nothing to say and there is nothing it can say, because it has come out openly in defence of the Shahanshah of Iran and against the popular uprising. We know that when Hua Guofeng was returning from Belgrade, he stopped in Tehran where he met, talked and dined with the Shah of Iran, at moments when the streets of Tehran were seething

with the mighty demonstrations of the people on whom the machine-guns of the Imperial Guard of the Shah poured volleys of bullets.

Now Hua Guofeng's China is preparing to send Deng Xiaoping to Washington. In their main articles foreign news agencies and the "New York Times" say that the United States of America and Carter will turn out to give Deng Xiaoping a welcome just as majestic as that they gave Khrushchev. They will welcome him with showers of flowers and ticker-tape thrown from the skyscrapers. That is why China "has no time" to speak about the struggle and the revolt of the Iranian people!

SATURDAY
JANUARY 27, 1979

THE SITUATION IN IRAN IS COMPLICATED

The situation in Iran continues to be disturbed and there are no signs of stability yet. Ayatollah Khomeini, who had declared that he would be in Iran on Friday without fail, was unable to stick to this decision, because the Bakhtiar government closed all the airports of the country and declared that Ayatollah Khomeini could not return to Iran for at least three days. Hence, all the airports have been occupied by the army and during this time, of course, combinations are being hatched up between the Bakhtiar government and the Shah, who is strolling in the parks of the King of Morocco and is said to be going back to his friend Sadat in Egypt.

According to the news agencies, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of State has returned to Washington. All the facts show that the actions of the Bakhtiar government are commanded by the United States of America.

Bakhtiar declared that legislative elections would be held for the Constituent Assembly within four months and it would emerge from these elections whether the people choose a republican regime or a constitutional monarchy. At that time, says Bakhtiar it will be decided whether Khomeini should be pardoned and allowed to return or should be banned. That means that during this period a thousand and one intrigues will be hatched up.

As for Ayatollah Khomeini, he has declared that he will fly to Tehran tomorrow, Sunday. How can he land there when the airports of Iran are filled with tanks? Civil war will have to break out, that is, a clash between the military forces and the people, because to capture the airports the people will have to defeat Bakhtiar's army. This is the only way that Ayatollah Khomeini can return. But there is another way, the illegal way, which is both possible and impossible: Ayatollah Khomeini cannot travel via Saudi Arabia, because that country does not permit this since it is pro the Shah and because the more the functioning of the oil-wells and the refineries of Abadan is delayed, the better for Saudi Arabia. Likewise for Iraq. That leaves the Soviet route, but Ayatollah Khomeini has declared that he is neither with the Soviets nor with the Americans. Therefore, the return of Ayatollah Khomeini to Iran illegally will be the signal for the commencement of the civil war. If Khomeini is determined to do this, he will not act badly, provided it is not done by means of the Soviets. Nevertheless, the revolution must forge ahead and conquer the armed guard on which the imperial bourgeoisie of the Shah and the American CIA are relying...

The problem is very complicated. The fact is that during this time the people continue to come out in the streets against the regime of the Shah, against the Bakhtiar government, against the state of emergency, against the army at the risk of their lives. Scores are killed every night. There are major movements among the students and the workers who are on strike. We must watch how the situation develops now, because the development and

course of events in Iran have exceptional importance in the international situation at present.

MONDAY
FEBRUARY 12, 1979

A NEW VICTORY OF THE IRANIAN PEOPLE

It has been announced that the Iranian government of Shapour Bakhtiar, which the Shah appointed before he was kicked out, has been overthrown together with the regency which the Shah left behind him. This is a new victory in the long struggle of the Iranian people for the liquidation of the Pahlavi dynasty once and for all and, at the same time, of the influence of American imperialism in that country. The formation of a new government has been announced.

The situation is very tense but revolutionary in all the Iranian cities. There have been bloody clashes with the police and army detachments loyal to the Shah.

TUESDAY
FEBRUARY 13, 1979

THE REVOLUTION OF THE IRANIAN PEOPLE HAS TRIUMPHED

The popular revolution in Iran has triumphed, the feudal monarchy of the Pahlavis has been overthrown. Yesterday the government of the Shah, headed by Shapour Bakhtiar, gave up the ghost. The regency established for manoeuvres against the people collapsed and the famous Imperial Guard was routed. Likewise, SAVAK, the notorious police force of the Shah, was routed. This is a great triumph for the broad masses of the revolutionary Iranian people, who have fought persistently for years on end with valour and self-sacrifice and in the last three or four months have struck the decisive blow at the detested monarchy of the Shah, Mohammed Riza Pahlavi.

This anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution of the Iranian people is markedly influenced by the spirit of the Shia mullahs, headed by Ayatollah Khomeini, the successor to Ayatollah Kashani, who was the leader of the Shia sect in Iran at the time of Mossadeq. The fact that they have influence cannot be denied, but their influence, however it may be dressed up in a democratic cloak, is nothing but a consequence of a retrograde idealist philosophy just as medieval as that of the monarchic regime. But the times require that they establish in Iran, under this cloak and this philosophy, a so-called Islamic Republic, which sooner or later might strengthen the foundations of a reactionary

state power and establish links, new ones, of course, and in forms somewhat more favourable to Iran, with American imperialism and the other imperialists.

Ayatollah Khomeini's Shias manoeuvred within this movement in which the people were the decisive force, though there were other forces, too. The "Tudeh" Party which, as far as we know, is under the influence of the Soviets, did not remain idle. In this revolution the progressive anti-imperialist elements and the Marxist-Leninists could not have been a major force. They were still lacking the necessary formation. But during this revolution they learned how to fight. Now their task is to consolidate themselves and to insist, by means of the broad masses of the people, that this revolution of a bourgeois-democratic character should advance and gradually free itself from the Shia idealist ideology. Hence, they should be the first to expropriate the property of feudals and capitalists, making it the property of the whole people, to carry out the agrarian reform, an agrarian reform not just in words but in the interests of the poor and middle peasants of Iran. Likewise, they must deepen the revolution, impelling the advance of the great revolutionary force of the Iranian proletariat, of the workers of the oil industry and other sectors of industry, because American imperialism has invested large amounts of capital in Iran, has built modern refineries and also various other factories in which a working class large in number is employed.

Hence, without immediately becoming involved in struggle on all fronts with the Shia movement, which seems to have a stronger influence in

Iran, the Iranian Marxist-Leninists, the revolutionaries and progressive elements must aim their efforts to oppose the idealist philosophy of this movement, because already we see that these religious zealots have gone into action. The mosques there are becoming main centres of indoctrination and Ayatollah Khomeini is making appeals to the people to go to the mosques for everything and there, apart from the instructions which Khomeini himself gives, the hodjas advise them on what they should do. It must be recognized that among the instructions which are given there, some are correct, for instance those which say that the elements hostile to the Iranian people must be liquidated.

Apart from other things, the revolutionaries, the Marxist-Leninists, the progressive elements of various classes must free themselves of the shackles of religion and of the religious ideology and teachings, above all, the women must be liberated from Islamic slavery, the veils which they are forced to wear must be done away with, so that the women uncover their faces. The women must start work in factories and everywhere else. In Iran, a country in which a medieval religious fascist and imperialist regime has prevailed right up to these days, the women comprise half the population and, as in every other country, they are one of the most revolutionary forces, second only to the proletariat.

The revolutionaries and Marxist-Leninists of Iran, the proletariat itself, must have learned from the savage exploitation which American, British and French imperialism and all world capitalism have imposed on them, therefore they must no

longer allow the wealth of their country to be shared out again in different proportions amongst these same imperialists. Naturally, Iran cannot exist in isolation. It cannot fail to produce and sell oil. Oil is a great wealth of that country, but it is also a vital sinew for the Western world, especially for world capitalism, which could go as far as waging war over the Iranian petroleum.

Iran could be a field of battle between American and world imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, which has about two thousand kilometres of common border with Iran where many Azerbaijanis live. The Azerbaijanis of Iran have family and tribal links with those of the Soviet Union, therefore it is impossible that that country does not have influence on the revolution of the people of Iran, not have its own men in the "Tudeh" Party and other political strata.

Thus, knowing that the importance of Iran is based mainly on its oil, and all of them will fight for the oil, the Iranian revolutionaries must be vigilant on this question. According to what the foreign news agencies say, influential people consider the blockade of Iranian oil much more terrible than the blockade of Berlin, the war in Korea, or the war in Vietnam. It is a fact that the events in Iran, the four-month strike by the oil extraction workers, have caused the capitalist industry of Europe and America losses from which it will take them at least two years to recover.

Therefore this is an acute problem. If the Iranians stick firmly to these revolutionary positions and proceed in the future with serious persistence, this action of theirs will certainly have a great in-

fluence on the other countries of the Middle East, too. Already Khomeini has refused to supply oil to Israel, the friend of the Americans, which got 75 per cent of its petrol from Iran, and has likewise refused to supply Rhodesia and the racists of South Africa.

If the new state which is being formed deals with the problem of oil in the interests of the Iranian people and the other peoples who are languishing under the domination of imperialists and social-imperialists, then this is progress for the revolution.

But, of course, the Iranian revolutionaries, Marxist-Leninists and proletariat have to understand that they cannot do what they like, as they like and all at once. The situation, the present objectively revolutionary situation, the subjective aspect of which is dominated by the religious idealist element, must develop still further. That powerful element must be gradually outflanked by means of more progressive alliances, or by hindering it in those actions which are harmful to the interests of the people, precisely by means of the great revolutionary strength of the people.

The Iranian people must be made aware that they themselves achieved the victory, that it was a result of their struggle and it was not won by Ayatollah Khomeini, Allah, hazret Ali or hazret Hussein. There has been, is and certainly will be in the future, a great deal of talk about the Islamic inspiration of this revolution, but the decisive factor in it was the fight of the people and the workers who were shot down in the streets, against the Shah, against his medieval empire and against imperial-

ism, to win a free life and a happier future, a genuine democracy until the socialist revolution is achieved.

TUESDAY
FEBRUARY 13, 1979

THESES FOR A NEW ARTICLE ABOUT THE EVENTS IN IRAN

I talked to the comrades about the need to prepare another article[1] on the revolution of the Iranian people, in which it should be stressed that this revolution which overthrew the medieval feudal monarchy of the Shah of Iran also struck a heavy blow at the imperialist powers, especially American imperialism, and at world capitalism in general, which, up till now, had profited by plundering the oil and exploiting the people of that country to the bone.

In the article we should point out that Lenin's thesis that the present epoch is the epoch of revolutions and the dictatorship of the proletariat is being confirmed. We should point out also that our Party has said that now the revolution is not just an aspiration but a problem on the agenda, and the uprising of the Iranian people confirms this thesis. With world developments in their present state, this revolution will certainly be followed by other revolutions, of course, of varying intensity. The example of Iran will have an influence in other countries, thus assisting the liberation struggle of all oppressed peoples.

---

[1] Reference is to the article entitled: "The Iranian Working Class Came Out on the Battlefield, Overthrew the Shah and Shook the Capitalist World," published in the newspaper "Zëri i popullit" on February 18, 1979.

In the article we must not deny the subjective influence of the Shia religious sect, because it has played a positive role in the overthrow of the imperial regime of the Pahlavi feudal dynasty. At the same time, we must point out, however, that the ideology which guides this sect is idealist, religious, therefore it can never properly and fully realize the democratic aspirations of the lay masses of the people of Iran, who from the outside might seem to be religious, but in action, and precisely in this revolution, proved to be progressive, objective and radical. It should emerge clearly that the inspiration in this revolution against the feudal dynasty of the Shah, Mohammed Riza Pahlavi, and imperialism is not merely religious and idealist, but has also a progressive democratic character. The popular masses displayed their eagerness for major transformations, for the land reform, for a really progressive cultural development, for the elimination of the backwardness of the people and the women and girls of Iran who, coming out in the streets to fight, engaged in bloody clashes with SAVAK and the Imperial Guard. Hence, it should be pointed out that for these masses it was not the problem of the Islamic religion, but the problem of the liberation of the people, of the working class, of the peasantry, the women and the youth of that country that presented itself.

We must also stress what Lenin said about the revolution, that this is a serious issue which, if you involve yourself in it, you must carry through to the end. In this way we should warn the people of Iran to be vigilant, so that they do not allow themselves to fall once more under the yoke of foreign imperi-

alists, whether American, Soviet or others, who will certainly intrigue and try by means of compromises and bribery to corrupt the corruptable, to regain control of their old concessions and positions through other "new" forms, with great profits for themselves and losses for the people of Iran. In the article we should stress that the Iranian people must never allow this. To prevent this from coming about the old state power must be smashed to its foundations and new organs of state power created, a new Constitution of theirs must be prepared and this must borrow nothing from the so-called democracy of the bourgeoisie. On the question of the organization of the state, the Iranian people must not allow the feudal bourgeoisie to infiltrate into its institutions, but must take complete control of these institutions themselves, placing in them their most faithful representatives who will carry out real major social and economic reforms.

We must develop the part in which we point out how Lenin's thesis that the revolution must be carried through to the end should be understood, while making clear that one cannot go on to the proletarian revolution immediately. The progressive forces must gain ground gradually, winning sound democratic and progressive positions against all reactionary elements, especially against remnants of the backward feudalism of the past that will resist the revolution.

The article should also stress the fact that the Iranian people have to take proper account of the strategic position of their country and all the means they have in their hands to defend the victories of the revolution. Oil is the strongest weapon they

hold, because it is known that whoever has the oil has the strength in Iran. Therefore, the working class must never allow anybody to wrest this powerful weapon from them. Throughout the Iranian revolution, during the past four months in particular, the oil has continued to shake the capitalist world. Therefore, we should point out that the people of Iran must be made conscious of the need to keep a firm grip on this weapon, to fear neither the Americans, the Soviets, nor the other coalitions, to have no fear of isolation and to defend their wealth with determination. By utilizing the developing situation with proper wisdom, always bearing in mind the interests of their homeland and the interests of the other peoples of the world who are fighting for freedom, a country in revolution, which has control of such a weapon as oil, which has such a courageous people who overthrew a rotten old world, such as the empire and dynasty of the Pahlavis was, in order to build a new life, is capable of resisting all enemies.

We can say the Iranian people ought to consider that their struggle also assists the liberation struggle of all peoples. For this we Albanians have exceptionally great respect and bow in honour to the fallen heroes who fought in the streets of the Iranian cities and gave their lives for this victory.

In the article we should also mention the Marxist-Leninist communists and the genuine revolutionaries. We should say that they must be in the forefront of the struggle and at these moments should be neither sectarian nor opportunist and in no instance play the game of those who, under whatever disguise they present themselves, will try

through a thousand and one tricks to deceive the people, to hinder the radical reforms and serve the superpowers.

Faced with the stubborn determination of the people to win their rights, the monarchy, the Pahlavi empire and the caste of senior officers could not resist, although they were supported by American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, so they were overthrown. In this popular uprising the members of the military caste, watchdogs of the Shah of Iran, grown fat on American dollars, were unable to preserve the unity of the army, because the young men of the people refused to follow them. It should be pointed out that the main force in any army is comprised of the young men of the people, therefore, the new army in Iran must be a democratic army. The progressive individuals who will be placed at the head of it must not allow its ranks to be penetrated by elements of the reactionary military caste, who will try to use the young men of the people to kill the people. It should be said that even in the bourgeois-democratic revolution in France the sans-culottes promoted outstanding commanders from their ranks and routed the army of the French kings, the aristocracy and feudalism. This example is very relevant at the present time when weapons have become the dread of the world, but it depends on who has control of these weapons and against whom they are directed.

WEDNESDAY
FEBRUARY 14, 1979

NEW THESES FOR THE ARTICLE ON THE EVENTS IN IRAN

I told Comrade Ramiz that in the article that is to be published about Iran, when speaking about the broad masses of the people who came out in the streets in their millions, rose against the Shah and his patron, imperialism, and carried out the revolution, it would be a good thing to quote parts of the article we wrote ten to eleven years ago, on the eve of the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet social-imperialists. Point one.

Second, I told him that it should come out clearly that the revolution cannot be carried out without violence. In the case of Iran hundreds and thousands of people were killed in the streets by the Shah's gangs. The revolution triumphed there, but it was won at the cost of bloodshed.

Therefore I expressed the opinion that we should accompany certain questions in the article with excerpts from the book "Imperialism and the Revolution."[1] Our Party has defended the important theses of Marxism-Leninism that the revolution is won with violence, that the revolution is on the agenda today, that many local cliques are in the service of imperialism and if they are not combatted, the fight against imperialism cannot be suc-

[1] This book of Comrade Enver Hoxha has been published in Albanian and several foreign languages by "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1978.

cessful. The events in Iran confirm the correctness of these theses and it should be pointed out that what occurred in Iran will occur in other countries, too.

The fact should also emerge clearly from this article that the working class took up arms and came out in the streets, hurled itself into the struggle, boycotted the administration of the Shah, shook American imperialism and the whole western capitalist world by standing in the forefront of the struggle of the Iranian people to escape from the savage exploitation of the Shah and foreign imperialists. With the fight it waged and the role it played in this anti-feudal and anti-imperialist democratic revolution, the Iranian working class demonstrated to the world that it is the only social force to which the future belongs.

It should be pointed out in the article that on the basis of Lenin's teachings the working class is the only class which must lead the revolution. The uprising of the people of Iran, led by the working class, proves the opposite of what the bourgeoisie and revisionists preach about the role of this class in the revolution. It was precisely the Iranian working class which shook the rotten bourgeois world to its foundations, however, it must be vigilant to avoid becoming downtrodden again. What occurred in Iran will occur in all the other so-called independent and democratic countries, whether monarchies or republics, in which the people are oppressed by the big bourgeoisie closely linked with foreigners.

Hence, in this article we should give a supplementary explanation to the theses our Party has ex-

pressed in its various documents.

I gave instructions that as soon as this article comes out it must be transmitted immediately by radio, because the revolution of the Iranian people against the monarchy and imperialism is an event of major world importance.

THURSDAY
FEBRUARY 15, 1979

SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT THE EVENTS IN IRAN AND THE PRESENT SITUATION

The anti-imperialist revolution of the Iranian people will have major repercussions, not just in the Middle East, but throughout the whole world, especially in the capitalist-revisionist imperialist world.

As I have written before, this was an anti-feudal and anti-imperialist popular revolution with features of a bourgeois-democratic revolution. The very broad participation of the working masses of city and countryside, workers of the oil industry and other branches of the economy, poor peasants, student youth, progressive elements of the intelligentsia, democratic-bourgeois politicians, leaders of the Shia sect, soldiers, sons of the people, give it its popular character. However, I think we must wait and see whether it will be turned into a true bourgeois-democratic revolution, because this depends on the reforms that ought to be carried out and will be carried out after its triumph, especially a far-reaching land reform which should return the plundered land to those who work it, the Iranian peasants, and other reforms which will give the people genuine democratic freedoms while pressing on uncompromisingly with the struggle against the influence and interference of any kind of imperialism in the internal affairs of Iran. Time will

make this clear to us.

The Iranian people had been left in the dark ages, in backwardness, especially in the countryside, where the big landowners made the medieval law. Even that industrial pseudo-modernization which was seen in the cities, especially in the capital and other main cities such as Isfahan, etc., was a forced industrialization created by a great inflation of the petrol dollar which had not lifted the Iranian working people out of poverty and want. The oppressed and exploited Iranian working class is a truly heroic class, the Iranians are an intelligent people with a many-sided ancient culture, who have produced great men, but the British imperialist exploiters and later, the American exploiters, operated together in such a way that the people were left in backwardness, while the wealth of Iran, the land and its underground riches passed into the possession of the exploiters. The whole of Iran was to become the property of world capitalism.

The British, American, Dutch and other big oil companies had their men in Iran, top and middle cadres and specialists, while the Iranian working class was left at such a level that hardly anyone sufficiently qualified to run production in the factories, plants and refineries could emerge from its ranks. Those who had been sent to schools and were appointed to manage production were individuals chosen solely from the bourgeoisie, which had fattened itself and was utterly corrupted, together with the Shah.

With "progress and development" reduced to such a state in Iran, its education and culture had been obscured by a dense fog, if they existed at all.

Its culture developed extremely slowly and had been deformed so as to keep the masses oppressed under the regime of autocrats. Of course, a major role in all this was played by the reactionary representatives of religion, who did their obscurantist work both under the dynasty of the Qajars and under the dynasty of the Pahlavis. In order to inhibit the development of the people's consciousness about the need to fight for national liberation from the yoke of imperialist occupiers they interfered especially in the superstructure, hence, also in art and culture. The ancient Persian art and culture had been ignored and lost and the Islamic philosophy of the imams predominated in Iranian art and culture. Now the mosques were no longer houses of culture, as they were in the time of Saadi and Ferdousi, when, apart from religious services, debates about philosophy, astronomy, mathematics and the social state of people were held in them. No, now they had the same function as they had in the Ottoman Empire, that is, they served only to pray to Mohammed and God and the successors to Mohammed, Imam Ali, Imam Hussein, and other imams.

The situation was very onerous for the masses of the people, but with the passage of time the oppression was intensified, the oil, that great underground wealth of Iran, became a sharp weapon in the hands of imperialists and the Shah and the sheikhs who, insatiable for wealth gambled with the fate and the assets of the people in favour of the empire and the repressive army they created. Thus, the Shah of Iran was one of the wealthiest men in the world. The Iranian army ranked fourth in the

world for its armaments and firepower. However, the generals and other senior officers of this army were a corrupt clique who defended the immense wealth of the Shah and his followers. There was an immense gulf between the soldiers, sons of the people, and this clique of officers. The anti-imperialist popular revolution of the Iranian people made this army, which, as I said, was ranked fourth in the world, and armed with the most sophisticated weapons, worthless. Thus, the Shah's army could not perform the task with which the Shah and his patron, American imperialism, had charged it.

Hence, this oppression, this discontent spread over the entire mass of the people, took concrete form, the transition from quantity to quality took place and the most suitable objective and subjective moments were found precisely by the people and by the workers, and this led to the revolt of the people against the Shah and against the American and other imperialists.

So the Iranian people, men and women, old and young, carried out the revolution. People from the Iranian working class, from the workers of the oil industry and all other branches of the economy, were in the forefront of this revolution.

The people rose and marched forward in bloody demonstrations even though the Shah, thinking that he could intimidate them, ordered his troops to open fire and hundreds and thousands of people were killed. Of course, Imam Khomeini utilized this objective situation and, with his own people, with that considerable grouping of Shia believers, was able to play a role, very important in appearance, a thing which has been publicized by the

whole world. It must be said, however, that in this popular uprising one could see mainly the youth, men and women, who raised their clenched fists and were killed in the streets. Somebody led them.

The Western news agencies showered Ayatollah Khomeini and his Shia group with publicity, presenting him as the inspirer of all these events. However, without excluding the influence of the Shia sect and religion, I think that this anti-imperialist revolution of the Iranian people had a class character, was in essence a social revolution and not a revolution of a religious character. Hence, we cannot consider it an Islamic revolution. They call it an Islamic revolution for many reasons, the main one being that they want to conceal a great truth from the broad masses of the people; namely, that the internal exploiting classes, which are closely linked with the foreign imperialists, can be overthrown only through a class revolution. That is why attempts are made to describe uprisings of this kind as allegedly inspired by religion. So we see once again that religion is always used as an element moderating and inhibiting revolutionary actions, that is, an idealist element.

Apart from this the western world, the capitalist world, wants to depict the revolution of the Iranian people not as a class struggle but as a religious struggle, in order to create the false idea that the Islamic world is rising against the Christian world. That is, it wants to turn the revolutionary moments which exist at present and which are demanding solution, the moments of proletarian revolutions, as Engels calls them, into medieval religious wars like those between Catholics and Protestants, in other

words, wants to turn the clock back to the time of the crusades. According to the capitalist world, the crusades are being repeated in the Middle East, allegedly over who should hold Jerusalem, who should have alliances with Syria, who should be on good terms with Lebanon, with the Christians or the Muslims of Lebanon, and other such tales.

It is true that the Arab world, in general, professes the Muslim religion, but in this Arab world there is also a sense of hatred for internal oppressors and foreign imperialists who, in order to rule, are intriguing in every direction, setting one people against the other, and when they see that they are losing, as is occurring in Iran at present, they try to give the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist national liberation struggle the colour of an anti-scientific Islamic religious struggle. They are doing this precisely at the moment when world capitalism is going through a great crisis from which it is unable to find any way out. All these anti-imperialist social revolutions, however, result from the hatred of the people for those who suck their blood. It is the bloodsuckers who cause the discontent, the great strikes in the United States of America, in Britain, France, Italy, the Soviet Union and elsewhere. Meanwhile the purpose of the imperialists, with these colours in which they want to depict such movements as that in Iran, is to tell the strikers in their own countries: see with what sort of people we have to deal, ignorant oafs, who want to take the world back to the Middle Ages, who want to return to religious wars, that is why we are obliged to close factories, to throw the workers out in the streets, to raise prices, to reduce wages, because

there are no supplies of oil. Hence, not we capitalists, but the Muslim peoples, the Arab peoples, are the culprits.

There is a diabolical purpose in this, which we must expose. The wars for national and social liberation, whether in the Middle East, Africa or elsewhere, are wars with a national liberation and anti-imperialist character. Although, for one reason or the other, the proletariat is not at the head of the masses of the people in these wars and does not have its own party, in the revolutionary situations that will be created in the future the progressive elements, in alliance with the poor peasantry demanding land, will create the conditions in which the fighting proletariat must hurl itself into struggle, and the genuine party of the proletariat, the genuine leadership of the state, and the genuine popular army will emerge, an army which will serve the people and not the new theocratic bourgeoisie, this time cloaked in allegedly democratic forms.

In regard to Iran, it is a fact that the proletariat, the workers of the oil industry who took part in the people's uprising, triumphed.

There was much talk about Ayatollah Khomeini's return to Iran. Bakhtiar tried to prevent it but in the end he fled the country together with his generals. Many generals who stayed behind in Iran were executed. Ayatollah Khomeini, who does not feel secure, is appealing to the people for order and calm, but they are not quietening down, are still in movement and reply: We will not lay down our arms! These things we see in the news agency reports.

American and British imperialism and Soviet

social-imperialism and all the others will try to take advantage of the disturbances which may be incited in Iran against the order which has been established there. In this direction everything depends on the vigilance, the ability and persistence of the progressive Iranians who set about the revolution. They must continue it, passing from one stage to the other, and at each stage finding solutions to important problems through radical reforms and not superficial, false reforms just for appearances, because all will try to calm this situation. We see that Carter, in his recent interviews, seems extremely frightened and shaken: they killed his ambassador in Afghanistan and he says nothing. In the capital of Iran the "guards of the revolution" took the American embassy by storm, and captured the titular head, 60 officials and 19 marine guards, who offered no resistance. Many documents were captured there and these will be useful to the Iranian people eventually. It required the intervention of the new provisional prime minister of Iran, Bazargan, to save the lives of the prisoners.

It must be said, also, that there is the danger of intervention. Indeed it has already begun by the Soviet social-imperialists who want to create their spheres of influence in the Middle East, especially in Iran, where there is a large number of Azerbaijanis (half the Azerbaijanis live in the Soviet Union and half in Iran). There are also the Kurds who are in movement at these moments, not only in Iran, but also in Turkey. However, there are Kurds in the Soviet Union, too. In this situation the Soviet social-imperialists are operating through the KGB, too.

The question of Iran has placed the United States of America in an exceptionally difficult position in the Persian Gulf, too, for instance in Kuwait where 35 per cent of the population is Palestinian, and in Saudi Arabia where the nationalization of the Arab-American oil company ARAMCO may be demanded.

With the expulsion from Iran of the Shah, who had become the gendarme of the United States of America in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, the main oil supplies to Israel were cut off. Hence, the dangers are great. Therefore, we must follow these matters with great vigilance and special attention in order to see how and in whose favour they will be settled.

We must explain things clearly and openly, just as they are, to those who want to listen to us, without hurting the religious feelings of the Arab peoples in this great revolutionary class movement. At the same time, in one way or another, we must tell them that this is not an Islamic war, as Carter and others claim, but a struggle, a revolution of the poor against the rich.

WEDNESDAY
FEBRUARY 21, 1979

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST ARE NOT FAVOURABLE TO IMPERIALISM

Developments in the Middle East region and Iran, of course, are not favourable either to the United States of America or to world imperialism. In this situation, the Soviet Union, which borders on Iran, is ready to overrun the whole country quickly in case of a conflict. At present, however, it is operating in a subversive way, through the large forces of the "Tudeh" Party, the Azerbaijanis and the Kurds, although Mullah Barzani is now no longer in Iraq, but in the United States. The fact that he is in the United States of America allows us to think that that country, too, has set in motion the Kurdish factor in Iran to serve as a counterweight to the Soviet subversion through Azerbaijan.

The United States of America has sent Brown, the Secretary of Defence, to the Middle East. He is going from state to state to arrange something and this something is an effective resistance of the bourgeois ruling circles against the people's uprisings which could occur in the countries of the Middle East, as it did in Iran, or to get commitments from the Emirates and the other Arab countries to resist any eventual Soviet threat. Likewise, we see that Carter has again summoned Moshe Dayan and the Egyptian prime minister to Washington to con-

tinue the talks on signing the peace agreement in Camp David.

At present Israel is in danger. Ayatollah Khomeini has declared openly that he will defend the Palestinians in their struggle against Israel. He has closed the Israeli embassy in Tehran and expelled the Israeli diplomats from Iran. The oil supplies which Israel received from the Shah of Iran have been cut off and now it is obliged to get oil elsewhere. In these conditions the United States of America is compelling Israel to reach agreement with Egypt, in other words, to accept the conditions Carter has laid down for such an agreement and stop kicking against it.

In view of this very dangerous situation in Iran, the Persian Gulf and the whole Middle East, the United States of America has set the agents of the CIA in motion. They see that the Soviet threat could come from Iran or from Iraq, and could also come from Syria or from South Yemen which can cross the Khali Desert and reach Oman, and join the Palestinians in Kuwait to stage a coup d'état. If this were to happen the United States of America would lose its whole strategic position and its economic power over the oil of the Middle East and Iran.

Today I heard that Ayatollah Khomeini has banned demonstrations with Marxist-Leninist tendencies at the universities of the country. This implies that the forces of the left, of course the "Tudeh" Party, but also the Marxist-Leninist forces, have now been set in movement there. It is possible that the Workers and Peasants' Communist Party of Iran known as "Toufan" or some

other party unknown to us, also has its people in the recent events. In any case, movements are arising there of groups which support a still more revolutionary situation and not the Islamic spirit which world reaction wants to give the revolution in Iran.

We shall see how the situation in Iran develops, but at the moment it is not quiet and, of course, it will evolve. We published an article on the events which have occurred in that country, but we notice that the foreign news agencies, which up till now have always been ready to report our articles, this time are saying nothing about our article on the situation in Iran and the future of the revolution there. They have put the lid on it because it is not in their interests.

THURSDAY
MARCH 8, 1979

ON THE SITUATION IN IRAN

From information we receive and the reports of news agencies which I read regularly, it is clear that regardless of the Islamic slogans which are used to show that the religious spirit is allegedly predominant in it, the Iranian revolution is an anti-feudal and anti-imperialist popular revolution.

It seems that Khomeini, who emerges as the main leader of the uprising, is the head of the Islamic party which must be the biggest party in the country. We noticed this from the time when the demonstrations against the regime of the Shah began, in other words, when the uprising started. On television and in the newspapers we saw that Khomeini was presented as the spiritual leader of the masses in the revolt against the Shah.

Now it emerges that Khomeini is collaborating also with the other democratic parties whose aim was the overthrow of the feudal monarchy and its government, and is for the establishment of democracy. Apparently Khomeini is also opposed to foreign intervention.

As far as we can see and as the various news agencies say, the Islamic party, the party of the Mujahideens and the "Tudeh" Party played the main role in the Iranian revolution. As far as can be seen, the party of the Mujahideens is the second party in Iran. This party is said to have a faction under the influence of Maoists, a thing which may or may not be true. However, it is possible that the Maoists, in

collaboration with the Shah, have created such a faction which remained in support and defence of the Shah as long as he was in power, but now that he has fallen it may have emerged as independent. Apparently, the Fedayeens, some of whom have been trained in foreign camps, are the commandos of the party of the Muhajideens. Seeing the influence that this party has among the people and its strength, Khomeini is collaborating with it and he personally gave the order for the release of thousands of fighters imprisoned by the regime of the Shah.

The "Tudeh" Party, which calls itself a communist party, is linked with the Soviet Union. It occupies third place amongst the other parties.

When the uprising was over those two parties refused to surrender their weapons, but Khomeini threatened that he would use force to suppress them, and it seems that they were obliged to support his policy.

It is said that the Soviet ambassador in Iran asked the Iranian government to give the "Tudeh" Party complete freedom, but it was made clear to him that it had to operate in the same conditions as all the other parties. Now this party has demanded, on the occasion of new elections, to have two representatives in the government. By following the reports of foreign news agencies on the events in Iran attentively, we can reach the conclusion that the aim of the Iranian revolution is to give the masses democratic freedoms and wants to put an end to foreign intervention in Iran. However, to what extent such a thing will be realized we shall see from future developments.

The United States of America, Britain and other capitalist states and the Middle-East countries with reactionary regimes are very worried about the situation in Iran. The United States has been obliged to recognize the new regime in Iran, but is trying through its agents to organize plots, to stop the revolutionary momentum of the Iranian people and to intimidate them into going no further on the course they are following.

The reactionary regime of Saudi Arabia, also, is very worried about the situation in Iran, because the same feudal oppression and exploitation that existed in Iran exist in that country too. A similar fate awaits the reactionary regime of Saudi Arabia, if not today, certainly tomorrow.

It is said that following the referendum on the proclamation of the republic and some other measures, Khomeini will also demand the removal of the American bases from Iran. It is said that the Americans want to transfer these bases to the Greek island of Crete. We shall see to what extent this, too, will be realized. One thing is certain: today Carter is going to Egypt and from there he will go on to Israel. His visit to these two countries is linked with the signing of the "peace" agreement between Egypt and Israel. In other words, the United States of America has put the hard word on these two satellites. Both these countries may also have other secret agreements with the United States and not only on arms supplies. The Secretary of the U.S. Department of Defence, Brown, who has been in this region for weeks, may have hatched up some secret agreement with the heads of Saudi Arabia, too. Hence, it is possible that a bloc of gen-

darmes will be created with some countries of this zone against Syria, Iraq and Iran, which have expressed their opposition to Sadat and Israel. Syria and Iraq have the support and the backing of the Soviets, from whom they buy weapons, too.

Up till now Khomeini is saying that the Soviet Union must not interfere in the internal affairs of Iran. But his stand is still not clearly defined. We shall see what stand he will take later. Nevertheless, the status quo so greatly desired by the Americans no longer exists in the oil zone of the Middle East. It has been upset by the overthrow of the Shah, Mohammed Pahlavi, and the Pahlavi monarchy, which was the gendarme of American imperialism in the whole of this zone.

According to reports from our embassies, our article on Iran, which was published in the newspaper "Zëri i popullit" on February 18,[1] caused a stir in the Arab countries and has found their full approval. We do not know whether it managed to penetrate into Iran.

[1] See this volume, footnote p. 203.

THURSDAY
MARCH 15, 1979

WHY CARTER SHUTTLED BACK AND FORTH IN EGYPT AND ISRAEL

The American president, Carter, has returned to Washington from his visit to Egypt and Israel. At the airport, of course, they staged a welcome for him with applause and bouquets of flowers, as we saw on TV, to give the impression that he returned from his visit to these two countries as a victor. That is how vice-president Mondale presented Carter.

No president of the United States of America before Carter had undertaken such a mission, although, of course, it was the "task" of the secretary of state, Kissinger, to come and go, to buy and sell, to offer threats and blandishments to one state or the other. So President Carter went to Egypt and Israel to talk on many issues with Sadat and Begin. He began and ended his talks with Sadat, going from Cairo to Jerusalem back to Aswan, returning to Jerusalem again and from Jerusalem back to Cairo, and eventually left for Washington.

As we learn from various news agencies, Carter had talks with the heads of both countries, but he also encountered opposition and pressure from the one and the other, both from the Israelis and from the Egyptians. The greatest pressure was exerted on the American president by the Israelis, by Begin, while Sadat proved to be more accommodating, more moderate towards Carter's proposals.

In other words, as news agency reports imply,

Sadat was not very exigent in pressing his demands which were in accord with those of Carter on many points. As Carter himself confirmed, the American views differed from the Egyptian views only on a few minor matters.

With Israel, however, on the face of it matters seemed different. According to news agencies he had "sterner" battles with Israel. This was noticeable in President Carter's talks with Begin and with the Israeli government as well as in the speech Begin delivered in the Knesset, the Israeli parliament. Here, too, Begin seemed to be really opposing the plan which Carter presented. On TV we saw various deputies to the Israeli parliament, especially a woman, who would not allow Begin even to speak. This deputy made a very vigorous speech and at the end of it, apparently to show that the treaty which Begin was preparing with Sadat was just a scrap of paper, she took a page from the desk in front of her and tore it into pieces. The stand of another deputy sitting close to her, who advised her to be more moderate, was ridiculous. And all this took place with Carter, who was present at this debate, sitting there in a corner as an honoured guest. Perhaps, this whole scene was staged cleverly to tell Carter, "I, Begin, want to associate myself with your views, but it is impossible for me to carry out what, you, the president of the United States of America, want, because of the great opposition I encounter in parliament. Therefore the United States must do everything in its power to get more and greater concessions from the Egyptians in favour of Israel."

After this Carter returned to Cairo, again, spent

an hour and a half or two hours talking with Sadat at the airport and then, after embracing and kissing him, as he had done with Begin in Jerusalem, he said goodbye and returned to Washington.

In his speech in Washington the American president declared that he had achieved a success. And this success was that a number of problems on the signing of the Israeli-Egyptian treaty had been ironed out. According to Carter and Begin, if no other disagreement arises in the meantime, the treaty will be signed next week.

Hence, we must await the text of the treaty in order to judge what concessions have been made by one side or the other, but we can give our opinion on the aims of the American president's visit to Egypt and Israel right now. Profound reasons, vital to the interests of the United States of America, impelled this lowering of the authority of the president to the level of that of a foreign minister. This is linked with the whole Middle-East problem. Will the Middle East become a domain of the Americans, will it come under the influence of the Soviets, or will an anti-imperialist popular revolution, such as occurred in Iran, break out in this region? If what occurred in Iran occurs in Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and the other countries of the Middle East, then the situation will be catastrophic for American imperialism and all the Western capitalist states.

The Americans are not certain of their oil supplies and that is why President Carter threw the whole weight of his authority, as the president of the United States of America today, and the future president, if he puts forward his candidature in the

coming elections, into the balance with his visit to the Middle East.

The aims of Carter's visit to these two countries of the Middle East must be the following: between Israel and Egypt there should be peace, but not only this. Israel and Egypt should jointly constitute a gendarme more reliable than Israel was before to defend the oil zone from two dangers: from the Soviet danger and the danger of the revolution. Thus the aim of President Carter and all the Western capitalists is that there should be no further "disturbances" in this oil zone like those that occurred in Iran where the situation has still not been stabilized. And how the situation there will be stabilized remains a question for the American imperialists and all the Western capitalists.

Hence, a struggle is being waged for oil and preliminary measures are being taken to protect it from any threat. As I have pointed out, however, these preparations are being made in case of a Soviet attack caused by other warmongering reasons, and also in case of the outbreak of a revolution against the present leaderships of many states in this region, who are in the service of imperialism, have sold out their countries to world capitalism and oppress their peoples.

For these reasons Carter declared that he will supply both Israel and Egypt with large amounts of aid, totalling more than 4 billion dollars, if I am not mistaken. And, of course, these 4 billion dollars will be mainly for arms. The American president wants Egypt, after signing the peace treaty with Israel, in opposition to Syria, Iraq and all the other Arab countries, to form a "army of the hawks" like

the Israeli army. Then these two together, in unity, should commence their aggression and suppression of the circles which are ruling in the other countries of this zone, or even further away, for example, in Libya. That country, too, is a key oil zone on which the American imperialists, the Western capitalists and the Soviet social-imperialists have their eyes.

Hence, the purpose of Carter's visit to Egypt and Israel was to strengthen the alliance between those two countries, to announce a plan of alleged economic aid, called the "Carter Plan" rather than the "Marshall Plan," for these two states friendly to the United States of America, and to create an army ready to intervene in North Yemen and Oman, if they are endangered, and also to defend Saudi Arabia if the revolution in Iran continues to develop in more radical directions.

The United States of America sees that the sea routes and the Suez Canal are in jeopardy, therefore it must strengthen its positions there. But Aden at the exit from the Red Sea is now in the hands of the Soviets, because they are linked with the Ethiopians who have occupied Eritrea. The Soviets and Cubans have established themselves in South Yemen and there they have prepared and launched the war against North Yemen, which is a barricade to defend Saudi Arabia. At one time North Yemen was "assisted" by Nasser, who sent his forces there and the leaders of the Yemen government welcomed them with great enthusiasm. Now it is possible that Sadat's army, strengthened with modern weapons, will go to the "aid" of North Yemen again and endanger South Yemen.

Thus, in the future, throughout this whole big smouldering region we shall see the two imperialist superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, striving against each other as each tries to capture strategic key positions. Precisely to this end the two superpowers will try to form alliances with the states of this region and begin regional wars, but not a general war. These regional wars are waged by supplying the reactionary cliques in the countries of the Middle East with direct or indirect aid in arms or with advisers. For example, the White House recently announced that it is to send 3,000 advisers to North Yemen. This means it will send a powerful military force to North Yemen. As for weapons, the measures have been taken in advance, since the time the United States of America allegedly permitted Saudi Arabia to supply North Yemen from the American weapons it has received.

Now, however, the problem is how things are going on in Iran. Nothing has been stabilized there. Khomeini imagined that after the overthrow of the Shah he would guide the revolution in the spirit of the Quran, which he presented as a democratic spirit, allegedly for complete freedom, for true Islamic democracy, and so on and so forth.

The control of the situation has not slipped out of Khomeini's hands, but with the overthrow of the monarchy of the Pahlavis, with the liquidation of this medieval monarchy, the revolution in Iran has brought to the fore elements more organized, more radical, more progressive than Khomeini, elements who are operating for a democratic, bourgeois Iran with considerable rights. But we shall see to what

extent they will achieve this aim.

These powerful movements in Iran are certainly led by a number of parties, by a number of fronts, which claim to be independent of foreign powers, although this is not the case. The Soviets have worked inside Iran through the "Tudeh" Party, but we do not know what state that party is in. The Chinese, too, under the protection of the Shah, have worked to create their Maoist party which was supposed to help the Shah to stay in power, and in times of danger when the Pahlavi monarchy had been liquidated, it was to come to light as an alleged Marxist-Leninist party. It is said that such a party exists there. Meanwhile Khomeini's party or front seems to be more powerful. There are also pro-Palestinian elements in Iran.

Of course, all these parties and fronts are struggling for position, to create a government in Iran which will defend the interests of a "new," more democratic bourgeoisie, but still a bourgeoisie in fact, which will try to attack the more radical revolutionary people's movements which will want to carry the Iranian revolution further.

As we wrote in our article "The Iranian Working Class Came out on the Battlefield, Overthrew the Shah and Shook the Capitalist World," published in the newspaper "Zëri i popullit," in this great popular uprising we see emerging on the stage great forces which are demanding rights and defining programs for profound transformations in many fields of life.

The Iranian women are taking part in movements and demonstrations. They are demanding equal rights with men and rejecting the veil which

Khomeini defends as an emblem of Islam. Many progressive students are in movement, too. Thousands of students are holding demonstrations in the university of Tehran, while others are demanding that the army should be an army of the people, that the officers should be chosen from the people. The people's courts in Iran are executing generals, senior officers, officers of the security service and all kinds of despots who served the Shah. In other words, purges are being carried out there, regardless of whether Khomeini likes it or not.

Of course, Iran has to live and its main wealth is oil. Now it has begun to extract oil, but not in the former quantities and, moreover, Iran has begun to raise the prices of oil. The present provisional Iranian government plans and has taken measures to nationalize the foreign companies which exploited the oil in Iran. If it carries out this measure this is something positive. How that great wealth of this country will be administered and who will manage it is another matter. There will be struggle over it...

However, the Iranian people must be made aware that this great wealth they possess should be administered by themselves, in other words, by a new Iranian state and party organization. We shall see how matters will develop in this direction. For the time being, however, we see that the American government is behaving like a lamb with the present government in Iran, until it can establish positions, if not what it had before, at least better than what it has at the moment, because they are very weak.

Khomeini has declared that he will fight the United States of America, the Soviet Union, or any

other power that tries to place Iran under bondage. Of course, in his struggle he cannot break with the foreign capitalist bourgeoisie. His reliance on one or the other depends on the pressures he will be subjected to. The Iranian people must not permit this reliance to be enslaving. Likewise, the progressive people of Iran must fight to eradicate the dangerous elements, to eliminate the deep roots of various secret agencies which exist there, a thing which will take a long time, and they must prevent the direct American, Soviet and other secret agencies, disguised as specialists or various allegedly democratic or communist parties, from establishing the influence of the superpowers in that wealthy, but at the same time, poverty-stricken country.

The Iranian revolution will have a great influence which will go beyond the borders of that country. In fact, this influence is already being felt in the Emirates of the Persian Gulf as well as in Iraq, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Oman, etc. But Iran must be vigilant, must take into account the great dangers which might come either from the American imperialists or from the Soviet social-imperialists. The Soviet Union has a long common border with Iran and the population of Iranian Azerbaijan has close links with Soviet Azerbaijan. Thus, Soviet agents will go in and out of Iran to organize sabotage, to incite insurrections, to make demands for autonomy, concessions, etc., etc.

In this situation only a sound, revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist political force, which has the support of the working class and the people, can gradually win ground and resist all those dangers which

are threatening Iran and the whole world. I say the whole world, because all this zone of the Middle East is a region fraught with conflicts, much greater than the Balkan conflicts of the last century. All the states of this region are under the influence of foreigners who support their leading circles and incite them to local wars.

Now we see the Egyptian-Israeli alliance and are watching the attempts of the Syrians and Iraqis to unite, but to what extent they will unite is another problem. Likewise, we see that Egypt has its eyes on Libya and that Sadat has close friendship with Nimeiri of Sudan. Hence, it is possible that a conflict will break out between the Libyans, Egyptians and the Sudanese for domination, over the question of oil, as well as to hinder the Soviet penetration into Africa.

Now the Soviet social-imperialists are supplying Qaddafi of Libya with weapons. Of course, there are Soviet experts there training the army of that country. Libya, for its part, has claims towards Egypt and other countries to the south. It is still pursuing claims to the desert in the south, where French influence is dominant. This desert has no water, but deep below it there is oil. Struggle is going on there over the oil, therefore disturbances may occur.

Giscard d'Estaing's visit to French-speaking Africa and the efforts which he is making to harness those countries firmly to his chariot, to exploit them thoroughly through the banks and multi-national companies, to invest in the former French colonies, to absorb the great wealth of these countries in this way and to have their leading cliques in

the service of the Elisée, are by no means senseless.

Of course, France does not go to the aid of Mobutu in vain, or urge Morocco to go to his aid in vain. It has not forgotten Algeria. On the contrary, it is awaiting the favourable moment to cause disturbances there again, either through the Sahara or Morocco. There is no sign of this on the horizon at present, but disturbances, conflicts are the spawn of capitalism and imperialism which organize them to defend their own interests and those of the cliques linked with them.

That is why on the African continent and in the Middle East we see a turbulent situation in which major interests of imperialism are in collision, but at the same time we also see an awakening of the popular revolt of oppressed peoples who are realizing who oppresses them, who intrigues against them, who robs them and who is enriched at the cost of their blood and sweat. So, naturally, the popular revolt arises, builds up and bursts out, perhaps sometimes without result, but outbreak leads to outbreak in the form of a powerful chain reaction.

Hence, imperialist oppression and exploitation will automatically bring about the reaction of the popular masses of the oppressed countries for their liberation.

SATURDAY
MARCH 31, 1979

AN ANTI-ARAB IMPERIALIST TREATY

As is known, in recent days in Washington, in a big marquee specially set up by Carter in the White House front garden, before an audience of a thousand or so people, apart from the public watching outside the garden fence, the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel was signed, with Carter signing as witness, on a desk used traditionally by the Americans for the signing of various enslaving imperialist treaties.

Hence, an imperialist treaty was signed following an aggressive imperialist war of plunder declared by Zionism, powerfully supported with arms and munitions and financed by American imperialism. The purpose which Israel had and achieved in this war of plunder was to liquidate the homeland of the Palestinians, to occupy Jerusalem, the West Bank of the Jordan River, the Gaza Strip and the whole of Sinai and to be poised like a hawk ready to strike at Lebanon and Egypt. Apart from this, the aggressive armies of Israel also occupied the Golan Heights which belong to Syria.

This was the aim of the aggressive imperialist war against the Arab peoples of Palestine, Syria, Egypt, Jordan and, indirectly, all the other Arab peoples. Through this predatory war Israel, powerfully supported by American imperialism, also had the aim of keeping the oil-rich region of the Middle East, that is, Saudi Arabia, the Emirates of the Per-

sian Gulf, Kuwait, Iran, etc., under the influence of American imperialism and forming a strong military-economic barrier against some other Arab countries and their partners, the Western capitalist countries, which rely heavily on the oil of the Middle East.

The Egyptians, the Syrians and the Jordanians, allegedly in unity, but in fact divided, tried to withstand this aggressive war on several occasions, but without success, because they were not seriously united in their struggle against this barbarous invasion. They were defeated in the time of Farouk, of Nasser and now of Sadat and also under the monarchy of Hussein. Meanwhile, cosmopolitan Lebanon, where large numbers of Palestinians have settled, especially in the south of that country and on the border with Israel, has continually been the prey of the latter and remains in this situation, facing the barbarous attacks of the Israeli infantry, artillery and air force. Lebanon has also been turned into a country of civil wars between Syrians, Christian Maronites and Islamic sects.

Apart from the use of weapons the United States of America and Israel have also combined to use methods of division, irrespective of what the Arab countries continue to trumpet every day about the Arab nation allegedly being a united nation. The activity of American imperialism and the aggressive war of Israel, on the one hand, and of Soviet social-imperialism, on the other hand, have done their work for the destruction of this unity, which is nothing but a formula. All these forces of darkness, imperialism, social-imperialism and their tools, cause splits among those countries and

peoples, and the basis of the divisions among them lies in the reactionary capitalist leaderships of the Arab countries, which have differing interests, ambitions to dominate one another, etc. Among the Arab countries, of course, the states which dominate are those richest in oil, that is, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Kuwait, the Emirates of the Persian Gulf which, although they do not have such military strength as to dominate the other countries, have great economic strength by means of which they influence those who are in power in Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Yemen, Egypt and all the countries of North Africa.

Hence, through the great economic strength of its tools, which it knows how to manipulate, American imperialism has been able to grab the lion's share of the income from oil, especially in Iran and Saudi Arabia. Consequently, American imperialism has also had great influence in the Emirates of the Gulf and still has this influence at present. This may be temporary because the Shah of Iran has been overthrown and the interests of American imperialism in this state have been weakened to an appreciable degree.

At present the United States of America is struggling to re-establish its domination in Iran. The appetite of Soviet social-imperialism has been whetted, too. It is influencing the situation in Iran through the Kurds, the Azerbaijanis and the old, allegedly communist, "Tudeh" Party. In the time of the Shah, various Trotskyite, Maoist parties were formed under various disguises in Iran where they vegetated under the surveillance of the Iranian SAVAK and now, following the anti-feudal, anti-

imperialist popular revolution, they have come to the surface and some defend Khomeini who is for an Islamic republic, while others demand a somewhat broader democracy. Elections were held in Iran yesterday and we shall see what results from them.

Hence, the economic interests of the United States of America linked with oil in Iran and, consequently, in the Middle East have suffered partial but not total damage and the struggle of the United States in that country is aimed at restabilizing the situation, not by restoring the Shah to power, but by exploiting other possibilities and ways.

To this end, the United States of America is acting with great speed and exerting threatening pressure on Israel and its prime minister, Begin, to have him sign a peace treaty with Egypt, a treaty best described as worthless. Through the signing of this treaty Egypt is placing itself in opposition to all the other Arab states. To save face, Sadat wanted the Palestinians to take part in this agreement, but they refused, or else to insert in the treaty some clause under which the Palestinians' future right to have their own homeland of which Israel has robbed them, would allegedly be recognized. In reality, of course, he worked to find some formula under which this lawful and natural right of the Palestinian people would never be recognized.

Sadat was persuaded that he should accept the American views and he brought Begin, too, round to the course American imperialism had chosen. In fact the Israeli-Egyptian treaty is not a treaty between these two states which have been and are at war, but is an American treaty, an imperialist

treaty, which safeguards and defends the interests of the United States of America in the Middle East. In this nine-clause treaty, naturally, Egypt regains part of Sinai on a series of conditions, regains the oil-wells in Sinai exploited by the Israelis, is obliged to declare the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran international waters, to accept that ships of all flags can pass freely through the Suez Canal, has certain rights in the Gaza Strip, and no more. Meanwhile, Israel, of course, is to keep large areas of Arab territory under occupation and include them in its own Zionist state. Israel categorically refuses to give up the West Bank and Jerusalem. Jerusalem, declared Begin, will remain the capital of Israel.

To attain this result the United States of America bought both the Israelis and the Egyptians, paying them about 2 billion dollars each for this imperialist treaty. Of course, the bulk of these 2 billions will be supplied in weapons. Hence, the American armaments industry will develop even further and American imperialism will supply weapons and munition to these two countries which it has linked to its own interests. This is the purpose and meaning of this peace treaty which brings not peace, but war, because it is not in the interests of the Arab peoples and states, even though they are bourgeois capitalist states.

The Palestinians, first of all, are irreconcilably opposed to the Israeli-Egyptian treaty. They quite rightly declared openly, firmly and courageously that they will wage a relentless struggle against this treaty and these results. They declared Sadat a traitor and that "they will cut off his hands and his

head." These are the terms Arafat has used against him, according to news agencies.

United with the Palestinians are the Syrians, first of all, because they are faced with an Israeli-Egyptian "unity" which makes it more difficult for them to regain the Golan Heights. Hence, if they are going to try to take their Golan Heights, they will have to link themselves closely in a fighting unity, with the other Arab countries which oppose this treaty. However, it is difficult for them to achieve such a fighting unity. Before the treaty was concluded it was stated that a meeting of all countries which opposed the Israeli-Egyptian treaty would be held in Baghdad. In fact, the representatives of these countries gathered there, but soon dispersed because not all of them agreed to break off relations with Egypt, to boycott Egypt and declare Sadat a traitor to the Arab cause, who has sold out to Israel and American imperialism. Of course, at this meeting Syria and Iraq were probably closest to one another and three quarters in support of the most resolute, that is, the Palestinians, but Saudi Arabia and the Emirates of the Gulf were cool to the idea, while some others were mostly talk. Of these latter countries, Qaddafi's Libya has raised its voice a little louder and moved troops towards Egypt, simply as a show of force, of course, while Sadat, before returning to Egypt, gave the order for his troops to move to the west, because now their flank on the Suez Canal is free, so he is deploying the army on the border with Libya.

Thus, Egypt is left with only one support, Sudan, which Sadat is trying with all his might to keep

close to him so that they will be linked together in case of any possible friction with Libya.

Of course, Saudi Arabia and the Emirates of the Gulf together with Jordan denounced the Israeli-Egyptian treaty, but it seems they did not agree to boycott Egypt, to break off relations with it and eventually to organize some minor war against it, because a small war against Egypt would also be aimed against Egypt's ally, Israel, and especially against American imperialism, which, when the Iranian people overthrew the Shah, sent Brown, the Secretary of State for Defence, to Saudi Arabia and the whole Middle East zone where he worked to hinder Arab unity among the countries of this region. Brown was followed by Brzezinski, Carter's national security adviser, who talked with the King of Saudi Arabia and the rulers of Oman and the Emirates of the Persian Gulf. Naturally, in these conditions the Baghdad meeting resulted in nothing at all.

Hence, no unity was achieved among the countries which allegedly oppose the Israeli-Egyptian treaty. Of course there is any amount of propaganda saying this treaty cannot last long, that the Arab peoples are against this treaty, that the Arab peoples will liquidate Israel, that the Arab peoples will liquidate Sadat, even liquidate him physically, that the 2 billion American dollars will not improve life in Egypt, etc., etc. Naturally these things are worrying Sadat and creating internal problems for him because the Egyptian people are not all with him.

But it is known that the Egyptian people made an effort and their army crossed the Canal and en-

tered Sinai. In the Yom Kippur War Israel was taken by surprise. Nevertheless, through a series of military manoeuvres, it crossed the Suez Canal, outflanked the Egyptian armies attacking in Sinai, encircled them there and stopped their further advance. Nevertheless, this war created a situation somewhat favourable to Egypt among the Arab countries, but this favourable situation resulted in the present situation which is disadvantageous to the Egyptian people themselves, the Syrian people and the Palestinian people, in the first place, and then to all the other Arab peoples.

In other words, through the Israeli-Egyptian treaty, American imperialism has now managed to somewhat ease a very critical situation which was created in the Middle East with the overthrow of the Shah of Persia. This treaty can be considered a minor electoral success for Carter.

On his return from Washington, Sadat did not fail to ask Bonn for a credit, not of one billion dollars but of 20 billion. The western news agencies are talking about the cordial reception he was given by Carstens, the president of the FR of Germany, and Chancellor Schmidt. They say that West Germany will help Egypt with credits for the improvement of its economic situation, and such a thing will be done, but not to the extent of 20 billion dollars, of course. This is an exaggerated figure and such a sum is not in the interests of the American imperialists, because the equilibrium and status quo which they created in the Middle East with such difficulty would be upset. In any case the credits which Egypt may get from Bonn will have to be repaid with high interest rates and on the due date.

Thus, Egypt has been placed totally in the sphere of influence and under the dictate of American imperialism and the revanchists of Bonn.

In this situation, of course, Soviet social-imperialism is trying to incite the Arab countries which oppose the Israeli-Egyptian treaty to war against the United States of America, that is, against Israel and Egypt, and to unite them under its own leadership and influence. For these reasons, just one day before the treaty was signed, if I am not mistaken, Gromyko made a visit to Syria and Iraq. It is clear that this visit was intended as a counterweight to the visit of Begin and Sadat to Washington to sign the treaty. Of course, during this visit Gromyko has held "talks," has made promises, presented plans, etc. Nevertheless, the Baghdad meeting yielded no results. These Arab states may merely get weapons from the Soviet Union and nothing else, their unification under the baton of the Soviets has not been and will not be achieved. The other Arab countries are trying to improve the relations among themselves. There is even talk of unification of Syria with Iraq. And if this unification does come about, it will be like the unification of Syria with Egypt some years ago. There are major contradictions between them and the respective "Baath" parties and the leaderships of these two countries are making them deeper.

As to the efforts which the Syrians are making to link up with Iran, this is something hypothetical. Iran has its own aims, its own economic interests, which have impelled it on a course not in accord with the Arab countries. On the contrary. While Saudi Arabia has the Emirates of the Persian Gulf

under its influence. The United States of America for its part, is strengthening and arming Saudi Arabia. Although its population is much smaller than that of Iran, Saudi Arabia may become a promoter of the unification of the whole Arabian peninsula in a single confederative state in which, of course, Saudi Arabia would predominate, and behind it would stand the United States of America. In other words, this means bringing about the unity of the two Yemens, uniting Oman, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and so on, with them, and if possible, creating very much better relations with Iran than those which they had in the time of Shah Pahlavi. At that time the United States of America gave the Shah of Iran strong support to have him as a counterweight against Saudi Arabia, while now that country has become American imperialism's best girl that is winking at Ayatollah Khomeini and giving him a come-on signal. We shall see to what extent this aim will be achieved. At present, however, although the OPEC countries have sharply raised their prices and the United States of America and the other capitalist countries are obliged to accept this rise in prices until they can get some stability in this disturbed situation which has long existed and has become even more complicated in the Middle East, this region remains as always a hotbed of war.

MONDAY
APRIL 2, 1979

IRAN HAS BEEN PROCLAIMED A REPUBLIC

Yesterday, the results of the national referendum on turning the country from a monarchy into a republic were declared in Tehran. Ninety-five per cent of the votes were for the proclamation of the Islamic Republic of Iran. On this occasion Ayatollah Khomeini made a speech in which he pointed out that the vote in the national referendum for the proclamation of the republic had put an end to monarchic rule in Iran.

This is another great victory in the struggle of the Iranian people for social liberation and breaking free from the influence of imperialists. Events there are advancing in a positive direction.

TUESDAY
APRIL 3, 1979

THE OTHER ARAB COUNTRIES BOYCOTT EGYPT

The official text of the resolution which was approved by the conference of the Council of the Arab League at the level of foreign ministers held in Baghdad has been published. Superficially at least, this conference produced results against the Egyptian government. This resolution says that by signing the peace treaty, with Israel, the government of the Arab Republic of Egypt has disregarded the resolutions of the Arab Summit Conference, especially the resolutions taken at the summit conferences at Rabat and Algiers, the resolutions of the 9th Arab Summit Conference and that it has disregarded the appeal of the Arab kings and presidents not to sign any peace treaty with the Zionist enemy. According to this resolution, the participants in the Conference of Baghdad consider the signing of the peace treaty with Israel by Sadat's government as a betrayal.

The resolution declares that with this act the Egyptian government deserted the Arab ranks and chose the policy of collaboration with the United States of America to take the same position as the enemy. The Sadat government is accused of abandoning the national duty to liberate the occupied Arab territories, especially Jerusalem, to regain the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to return to their homeland and the right to self-determination to create an in-

dependent state of Palestine on their own national territory, of failing to safeguard Arab solidarity and unity and defend the Arab cause, etc.

The resolution states that the Council of the Arab League at the level of foreign ministers decided:

First,

a) to recall the ambassadors of Arab states from Egypt immediately;

b) to recommend the breaking off of political and diplomatic relations with the Egyptian government. The Arab governments must take the necessary measures to implement this recommendation within a month from the proclamation of this decision and in conformity with the constitutional dispositions of each country.

Second,

Beginning from the date of the signing of the peace treaty with the Zionists, Egypt's membership in the Arab League will be considered invalid. This means that Egypt must be deprived of all rights of membership in the Arab League.

Third,

a) Tunis, the capital of Tunisia, is to become temporarily the centre of the Arab League, its General Secretariat, Ministerial Councils and Permanent Technical Committees, beginning from the date of the signing of the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel,

b) an appeal is to be made to the government of Tunisia to provide all the necessary facilities for the new centre of the Arab League;

c) a committee is to be created of six member countries: Iraq, Syria, Tunisia, Kuwait, Saudi Ara-

bia and Algeria, as well as the representative at the General Secretariat of the Council of the Arab League in order to implement this resolution, to make appeals to the member states and to give these countries the aid required.

The Committee assumes the full competence of the Council of the Arab League to take the measures necessary for the implementation of this resolution, including the protection of the assets, funds, documents and records of the Arab League. The Committee must take the necessary measures against any action undertaken by the Egyptian government to hinder the transfer of the headquarters of the Arab League, or to violate its rights or interests.

This resolution contains many other decisions linked with concrete sanctions against Egypt. In other words, in Baghdad the Arab countries took a decision by means of which they boycott the Arab Republic of Egypt, brand Sadat a traitor and reject the Israeli-Egyptian treaty which was signed on March 26, 1979, jointly with Carter, at Camp David in the United States of America. Of course, this will have consequences in Egypt, but it seems to me that not all the Arab countries which met in Baghdad are fully determined in their stand against Egypt. On the surface it seems as though the resolution was taken unanimously, but apart from Syria, which is interested because part of its territory is occupied by Israel, apart from the Palestinians who are left without a homeland and whose cause went totally unheeded in the Israeli-Egyptian treaty, and Iraq which stands behind Syria, that is, apart from those who are most interested in oppos-

ing Egypt, the other states such as Saudi Arabia, do not take the same stand. These states are wavering. They will wobble as the situations and circumstances dictate in the direction of the American policy and will not completely break off their contacts with Egypt. For his part, King Hussein is opposed to the treaty, but is pro-American at the same time. He is opposed to breaking off contacts with Egypt because he is afraid lest one day the nearly half a million Palestinians who live in Jordan may topple him. Thus he poses as pro the Palestinians, but in reality is a lackey of the Americans and Saudi Arabia.

This is the view we must take of Arab unity, which has not been achieved irrespective of the fact that the countries taking part in the Baghdad meeting emerged with a common conclusion. The United States of America will certainly work to keep them under its influence. Who knows whether eventually Syria, too, may become involved in long and difficult negotiations with Israel and thus the question of the Golan Heights may be liquidated in one way or another. Hence, the losers in all this are the Palestinians who are left without a homeland, and so the problems in the Middle East will go on forever unresolved, while the great powers operate according to their own interests.

Only uprisings of the peoples can put an end to such a difficult and complicated situation in this zone in which Soviet social-imperialism, American imperialism and the other capitalist states of the world have planted their feet. This is a sensitive zone of very great strategic importance, a zone of oil, a zone of inter-imperialist wars, of a war of

plunder which only the peoples of this zone and not the representatives of the forces which are in power in certain countries of this zone, are able to withstand. These forces combine or split according to the interests of the bourgeoisie which they represent and which dominates in those countries, and not according to the national interests of the peoples whom they rule, they link themselves with American imperialism or Soviet social-imperialism, according to the interests of the big oil bourgeoisie.

MONDAY
APRIL 16, 1979

EVERYTHING THAT IS DONE IN THE MIDDLE EAST IS LINKED WITH OIL

News agencies say that a treaty of friendship and collaboration between the Soviet Union and Syria is to be signed. This may be so, but all this clamour may just be a *ballon d'essai*[1] as the French say, to sound out how Gromyko is going to act. Recently, Gromyko was in Damascus where he held talks with the Syrian leaders. He visited this country precisely at the time when the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt was being signed at Camp David, under the chairmanship of Carter, who also signed the treaty.

If Gromyko has arrived at the conclusion that the Soviet Union should sign a treaty of friendship with Syria, this means that Soviet influence will be increased in the Middle East, especially in Syria and Iraq. It will be increased among the Palestinian people, in particular, who are fighting and who may be inclined to pay more attention to this friendship with the Soviet Union for it will "supply" them with weapons. There will be a tendency, also, for the other Arab states that oppose the Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty to be drawn to this treaty with the Soviet Union. However, the United States of America, too, is taking care to avoid any decline in

[1] Test balloon (French in the original).

its influence, and that is why it is working on Saudi Arabia, especially among the sheikhs of the Persian Gulf, as well as on Iraq.

Soviet social-imperialism is at work in Iran, too, primarily in the ideological terrain, by financing and assisting the revisionist "Tudeh" Party inside and outside the country. It has also set in motion the Kurds who live in Iran, friends of the Soviets in the past, as well as the Turcomans who are demanding autonomy within Ayatollah Khomeini's Islamic Republic. Of course, efforts are being made to patch up all these problems but in the final analysis patches are only patches. The fire is blazing in Iran and benzine is being poured on the flames by the Soviets, as well as by the CIA which, although it suffered a great loss with the liquidation of the Shah, still has bases and deep roots there, so it is waiting for this first storm to blow over, not concerned that a number of people loyal to it are being shot, because it has others which it will try to save. They can play their role later, not in the interests of the Shah, of course, but in the interests of the United States of America in some form of government called bourgeois democracy, but dependent on America.

It is self-evident what all these efforts are being made for. They are being made for oil. If the treaty of friendship between Syria and the Soviet Union comes about, undoubtedly this, too, will be done for oil. This was the purpose for which the Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty was signed, too. Likewise, the friendly approaches of the United States of America to Saudi Arabia and the Emirates of the Persian Gulf and the efforts to unite the two Yem-

ens, to toss the Soviet base at Aden into the Red Sea, are primarily on account of the oil.

The Arab world is in movement, not in stability.

SATURDAY
MAY 26, 1979

POLITICAL PANORAMA

The turbulent situation in the world is causing concern. The peoples, the governments, the various parties are in feverish activity. A chaotic political situation has been created everywhere as a result of the profound general crisis which has all the capitalist-revisionist countries tight in its grip. Of course, this state of affairs is causing major disturbances in the social life of peoples and countries and great and insoluble problems for the government leaders who rule those peoples and countries.

Such a troubled situation is very dangerous for those who desire the status quo. The upsetting of this status quo, which rests on various agreements and alliances between capitalist and revisionist countries, could cause minor disasters, but could also cause a major catastrophe. The capitalists and the revisionists are doing everything in their power to avoid the latter, therefore they are working for minor disasters, for new political-economic-military combinations between themselves. They are doing all these things to quell or to weaken the great social movement of the peoples who, day by day, are becoming more clearly aware of where the external oppression, the domination of imperialist and social-imperialist monopolies, together with the internal oppression by the wealthy classes who rule these peoples in close collaboration with the dominant external capitalism, are leading them.

In this situation, two main trouble spots, apart

from others, can be defined. They are Africa and the Middle East.

Africa is a great continent in the process of awakening. Of course, this awakening is not at the same level everywhere, but there is no doubt that this process is accompanied with opposition on the part of the ruled against the rulers, gives rise to strikes and demonstrations which are bloodily suppressed by the various ruling cliques and the neo-colonialists who are nothing but the old colonialists and, first of all, by the Americans. They have invested huge sums in many African countries, collaborate with the reactionary government leaders in these countries and are linked with the other imperialist and neo-colonialist states through joint concerns, trusts and companies. However, we notice that apart from the United States of America, Britain and France also have a long-standing influence in Africa, while Soviet social-imperialism has just begun to take a hand in it and so has Chinese social-imperialism, which is probing around like a hungry man trying to find some way to get into the feast on the cheap.

These colonial powers are trying to preserve the status quo which was established in Africa after the Second World War. They want to preserve that status quo which is linked with the moment when they gave a certain superficial freedom and independence to a series of African states, the borders of which they defined according to their own dominant interests. France was obliged to give "freedom" and "independence" to all its colonies and Britain likewise, while the United States of America, although it did not possess colonies in the old

sense of the term, still had very great influence in Africa, especially after the Second World War, while Germany lost its influence, because it lost the Second World War. Portugal alone continued after the Second World War, indeed right up till recently, to hang on to its colonies in Africa such as Angola, Mozambique, the Cape Verde Islands, etc. Now, after the death of the fascist dictator, Salazar, changes have been made in these countries, too, their independence has been won and recognized and some state borders "have been defined." Nevertheless, the borders of African states, especially those in Eastern, Central and Southern Africa, have been defined only formally. This imposed formal definition does not permit that status quo which the big neo-colonialist capitalist states are seeking in Africa now, because when the division of these states was made, the formation of nationalities was not taken into account and Africa, which has hundreds of different nationalities, was cut up into separate states. Now, about 400 tribes of different nationalities, egged on by the others, are demanding secession from the states created and the formation of new states of their own.

The capitalists of Western Europe, the United States and the Soviet Union have major interests in these countries. They are exploiting the mines and the many assets of these countries above and below the ground by modern methods and with the exceptionally cheap native labour. Therefore, in order to safeguard their financial and political-economic domination in these states, to preserve their old structures and infrastructures with some minor changes, the neo-colonialists of all hues created a

sort of new intelligentsia, which they sent to schools in their metropolises, in order to give the false impression that these states are self-governing. But everyone knows who runs these countries in reality. For example, according to statistics in the whole of French Africa there are 50,000 Frenchmen working and running things. A similar situation exists in Southern Africa where a handful of whites dominate and suppress all that great part of the continent which constitutes South Africa, the country of the Zimbabwes. And in order to give these states an exotic form, individuals such as Mobutu and Bocassa, a former corporal in the Indochina war, then president and emperor of the state of Central Africa, and others like them have been elevated to power. In these African states the privileged are the colonizers who live in the cities built by them with the best of facilities, and they are followed by another stratum, comprised of lower-ranking officials who receive average wages, and last of all comes a peasant-proletariat excluded from these strata, a very poor indigenous proletariat which produces minor things in primitive ways and is so poor that it can neither sell nor buy.

Such a situation is unacceptable to the progressive elements, especially, the new intelligentsia, the members of which are developing and becoming really aware of the barbarous exploitation of their peoples by foreign and local rulers, and are making increasing demands on the employers, not leaving them in peace to live and exploit as they please.

In the present situation which arises from the inter-imperialist rivalry for the division and redivision of spheres of influence and markets, fric-

tions and ambitions develop among the capitalist powers bent on enslaving Africa. Thus, the Belgians, the French, the British, the Americans, the Soviets and the Chinese are not only trying to create or to strengthen their influence in the states of North Africa, such as Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, Egypt, Sudan, etc., but are also striving, at one another's expense, to infiltrate especially into those countries whose independence was recognized late, in order to establish themselves there firmly and expand. To this end, France under Giscard d'Estaing is consistently pursuing a Euro-African policy to which it has now added the term Arab, making it a Euro-African-Arab policy. Through this policy France aims not only to safeguard its privileges in the French-speaking African countries, but also to increase and extend its influence in the Arab countries.

France has had colonies in Africa and the Near East, as for example Syria and Lebanon, where, at the moment, its former influence has been eroded by the other imperialist states. Nevertheless, if it does not have great economic influence there, France has political and cultural influence which it is trying to exploit. It will do this because it sees that Britain, in close collaboration with the United States of America and the reactionary racist regime of South Africa, has captured strong positions on the African continent. Apart from the British threat, France sees a major threat also from the FR of Germany which is striving for and has managed to take pride of place in the European Common Market and the European Union, a place to which France aspires. To realize this aspiration, however,

France must ensure such economic and military strength as to be able to withstand the influence of West Germany.

Thus, for France, Africa constitutes a chessboard on which it is trying to move the pieces to its own advantage in order to checkmate the others. One of these others, apart from those we mentioned, is the Soviet Union which, through the intermediary of the Cubans and, of course, by means of not very large but continual credits, has penetrated into Angola, Ethiopia and Eritrea and is trying to insinuate itself wherever it can gain access.

Thus, amongst internal squabbles and contradictions, the coalition of Western states is striving to strengthen its positions in Africa. In particular, this coalition is trying to preclude any possibility of penetration by Soviet social-imperialism into this continent, where it aims to seize markets and positions important to its military strategy.

In this major political, economic and military movement we see that these imperialist powers are even inciting local wars among African countries, as in the case of the war between Morocco and the POLISARIO Front, and fanning up the feuds between Morocco and Algeria and between Mauritania and the POLISARIO Front. We see Zaire at war with Uganda; the situation in Angola is not calm, and likewise in Ethiopia the situation is still unstable irrespective of the fact that Haile Sellassie, who was an Ethiopian Bocassa, has been liquidated. Now that country, assisted by the Soviets, is at war with Eritrea and Somalia. The latter formerly had the support of the Soviet Union while now it has turned for aid to the United States of

America and China. The bourgeoisie ruling in these countries strives to secure comfortable positions for itself and suppress the revolts of the popular masses, revolts which are not continuous, but sporadic and ill-organized, because the people involved still lack ideological and political formation. Of course, these movements will never be organized properly until the full development of the objective factor, which will require the creation of the subjective factor, or will strengthen it, if it exists, in order to lead the people in an open and triumphant revolt against their external and internal oppressors.

In Central and Southern Africa the situations are very liable to change, very unstable, while in French-speaking Africa there is a certain stability. Apparently, in these countries, the French infrastructures, companies and concerns, have established a relatively sound position and set up a suitable organizational structure like that of the metropolis, which, nevertheless, is unsuitable for the new colonies which it has under its economic-military-political leadership.

In North Africa there are countries which appear more independent and pursue a policy allegedly not according to the interests of the Great Powers. They all talk about Arab unity and call themselves independent countries, but if you analyse the content of these labels which they have given themselves, the reality turns out to be not as they want to present it. In other words, they are Arab countries, but in reality nothing unites them apart from the Muslim religion, which can never be a spiritual means capable of eliminating the eco-

nomic and political contradictions between them. Today we are not in the time of the Prophet and the khalifs; it is neither Damascus, Baghdad nor Tehran but class interests that dominate. The Muslim religion, like other religions, has become a direct aid by means of which the wealthy ruling classes exploit the proletariat and the oppressed masses and keep them in ignorance, promising them a happy future, not in this world, but in the "next world."

Wherever possible and where their economic or political interests converge, the Arab and Muslim countries try to make their religion a means of unification, but it also becomes a means of war when their interests come into opposition with one another. Concretely we see that in North Africa there is no unity of opinion and it would be absurd to think that unity could exist between feudal and bourgeois-capitalist regimes. Likewise, it is a mistake to say that these countries are completely independent of the imperialist great powers. The fact is that they are linked and interconnected with the interests of world capitalism and in order to serve these interests as well as the interests of the bourgeoisie in power, they establish or break off agreements with those developed capitalist states which give them powerful support to achieve their own aims.

Of course, we cannot say that there is not something progressive in the programs of the governments of these countries of North Africa; it must be said, however, that in many of these countries even this feeble progressiveness, if it exists at all, serves the ruling class and not the oppressed

masses who produce and are exploited, while the wealthy make profits and rule. Therefore, there are contradictions between different classes within these states, contradictions which are growing deeper, upsetting that status quo which the neo-colonialists want to preserve and also damaging the harmonization of the interests of various states in the relations they have with one another.

Only someone who understands nothing of politics, who is unable to make a realistic analysis of the policy pursued in these countries and of their social conditions, could arrive at the conclusion that in these situations the contradictions which are operating in these countries are only those between states, and could forget that the other contradictions, which Lenin defined correctly, exist and develop at all times and in every situation, making the status quo desired by the capitalists impossible.

It is equally foolish to think that only the imperialists and social-imperialists make the law and that the contradictions, disagreements and the antagonistic struggle between them cause this disturbance of the status quo. As a consequence of this, in order to deceive the masses of the people, the ruling classes, of course, rely on one imperialist or the other, presenting the one as good and the other as bad, and so the responsibility for the evils or the "blessings" is due solely to the reliance on this or that imperialism. In fact, the contradictions operate in every direction intensively, less intensively or in latent forms, but they do their own work.

Let us look at some of them without going into details.

Morocco was a colony of France which exploited it for many decades. In that country France had established its hegemony and such forms of the superstructure and structure as responded to the needs of the metropolis. In the French army there were detachments of Moroccan mercenaries who shed their blood for France for the metropolis, for the colonies of the 200 French families.

Today Morocco is ruled by a king who tries to pose as a democrat, who plays an allegedly progressive role, but in reality rules by barbarous medieval laws. Morocco, in which the intrigues of the imperialist powers operate, has profound contradictions with neighbouring states such as Mauritania, Algeria and with the POLISARIO Front.

The Kingdom of Morocco, assisted, of course, by French and American imperialism, does not want Algeria to have influence in the POLISARIO Front and wants to have Mauritania under its thumb. There are also intrigues and rivalries developing between the Americans and the Soviets there. The latter are trying to establish their naval bases in the Atlantic and, therefore, are doing everything in their power to exert influence on Algeria and the POLISARIO Front and trying to find the most suitable moments to make the Kingdom of Morocco a satellite of theirs for difficult times. At present, however, such a thing is not occurring. The Soviet Union is quite unable to influence Morocco.

Algeria is the only country of North Africa which waged war, and we must say heroically, against the French occupiers, gaining its bourgeois freedom and national independence.

In Algeria some social reforms have been car-

ried out. There is modern and Islamic cultural development there. French culture exerts a permanent influence and Algeria maintains important economic relations with France, especially in regard to the exportation of Algerian labour power, wines and grapes and, above all, the exploitation of the oil and gas of the Sahara. Its oil and gas play a decisive role for all the countries which possess parts of this desert, which is very rich in oil and gas and, possibly, in other valuable minerals. For this reason there is a continual conflict among the bordering states...

At present, Algeria is playing an important role in the question of the unity of the Arab countries as well as among the so-called non-aligned countries. Tito, who wants to be the leader of the "non-aligned" countries, has great hopes that Algeria will exert its influence on the other countries to preserve their so-called unity, which has never existed and never will exist, because all these countries are all more or less dependent on the various Great Powers.

Libya is a country which was liberated or proclaimed "independent" when colonel Qaddafi overthrew King Idris through a coup d'état. The fact is that the former Italian colony, Libya, now headed by Qaddafi, is trying to play the role of a pure Islamic Muslim "socialist" country. Qaddafi has many ambitions: he wants Egypt to be dependent on Libya, has intentions upon a number of states of Central Africa and is also trying to assume an important role in the Arab question.

Egypt, formerly headed by Nasser and now by Sadat, is a bourgeois country, with or without a

king. The wealthy bourgeois democrats threw out King Farouk and they did well, but they did not lead Egypt on the course the people called for. On the contrary, the economic reforms there were non-existent and politically Egypt has become a chessboard of the imperialist superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

As a result of the confused policy of Nasser and Sadat Egypt has suffered major losses during the wars which were imposed on it by Israel, armed to the teeth. Indeed, Cairo itself was threatened by Israeli occupation, but the imperialist powers intervened to prevent this, because they foresaw an even greater catastrophe in the Mediterranean area with the complete occupation of Egypt. Nevertheless, Israel managed to strengthen its own Zionist state, to occupy Egyptian territories and the Golan Heights, a dominant strategic place, the occupation of which was at Syria's expense.

With Egypt and its conflict with Israel, which implies the conflict of all the Arab peoples, including the Palestinian people, with the Israeli aggressors, **we go on to the second key point of the present international situation.**

With the signing of the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel a new situation was created. All the Arab countries oppose this treaty, publicly at least, because it is an unjust treaty and sacrifices the interests of the Palestinian people. In fact, contrary to the joint policy of the Arab countries, Egypt signed this treaty with Israel, which is an agency of the United States of America in the Middle East, got back only a part of the territories occupied by Israel, and completely forgot the Golan

Heights and the Palestinians. This is why it is so "sternly" opposed by all the other Arab countries and also by Ayatollah Khomeini's Iran. In this allegedly Arab alliance, however, there is no complete unity of views and actions against Sadat for his betrayal of the common cause of the Palestinians and Syria. For example, although Saudi Arabia and the Emirates of the Persian Gulf take part in this grouping which opposes the Israeli-Egyptian treaty, still they have one hand held out to it and the other to American imperialism, because they are worried about their petrol dollars.

Thus, Syria, in fact, has disagreements with Egypt and is at war with Israel. Iraq is with Syria. These two states, Iraq and Syria, are trying to combine with one another to create a unity. It is clear that they are talking about this aim, but it can never be achieved, because of the major contradictions which exist between the regimes of these two states and the differences in their economic level, as well as because of the strategic position of each of them. The various imperialist powers, also, are opposed to such a unification, and that is why they are making efforts to prevent it.

Syria and Iraq are two republics with a brilliant ancient Islamic culture, but in their infrastructures they remain in the position of feudal-bourgeois countries where the wealthy and the religious hierarchy rule. We can say that in those countries, religion, as such, plays a major role in the oppression of the working masses. In Syria, French culture, and in Iraq, British culture, also, have played and still play a major role.

In Iraq there is a Kurdish minority, part of a

very big people divided among a number of countries by the unjust treaties of imperialists. There are Kurds in Turkey, the Soviet Union and Iran. In Iraq the struggle between Kurds and Iraqis has come to the surface many times. Great national contradictions exist there, contradictions which are incited by the Soviets, in particular, and which come to a head time after time.

When the Baghdad government is trying to walk the tight rope, as you might say, in the Persian Gulf, Saudi Arabia, which is especially rich in oil and closely linked with American imperialism through the big oil company ARAMCO, created in the time of Roosevelt, is playing a major double role allegedly in the interest of the Arab peoples, allegedly against Israel and allegedly independent of the United States of America. In fact, Saudi Arabia remains a powerful capitalist state in regard to its wealth, but weak from the political and military aspects. The Saudi policy is simply a policy of dollars, of oil, and nothing more.

Of course, Saudi Arabia has very great influence in all the Arab countries. For their part they are interested in getting credits from Saudi Arabia which, for its part, dictates to them, to some degree, the defence of its interests and those of the United States of America. Hence, we can say that Saudi Arabia is three quarters a supporter of the American imperialists' policy, while up till very recently Iran was entirely at the disposal of the Americans. However, with the overthrow of the Shah as a result of the great popular demonstrations in all the cities of Iran, especially the demonstrations of the oil workers, and the coming to

power of Ayatollah Khomeini, the situation in that country changed: Iran was transformed from a country enslaved to the United States of America to a country in revolt against the savage oppression and exploitation by the American, British and other imperialists.

Certainly such a thing does not mean that Iran has become a progressive democratic republic. No, but the activity of the popular masses gave the retrograde Islamic activity a more or less progressive colour. These masses overthrew the Pahlavi empire and set in motion the revolutionary Islamic courts, which up till now have sentenced to death a number of lackeys and agents of the Shah and the Americans, whose hands were stained with the blood of the Iranian people. Will these courts continue to impose such sentences in Iran? This is not known.

But another and more important question is that the great strikes of the oil workers in Iran have caused a major economic and energy crisis throughout the world, especially in the Western imperialist countries, headed by the United States of America. The situation created in Iran proved that the powerful CIA had underestimated the strength of the people of Iran, which erupted against the desire and without the knowledge of the United States of America. The Americans proved short-sighted in regard to their hegemonic interests and thought that, under their direct domination, the Shah of Iran would exist forever and go on thoroughly exploiting the Iranian people. However, the opposite occurred. At the moment nothing has been stabilized in Iran yet. Of course, during this

period the imperialists and the social-imperialists are manoeuvring with their policies to find ways to cool the tempers, to tame the revolt in the interests of the wealthy classes, to avoid the total liquidation of their agency and to bring to power new people who will more or less redress this great disequilibrium which the Iranian problem has caused them. The fact that the American Senate itself continues to interfere in the internal affairs of Iran, by threatening to take decisions against the trial and execution of the Shah's murderous supporters, proves this very clearly. Meanwhile Ayatollah Khomeini sternly opposes this interference and opposes it by continuing to allow the Islamic courts to do their work.

We can say that the popular forces in Iran are on the move, the objective factor is developing, but the question of the leadership has not yet been decided. The most powerful leadership at present is the Islamic leadership of Ayatollah Khomeini with many tendencies, but still with a certain unity, while in the Bazargan government tendencies to conciliation with the old imperialists can be seen and this conciliation, if it is achieved, of course, will be realized in forms which will differ from those which existed at the time of Riza Shah Pahlavi.

Nevertheless, the uprising of the people of Iran against the feudal monarchy of the Shah has had an influence throughout the world, not only from the economic aspect, which shows how powerful the oil weapon is, a weapon which could make war impossible, because without oil the military machine cannot be set in motion against the peoples, but

also from the political aspect. As a liberation movement, this uprising has created a favourable situation throughout the whole region of the Arab and African Countries and the peoples could take it as an example of how to rise in liberation struggle.

The Palestinian people are not laying down their arms, either. Through their struggle they are displaying their dauntless fighting spirit, but the great evil is that they have been left without a homeland and are fighting wherever they have the possibility to establish themselves. The present government of Egypt maintains a stand of stern opposition to the Palestinians, although it may be stern only in appearance, because it would not be surprising if "Al-Fatah" were secretly working with Egypt to turn the Gaza Strip and the West Bank into a state with a certain autonomy for the Palestinians. This may appear a vague idea, but not without foundation. Meanwhile the Palestinians in Lebanon are under the continual attacks of Israeli bomber aircraft in reply to any action they launch, actions which are expressions of their struggle for the liberation of their lost homeland.

At present all the countries which oppose Egypt are defending the Palestinian cause, but this defence is more substantial here, timid there, and elsewhere only in words. It is not surprising that the Palestinians settled in Syria, Iraq and elsewhere and especially in the Emirates of the Persian Gulf and Iran, serve as a means of pressure by these states against American imperialism and, at the same time, also as an obstacle to the agreements which these states might make with the imperialist

and social-imperialist powers.

Even the Palestinians are not linked in a strong unity. Their situation is a reflection of the many contradictions which weaken the Arab peoples and states themselves. There are many different factions in the ranks of the Palestinian fighters. Because of the vacillations of Arafat and "Al-Fatah" it is uncertain what policy they are pursuing, while Habash, who presents himself as very intransigent against Israel and is not in agreement with "Al-Fatah," might reach agreement with the social-imperialist Soviet Union in order to achieve his aim.

Thus, the Middle East is not and never will be tranquil and, irrespective of the fact that the positions of American imperialism have been somewhat strengthened with the signing of the Israeli-Egyptian treaty, the policy of the United States of America is still in great difficulties in this major region, the so-called oil zone, the Arab zone. There will be no peace in this region, because the contradictions among the American, British, French imperialists and between them and the Soviet imperialists and the various ruling cliques which will take the side of one or the other imperialist state, as well as the contradictions of the peoples against the ruling classes, will increase continuously.

Socialist Albania, although it is small, through political, economic and cultural contacts, has become known and enjoys a very fine reputation among all the peoples of these countries, indeed, even among many of their leaders that have contradictions with the superpowers and the developed capitalist states. So, in these countries there is admiration for Albania, for its principled policy, for

its courage and valour, for its independence and sovereignty which it keeps inviolate of foreign powers, as well as for its continuous support for their struggle against the Israeli aggressors, against American and Soviet imperialism, especially for the struggle of the Palestinian people for their national and social liberation.

Our stand and policy make deep impressions on those peoples who aspire to genuine freedom and independence. They are impressed, also, by our socialist order, which they dream about but which they still do not see clearly and do not realize how it can be achieved and how a new society can be built as in our country.

We are convinced that the new society will be built there, too...

The oppression, poverty, misery, pronounced class differentiation, the harsh contradictions existing in those countries make the progressive people, the proletarians of towns and villages and the progressive intelligentsia think about Marxism-Leninism, even if they are not fully acquainted with it, and come to the conclusion that this revolutionary theory and practice is combatted so hard by the capitalists and revisionists because it is against them, against oppressors and for the oppressed...

In reality, the imperialist and social-imperialist superpowers are in decay, degenerate and their foundations are shaky. This is because their order is in great crisis and the peoples have risen in struggle against them. Nevertheless, these superpowers with their military machines, with the strength and organization of their economic structures and political superstructures to which they give different

appearances, try to make people think that they are irresistible. And the fact is that there are some who accept and foster such an idea.

The problem is that the imperialist and social-imperialist superpowers must be neither underrated nor overrated, but considered as they really are. Only in this way will their weak spots he found, spots which are obvious and which can be attacked with revolutionary force to collapse the foundations of their rotten structure and bring the whole thing tumbling down.

At present American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism are making great efforts to strengthen themselves and to look like two great invincible superpowers. It is true that they have great atomic military potential, have great economic strength, are imposing a policy of enslavement on the world, are influencing and interfering in the internal affairs of other peoples and states, making the law in many countries, here by brute force and there indirectly, but nevertheless, they are in decay and their positions are shaky. They are trying to strengthen their positions, but it is impossible for them to achieve this aim at the expense of the peoples they oppress. The more time passes, the more the peoples see that the forces in the world are polarizing into those who want the revolution and those who want to suppress it. The peoples are going to carry out the revolution, therefore they must prevent predatory imperialist wars and kindle national liberation wars which open the way to the world proletarian revolution.

To possess weapons and dollars does not mean that you have invincible strength. If you have the

people politically conscious and organized for stern resistance, then yes, you can say that you have the power to overthrow these savage and powerful enemies. It is known that these enemies have profound contradictions with each other, which they try to avoid, but in vain. We are struggling against unjust wars, imperialist wars, because they are waged to the detriment of the peoples, but the imperialists, too, especially in the present conditions of the existence of atomic weapons and the awakening of the consciousness of the peoples, are making efforts to put aside their contradictions because they know that, if a new atomic world war does break out, it will be to their detriment and, at the same time, to the advantage of the revolution, it will cause mankind colossal losses, but will put the order of the imperialists in danger.

In this sense the SALT agreements and other deals which the superpowers make are made from fear of the revolution, of the economic crisis of overproduction, of the political, ideological and military crisis. Through the SALT agreements they want to achieve a balance in their nuclear weapons and in their economic power at the same time, to economize on such expenditure so as to devote it to investments, to the suppression of the peoples, to the exploitation of the sweat and assets of these peoples in the interests of the metropolises, for the creation of a life of fabulous wealth for the society of great lords.

Hence, the aim of the American, Soviet, Chinese, Japanese, French, British and other imperialists is to achieve a balance of their economic and military power, both between individual states and

between various groupings. Naturally, this is achieved by signing various open and secret agreements.

The new Chinese social-imperialism, eager for new conquests, to capture new markets, has opened up to the United States of America, Japan and the developed capitalist countries. China's ambition is to become an economic and military superpower and dominate the whole of Southeast Asia, to make the law in the ASEAN countries and, possibly, in the Pacific and to block the way for Japan. Perhaps, China will attack Siberia, but it could also combine with the Soviet social-imperialists to oppose the American imperialists. If the latter assist China, while closing their eyes to its ambitions, then China could become a very great threat to the imperialist expansion of the United States of America itself.

That is why at the moment we see that China, with a capitalist regime, with ill-considered and ill-founded efforts to develop its economy, with megalomaniacal ambitions to carry out the "Four Modernizations" in about the time it takes to wink an eye, and this with the aid of the American and Japanese imperialists and other capitalists, is in great chaos. The situation in China is unstable and without stability it cannot proceed on the course of major conquests and major competition with the superpowers. That is why daily efforts are being made, hitherto in vain, for "unity," for discipline against the "rightists," against the "leftists," against the "extreme right" and the "extreme left," against "radicals" and "democrats."

This shows that China is in great political

chaos, that the power of warlords exists there, that socialism never was built in China and the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat there was only a personal or group dictatorship. And now these groups are quarrelling amongst themselves for domination, but the complete domination of one or the other group is impossible. This will require a very long time. However, this situation favours an adventurous policy. The first adventure is the opening up of China with such great vigour towards the West; the second adventure is the war against Vietnam and the insistence on teaching it other "lessons." However, these "lessons" which China is giving Laos, Cambodia and the ASEAN countries from the Philippines to Indonesia, apart from Vietnam, have only one aim: that these should come into the political, economic and military orbit of China.

We see, also, that the European Union, the Europe of reaction, of capitalism, the Europe which has set the world ablaze twice since 1914 and might do so for a third time, constitutes a major political, economic and military force. As a military force, however, it is unable to confront the Soviet force without the aid of American imperialism, while as an economic force it can play its own hand. Of course, in the complicated relationships which exist at present among the imperialist powers, the European Union as an entity is quite unable to free itself from these ties with American imperialism.

For the European Union, that imperialism will always be the last resort against a Soviet invasion. Politically, the European Union is trying to soften its policy with the Soviet Union because it has ma-

jor economic interests and is seeking any way to avoid a conflagration between itself and the Soviet Union. It is more interested in seeing the contradictions deepen between the Soviet Union and China so that this results in a war in the Far East, and is also interested in the sharpening of the contradictions between China and the United States of America, between China, on the one hand, and Japan and the United States of America, on the other. Thus, the European Union thinks that the others should pull the chestnuts out of the fire for it. But these are illusions, just as there is no sound basis for the hopes about the unification of this Europe comprised of different states with different cultures, different economic interests and different ambitions for domination, whether in the European Common Market, the alliance of the European Union, in Africa or the other colonial countries.

Thus, the European Union about which all the states of the world are making such a great fuss at the moment, is nothing but an ephemeral solution and a reactionary capitalist policy which, sooner or later, will be faced with countless many-sided difficulties of various natures which will ensure that it is weakened instead of growing stronger.

The European proletariat cannot go on forever obeying the trade-union bosses and the social-democratic and revisionist parties which prattle that a better future will be won through structural development, the parliamentary road or reforms. It is becoming more and more clear these days that the "European Union" makes the dream of the proletariat and the peoples of Europe for a happy future

more improbable. That is why the manipulated strikes and demonstrations which are taking place in Europe, and the drug addiction, degeneration, etc. which have swept the countries of this continent, are unable to stop the sound overwhelming bulk of these peoples from revolting against the reactionary regimes in power. At a certain moment this revolt will reach its culmination when it demands a solution to these problems and brooks no delay.

A similar process, of course, with some different characteristics, is occurring in Latin America, too. American imperialism has a more powerful influence in the countries of South America because the United States of America has worked harder and in more radical ways and has managed to create among the military leaderships of these countries the sentiment of government through putschist methods and allegedly in democratic forms. The putsches bring to power different generals and governments which create the impression that they are carrying out economic and political reforms, but in reality they are nothing but dictatorial military governments, merciless exploiters of the peoples of Latin America and collaborators with American imperialism.

Hence, we can say as a conclusion that the present political panorama is like this: American, Soviet, Chinese and Japanese imperialism look like great powers that are making the law in the world, but if the situation is analysed more deeply, this is not precisely so. These big military and economic powers are growing progressively weaker each year. The all-round crisis which has the capitalist

and revisionist countries tight in its grip, the millions of unemployed, the inflation and the decline of the rate of industrial production in these countries, all show this weakness and, likewise, the great impoverishment of the working masses, which brings with it the revolt of these masses against their employers.

In this situation the ceaseless struggle of the peoples against the imperialist powers and local ruling cliques is developing more powerfully day by day. This struggle is tangible, can be felt and seen. Sometimes it seems hopeless, but this is not so. The revolutionary struggle may suffer defeat at a particular moment, but this is temporary. Following the defeat, the revolution is prepared again and victory comes. In this struggle of the oppressed masses we see a vigorous movement, an organization, stronger here and in embryo there, against the manoeuvres of the imperialist great powers which are obliged to use all possible tactics to deceive and mislead the peoples and divert them from their correct course.

Therefore it is necessary that we thoroughly understand the various tactics of the imperialist powers, see clearly how they evolve, how they are concocted and what aims they have, so that we can determine correctly what we must do to defeat them, one after the other. Their defeat creates premises for counteractions which follow one another until the general uprising is achieved.

TUESDAY
JUNE 26, 1979

THE SUPERPOWERS SABOTAGE THE TRUE UNITY OF THE ARAB PEOPLES

The agreement between Syria and Iraq to unite or combine burst like a bubble and suffered complete fiasco. In an earlier article, I pointed out that these unifications cannot be achieved on capitalist foundations. The ruling parties of Iraq and Syria have only the name "Baath" in common, while they are two nationalist parties, each of which tries to dominate the other. In this union, Iraq, of course, wanted Syria to be under its leadership, while Syria wanted Iraq to place itself under its leadership. Hence, alleged unity, but in fact attempts at domination both on the part of Damascus and Baghdad.

Of course, this is a big minus for the Arab peoples who are honest fighters, but those in the leaderships of some of their countries do not defend the interests of their own peoples.

Syria is relying on the Soviets. They are supplying it with arms and credits. The aid of the Soviet Union is not sincere. In reality it has not defended and is not defending Syria from the Israelis. On the contrary, the Soviets are providing Syria with outdated weapons, while they are supplying Israel with cannon fodder. All the Jews of the Soviet Union, tens of thousands a year, are being sent to Israel. This kind of emigration augments and strengthens the army of Dayan and Begin. With

these people Israeli Zionist colonies are founded on the occupied territories of the heroic Palestinian people.

On the other hand, as emerges from the foreign press, Baghdad is smiling towards the Americans, a thing which indicates that it will become a centre to be exploited by them. Al-Bakr's Iraq is a country rich in oil. In recent days news agencies report that even greater resources of oil have been discovered in this Arab country, therefore, American imperialism, which has more or less lost Iran, is now trying to get Baghdad into its clutches. The dream of Al-Bakr and the "Baath" Party is to dominate the Persian Gulf, in which it wants to make the law now that Iran is in a "revolutionary" maelstrom.

Nevertheless, the Americans have not given up Iran and news agencies allege that the government of Iran has approved the return of a large number of American oil experts to Persia. We must see how much truth there is in this. Meanwhile, the Soviets are playing the card of Iraq and Syria. It is better for them that these countries should be divided rather than united, for the reason that the Soviet Union can do no good for itself on the Israeli question, because Israel and Egypt are now harnessed to the American chariot. This, of course, did not please the Soviets who are trying to combat and divide those countries, but this is difficult because, at the same time, they want to maintain and safeguard their friendship with the United States of America.

The treaty between Egypt and Israel which was signed at Camp David cannot be attacked openly by the Soviets. Naturally, they will play the card of Syria, the card of Libya and the card of their secret

agency inside Egypt to the extent that this is possible, but most of all they want Syria and Iraq to be divided and under their influence.

In Iraq the Soviets are playing the card of the Kurds under Barzani or some other leader, and this continues to be their trump card to ease or step up the pressure on Al-Bakr. The Soviets are doing a similar thing in Iran, where the Kurds and Azerbaijanis can and do move according to Moscow's instructions. Recently, Ayatollah Khomeini, in a public speech warned the Soviets not to create disturbances in Iran, but these disturbances and intrigues will be continued there, both by the Soviets through their secret agency and by the United States of America through the CIA.

Only a further development of the revolution with bourgeois-democratic features can save Iran from these intrigues...

In other words, the Middle East, the oil zone, is on fire, is a field of mines which could be detonated by the imperialist powers and blow up at any time. The only correct alternative is the true awakening of the Arab peoples in the Middle East. The universal example of the heroic struggle of the Palestinian people is what ought to create that sense of unity for the elimination of the heavy burden of intrigues and oppression imposed by the imperialists and local capitalists. The Palestinians, a people without a homeland, are showing the world that the fight for freedom, for land, for bread, for democracy, the revolutionary armed struggle, is the only way to salvation. Justice, the basis of unity lie in this struggle.

Regrettably, the Palestinians, too, are divided

among themselves and their division is inspired by their Arab brothers. There are Palestinians who are incited by the Syrians, others who are influenced by the Emirates of the Gulf, others by Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and so on. The Soviets pretend that they are assisting Arafat who travels back and forth to Moscow and from one capital city to another. But he, too, is in opposition to various Palestinian currents which are fighting against Israel, the United States of America and Egypt, which joined up with Israel and left the Palestinians in the lurch.

The question of oil could flare up, because the present shortage of it, increased prices, etc., have seriously affected the imperialist and capitalist states, creating repeated difficulties and worries for them and causing them great concern. Therefore, they are taking draconian measures to reduce consumption of oil. But these measures also reduce the profits they want to make at all costs at the expense of the workers and the working masses who, plunged into suffering and want, after all have two hands to defend themselves and so the time will come when they come to grips with decaying capitalism. In this whole situation the question of oil plays a major role. In the hands of the Arab peoples it is a powerful weapon for their liberation and an aid to national liberation struggles and the proletarian revolution, but at the same time, it is a means of oppression, if it remains in the hands of imperialists and their agents.

POGRADEC, THURSDAY
JULY 19, 1979

THE OIL CRISIS AND ITS INFLUENCE IN THE WORLD

The oil crisis or as it is more widely called, the world energy crisis, which is linked with the reduction of production and the continual increase of prices for their oil by the producing countries, is one of the fundamental factors which increases or decreases the gravity of the consequences of the general economic crisis which has gripped the capitalist and revisionist world. In many political events, government crises, the general decline in industrial production, the uncontrollable fluctuations or devaluations of this or that currency, the colossal disorder of all types of transport, the increase in prices or inability to cope with the consequences of severe winters, oil has its influence and is, you might say, the main factor of the worsening or improvement of the situation, of getting over or increasing the difficulties. Major monopolies and banks, various governments and parties of the capitalist and revisionist bourgeoisie are set up or collapse over the question of whether or not they can get hold of the supply of oil.

The disturbing effects of the shortage of oil, of this primary product of vital importance for the economies and war machines of the imperialist and revisionist states, became very acute in 1973 when the Arabs proclaimed their boycott of the Western countries which supported Israel. In my opinion, this boycott showed the Arab oil producing coun-

tries that by means of the oil weapon they could conquer Israel, its patron, the United States of America, or any other of their enemies. To achieve this, however, they have to foil the all-sided economic, political and military pressures as well as the intrigues which are hatched up by means of some oil-producing countries which break the boycott.

...The oil crisis shook American imperialism to such an extent that Carter's speech,[1] irrespective of his claims that it had the approval of a relatively good proportion of the middle strata of the American population, aroused the opposition of the big trusts and corporations whose incomes Carter threatened not only because of the oil shortage and the failure of industry (partial, of course) of the United States of America to develop during the period of crisis, but also because of the way American imperialism wants to get out of its grave situation of debts amounting to billions of dollars, especially towards Japan and the Federal Republic of Germany. To emerge from this situation and to keep the dollar relatively stable the government of the United States of America imposed new taxes on the big American trusts and concerns. If you tread on their corns, however, they immediately jump up in anger and this was demonstrated with the whole of Carter's cabinet resigning. For the past two days the United States of America has had no government; the whole cabinet resigned. This indicates a major crisis and, as far as we know, this is the first

[1] Carter's speech to the nation over the American TV on July 15, 1979, after his return from Camp David.

instance of a crisis in which the whole cabinet of an American president has resigned. Not only all the members of the cabinet, but also many top-rank functionaries of the White House did this. Undoubtedly what will occur there will follow the French saying: *prendre les commandes*.[1] Carter will accept other representatives of the trusts, will come to terms with those who are in revolt and will form another cabinet, which will do what he proposed, if the American Senate agrees to this. Otherwise, Carter himself will have to go. He may not shift at the moment, but after the coming elections he may have to kiss the White House goodbye never to return.

The oil crisis caused a grave economic situation for the United States of America, and this, of course, has political consequences. Thus, prices are rising and unemployment and inflation are mounting in that country. Observations of the exchange rate of the dollar show that in the last few days it has continued to fall against gold and also against the other currencies of Western Europe. Imagine how far things have gone when even the Italian lira is rising and the U.S. dollar falling. The conclusion is that the leader of imperialism, American imperialism, is suffering a major political-economic defeat.

The American imperialists and the other capitalists feel the shortage of oil as a shortage of "blood" in the great war which they are preparing. Of course, when they are short of "blood" they must fight to get it, hence, they must get oil, and so

[1] To take over command (French in the original)

the international situation becomes even more dangerous and the threats of a world war or local wars increase. However, without oil it is impossible for a world war to be waged on the scale intended and with the results desired by the American and other imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists or as called for by the Chinese.

The signing of the Israeli-Egyptian treaty also seemed to be a success for American imperialism. I have pointed out that this treaty was achieved under the patronage of the United States of America which wants to have two pistols instead of one in the Middle East to protect the flanks of its oil basin from a political-economic and eventual military invasion by the Soviets. Nevertheless, it must be said that the hostility between American imperialism and the Arab countries always remains. Of course, this is a differentiated hostility, because of the lack of that unity which should exist between the Arab countries in order to oppose the great intrigues of American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. Nevertheless, the Israeli-Egyptian treaty angered the other Arab states, which opposed it, some more heatedly others more coolly, but we can say that all of them opposed it with some force. This opposition was, of course, expressed more vigorously in Iran, where the Shah had been overthrown, where the rates of oil extraction were slowed and sales of oil, especially to the Americans, reduced. However, it was reflected among the others, too, and as a result the prices of oil were raised. Even Saudi Arabia joined in this action although it is friendly to the Americans; it acted without breaking off this friendship but also without ex-

pressing it openly. As a result of this situation the disagreements between the Arab countries increased, and it is clear that these disagreements result from the general policy of American imperialism, world capitalism and Soviet social-imperialism, not forgetting the Chinese social-imperialists who want to take advantage of the situation.

In these conditions attempts were made at the unification of Syria with Iraq, but these attempts resulted in the resignations of Al-Bakr and the leader of the "Baath" Party, and the advent to power of another to replace Al-Bakr and the leader of that party. The reason for this could not have been Al-Bakr's old age. No, Al-Bakr is not an old man, but it is not clear how closely he was linked with the Soviets. I think that in Iraq the Soviets are playing two cards, that of the Kurds and that of Al-Bakr. In these disturbances the Soviets have now set in motion the Kurds who are rising in Iraq, in Syria and Iran. Naturally, such a thing is in favour of the Soviets and in disfavour of the Americans. Hence, the CIA which suffered a major defeat in Iran, is now trying to gain ground. We shall see how and to what extent it will achieve this.

To get out of the situation in which they find themselves, the Arab peoples and countries must manage, to create a true unity of action against American imperialism and reaction in power. Therefore, the question that presents itself now is how these peoples and countries will resist the internal pressure of reaction and the external pressure of imperialists and how they will tackle the two important problems which I consider are linked both with the question of the Middle East

and with the question of peace or war in the world: the question of the rights of the Palestinian people and the question of oil. I say this because the Americans are exerting economic pressure on OPEC through the measures which they have taken or will take during the next 10 to 15 years, to produce synthetic petrol and to introduce the use of coal and solar or nuclear power on a greater scale for the production of energy. In this way they want to tell the oil-producing states that they will no longer have great profits from the extraction of oil, while in fact, although the Arab countries have sold the oil for a pittance, they, not the peoples, of course, but the Shah, the kings, the sheikhs, have still made colossal profits.

In his speech in recent days Carter threatened violence against the Arab countries when he said that OPEC has its dagger drawn against the United States of America. Of course, with these words he wanted to indicate that the United States, too, would raise its dagger against OPEC. Indeed, the United States of America has always had its dagger drawn and it will be even readier to use it now that its interests are threatened.

Hence, the two superpowers are engaged in many manoeuvres in the Middle East. Begin and Sadat are holding meetings continually and consolidating their "friendship." Sadat proposed to the Egyptian parliament and received its approval that Egypt should offer refuge to the Shah. This is a direct threat to the Iranian revolution. This places the people of Iran before the alternative: either submit to and come to terms with American imperialism or face the threat of the return of the Shah

to Iran. Whether or not he will return depends on the Iranian people. But for the moment it is improbable. Sadat's action looks like a symbolic gesture or a reply to the opposition of the other Arab countries to the Israeli-Egyptian treaty.

The question of oil has become the epicentre of major world intrigues and machinations, because all countries are involved in this question.

The Soviet Union, too, is involved in this very great problem because, together with American imperialism, it has entered an indescribable crisis, not to speak of the China of Hua Guofeng and Deng Xiaoping which is in complete disarray.

The whole of Europe and Western Europe, especially, is going through difficult and gloomy days which the European parliament that was elected by universal vote, will do nothing to brighten, however hard it tries.

...The oil crisis has these countries, too, in its grip and they have been alarmed and taken measures, indeed draconian measures, at the expense of their peoples, of course, because there is still no apparent sign that the European trusts, cartels and multi-national companies are feeling the great crisis which has broken out, as they ought to. The whole burden of this crisis has fallen on the backs of the working people of these countries of the European Union. Every day millions of them go on strike. This testifies to the worsening situation in these capitalist states and to the efforts which their regimes are making to reject the demands of the working masses and to suppress the revolts and uprisings that might break out there. However, in these countries unemployment is con-

stantly increasing, prices are going sky-high, inflation is at high levels and there is no end to the insecurity of people in their jobs and lives; gangsterism, murder, theft, kidnappings have assumed wide proportions.

...News agencies say, and this could be true, that the big Japanese, American, British and West-German oil companies together with the Italian companies, have signed contracts to prospect for and extract oil in the South China Sea. Naturally, the extraction of oil from the sea will be very costly, especially to China, because the income from crude oil will be guaranteed to the creditors and China will get a minimum profit. Hence, things will be done just as American imperialism and its partners have done for a long period with the Arab oil-producing countries and OPEC...

The consequences of the economic crisis, hence, the energy crisis, too, are making themselves felt greatly in the political and economic events in our neighbouring countries, too. They may also have an indirect influence on our country if we lower our vigilance. In these conditions we must continue principled policy we have followed hitherto, must continue to develop reciprocal trade with the capitalist and revisionist states, with the exception of imperialist USA, the social-imperialist Soviet Union and some countries where fascists and racists are ruling. We must try to ensure that these exchanges are of mutual benefit, without making any political or ideological concessions to those states, but on the contrary combatting them consistently in these two decisive and cardinal directions. On the other hand, our economic and cul-

tural policy must be an honest, principled policy and assist the peoples and proletariat of all those countries with which we conduct trade so that they really see that a small country can live free, independent and sovereign without accepting credits from anyone, without accepting the aid of the Great Powers, but advancing and building socialist society relying on its own toil, its own strength, the strength of the Party and its ideology. We are a small state, a state without great economic power, a state for which difficulties can be created in the directions I pointed out above, but our socialist state is unique and impregnable. This is what our Party has made it, because it has known how to exploit the major contradictions which exist among various capitalist and revisionist states, this is what the dictatorship of the proletariat has made it. Hence, it is essential that we follow the development of situations in international life step by step and are able to explain the roots of and the reasons for those changes, contradictions and attacks so that we are never trapped by them, never pursue a pragmatic policy, but on every occasion take prudent steps in line with a saying of our people, "Measure seven times and cut once"! This means, we must be prudent and vigilant...

Nevertheless this does not mean that we must sit with folded arms, but on the contrary, we must always be on the offensive...

POGRADEC, MONDAY
JULY 30, 1979

HUA GUOFENG BEGS AYATOLLAH KHOMEINI'S PARDON

According to a report of the Reuter agency, dated July 28, Hua Guofeng has begged Ayatollah Khomeini's pardon over the visit he paid to the Shah last year. It is known that prior to the advent of Hua Guofeng to power, the princesses of Iran, the sisters of the Shah, visited the China of Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai and their visit was returned by Li Xiannian and other main Chinese leaders who went to Iran. At that time Beijing Radio gave great publicity to the close friendship between the Shah and his wife and Mao and Zhou. This, of course, did not surprise us Albanians who had carefully observed China's stands, but it made us indignant. The Chinese considered it a great honour and a major policy matter to maintain "sincere" and friendly relations with the Shah of Iran.

However, scandal followed scandal. With the advent of Hua Guofeng to power, this friendship was so augmented that when that strutting Chinese without a brain in his head on Tito's advice, stopped off in Tehran, after his visit to Romania and Yugoslavia. He stayed there three whole days, ate, drank and held intimate talks with the Shah, while hundreds of demonstrators, who were seeking to overthrow Mohammed Riza Pahlavi, the Shah of Iran, were being shot down in the streets of Tehran. Hence, **Hua Guofeng, the chairman of**

"socialist" China, held intimate talks in the palace of the Shahanshah, while SAVAK was slaughtering Iranian patriots and people en masse. However, the Shah fell and Khomeini came to power. What was China to do? Of course, it would eat its words and kiss Khomeini's hand.

It means nothing to the Chinese to commit *a volte face*, they feel no shame about this, are not worried that today they are with the Shah or Pinochet and tomorrow are with the Ayatollah and a new Allende. Thus, they were bound to beg Ayatollah Khomeini's pardon. In the time of the Shah and the power of SAVAK, the Chinese were able to organize their own agency there which collaborated closely with the CIA. Now these partisans of China cannot be left without support, but if you do not support Ayatollah Khomeini you cannot ensure the existence of your agency in Iran. So China is manoeuvring in this direction, too. According to the Reuter agency, Agha Shahi, the Pakistani presidential adviser who is in Iran on a visit, handed over a message from Chairman Hua Guofeng, in which the latter begged the pardon of Ayatollah Khomeini for the visit he paid to Iran during the regime of the expelled Shah, saying, "I express my sincere feelings for the Islamic Republic of Iran." According to the Reuter agency, the Chinese leader tried to justify his meeting with the Shah of Iran to Ayatollah Khomeini by saying that he had stopped off in Iran on his return from Yugoslavia to rest after the long trip he had made. After this, we are told, the Iranian state television service pointed out that Ayatollah Khomeini had accepted the Chinese Chairman's apology and stressed that "our country

wants to have friendly relations with the Islamic and non-Islamic countries, even though his (Hua Guofeng's) visit was made at a time when the youth of Iran were being drowned in blood. We and the Iranian people will excuse him for this." Amen!

Hence, Chairman Hua is fixing up his connections with the leaders of Iran, with the Islamic countries, with Pakistan and with the Americans. It is self-evident that **China is serving as a vanguard of American imperialism and the CIA in Iran.** It was not accidental that Hua Guofeng, the leader of a big country, came to support the Shah against the people in revolt precisely in his last days. **It is of no importance to the Chinese whether you are a Shia or a Sunni, a Buddhist or a Muslim, a Catholic or a Protestant.** They are all the same to the Chinese, all "cats" are the same so long as they catch "mice." It is unimportant whether the "cat" is black or white, it is a "cat" for China. Therefore, there is no end to the kowtowing of the Chinese. It is accompanied by incessant smiles from both sides. Thus, whoever wants to please the Chinese will have to visit the dentist after meetings and talks with them to get his jaws repaired, because they will certainly be tired from the false smiles at the Chinese. For our part, we did not smile back at the Chinese trickery, but on the contrary, cut their smiles short with a sharp slap in the face.

MONDAY
SEPTEMBER 17, 1979

WE AIM TO EXTEND OUR FRIENDSHIP WITH THE ARAB PEOPLES

Today I summoned to my office the Minister of Trade who is going to Iraq and Turkey at the head of our trade delegation.

I recommended that he should tell the Iraqi functionaries that we are a small country and we are building our economy with our own forces, therefore, we do not have as many possibilities as they, nevertheless, we want to have mutually beneficial commercial exchanges with them. However, our main aim is not simply trade; through our commercial relations we must create conditions for the extension of our friendship with the Iraqi people and the other Arab peoples.

In general, the Iraqi people and all the other Arab peoples nurture sympathy for the people and policy of our country, which they have seen more clearly in the stern and consistent struggle of the Albanian Party and state against imperialism and revisionism. I told the Minister: You will find this opinion there among the masses, regardless of who is in power. Even in the leadership, however, there may be people who will speak well of us and, of course, you, too, must speak well about Iraq, its people and the other Arab peoples. This is more important than the trade agreements which may be concluded. Therefore, I instructed him that he

should operate in a complex way, so that we do not remain solely within the limits of commercial agreements but, by making use of these, find the ways and means to express to the people whom he has occasion to meet, our respect for the Arab peoples, to speak about the ancient traditions of friendship between our peoples, etc.

Amongst other things they should also be told that the group of Arab states has a common enemy, Israel, and all those who collaborate with it. It should be pointed out to them that we support them with all our might in their struggle against Israel and will continue to do so because Israel is our common enemy, a collaborator and instrument of the American imperialists.

As to the question of the Kurds, which is an acute problem in Iraq, it should be made clear to the Iraqis that Albania never interferes in the internal affairs of others, that it is for the unity of the state of Iraq and against the intrigues and intervention of the imperialist and revisionist powers in the internal affairs of that country.

THURSDAY
DECEMBER 27, 1979

HANDS OFF IRAN!

Theses for an article

I gave the theses for another article[1] about Iran. This article, which is the third or fourth we have written about events in that country, must have the defence of Iran from the threats of Americans as its object. In other words, in this article we must express our opinion on this problem.

For the content of the article we must take the cue from Carter's statements and the actions of American imperialism which has decided to impose a complete economic blockade on Iran. Already it has frozen the Iranian assets, both those of the Iranian state and the billions stolen by the Shah, in the American banks and their subsidiaries. Hence, American imperialism is threatening Iran initially with cold war in order to turn it into hot war later. It is self-evident why American imperialism is doing this, because it is receiving heavy blows from the people of Iran and suffering defeat in everything it undertakes. American imperialism will suffer other defeats if it does not abandon its threats and predatory war. However, American imperialism cannot fail to defend its "empire." This means that it will go on trying to keep control of Iran, that is, of the oil of that country. Hence, it

[1] Published in the newspaper "Zëri i popullit" on December 30, 1979 under the title "Hands off Iran!"

defends the plunder of the Iranian people and defends the executioner of the Iranian people, Shah Pahlavi, who is an agent of American imperialism and at the same time the bloodstained murderer of his own people.

The Iranian people have risen against American imperialism and are waging a just, merciless fight against it. Hence, the fight of the Iranian people is on a correct course and must be supported, while the war which American imperialism is preparing is a predatory war and must be condemned. These things which I pointed out should serve as a background for the article, while we must emphasize that all the other imperialists and the Western capitalist countries and likewise their satellites, like Tito, Deng Xiaoping and company, support American imperialism in its activity, openly or secretly, to a greater or lesser extent; even the Soviet Union gives it direct or indirect support.

In fact, however, the Soviet Union and the United States of America are struggling to divide up this region into their spheres of influence. Hitherto, Iran has been in the American sphere, while at the present juncture Soviet social-imperialism is trying to take the place of the Americans. On the one hand, it is doing this through secret pressures and open threats, allegedly to defend the independence of Iran and, on the other hand, seeing the threatening situation which American imperialism is creating, it is assembling armed forces in Soviet Azerbaijan, causing disturbances through its secret agency inside Iranian Azerbaijan and Kurdistan, and so on.

Last evening the American Department of State

and news agencies reported that the Soviets had landed about 50,000 troops and a number of tanks in Afghanistan, had carried out a coup d'état against the prime minister, Afizullah Amin, who posed as pro-Soviet and, as is known, likewise had come to power through a coup after overthrowing and killing Taraki, who likewise was pro-Soviet. Apparently both the Soviets and the Americans are each playing their own game in this region. In the final account all these things are to the detriment of Iran, where the superpowers are trying to achieve their expansionist aims.

It is clear that the acts of plunder, secret or open, of American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism in this region, the pressure on Iran, the direct occupation of Afghanistan, are part of the coordinated imperialist plots against Iran, the countries of the Persian Gulf, and of their aims to quell the uprisings in the Middle East, that is, in the Arab countries.

In this article we must stress that the struggle of the Iranian people is a liberation struggle against feudalism and imperialism. Therefore, for their own good, the Iranian people should be united against the main enemies that threaten them, American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism. We can also mention Khomeini and should say that we are not in agreement with his Islamic idealist philosophy, but we are in agreement with his political stands and his anti-imperialist and anti-American struggle and support him in this struggle.

Then we must say that later, after the independence of Iran has been consolidated and the danger

which threatens it from American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism has been warded off, the Iranian people should fight for democratic rights, land, bread and their freedom.

We must point out that the activities of the Americans will cause dangerous disturbances which may lead to world war. Ayatollah Khomeini has declared that the United States of America wants to blockade Iran, a thing that would mean war between them and that this war will be turned into a bloody world war. Imam Khomeini is right, because if American imperialism attacks Iran, it should be borne in mind that the whole of the Middle East, the whole oil zone, will catch fire and in this war the peoples of those countries cannot fail to defend the Iranian people who are of one faith with them, regardless of the contradictions which the governments of the countries of this region might have amongst themselves. Hence, a war between the Americans and the Iranians in the Middle East will disturb the existing unstable situation built up through intrigues, and the Soviet Union, Britain, France and other countries will be involved in the conflict.

Thus, in case of war, the United States of America will be confronting not only the people of Iran, but also the other peoples of the Persian Gulf and the peoples of the Middle East in general. On the other hand, the Americans' military actions or blockades will certainly encounter opposition from the partners and allies of the United States of America: Japan, Britain, France, Italy and West Germany, which will suffer economic damage because their oil supplies will be cut off. Those coun-

tries cannot exist without oil, are unable to wage war without it. Not even the United States of America could continue a war for long without the oil of the Middle East. If the United States of America turns the cold war against Iran into a hot war it will lose the oil.

We must point out that in Iran the American and the other imperialists have their longstanding secret agencies which will operate against the anti-imperialist popular uprising there and against the students. Therefore, the Iranian people, the working class, the students and peasants must be vigilant and stand together in a block against the external and internal enemies who manoeuvre in a thousand open and secret ways, through pseudo-democratic movements or through plots.

All these plots and pseudo-democratic movements are linked with the foreign imperialists who want to bring back the old regime, their tool and old agent, the Shah, or his men, who will serve them best and guarantee them the oil of Iran.

We must point out that the so-called diplomatic staff of the American embassy held prisoner are nothing but secret agents. Today American diplomacy, Soviet diplomacy or the diplomacy of many other states no longer have the genuine character of a diplomacy and do not apply those principles which are expressed when the ambassadors of those countries present their letters of credentials to the states to which they are accredited; in fact, all of them are agents of the CIA, the FBI, the KGB, etc., and in the countries to which they are accredited they organize networks of spies and conspirators against the freedom, democracy and inde-

pendence of the peoples of those countries.

Such are the American diplomats who back the Shah and his minions in order to gain the fabulous wealth of Iran.

Ayatollah Khomeini, the students and the Iranian people have the right to hand these people over to the courts to render account for the diversionist activity they have carried out in collaboration with the Shah of Iran.

The bourgeois world describes this just action of the Iranian people as a violation of the international norms which govern the status of diplomats and diplomatic relations, but they forget to say that, in the first place, these diplomats violated the regulations and norms referred to, to the detriment of the Iranian people. Even the Pope, one of the biggest capitalists of the world, threatened Iran from a window in the Vatican, that institution which has spread its sinister spider's web over the whole world, and "prayed" that Khomeini would release the hostages. However, the Pope of the Vatican never raised his voice when the Americans, through the CIA and the ambassador Henderson, drove tanks over the people of Tehran who overthrew the Shah in the time of Mossadeq.

Of course, the Polish Pope, Wojtyla is in complete agreement with the Polish-American Brzezinski, chief of the National Security Council of the United States of America and the main architect in the preparation of the cold and hot war against Iran.

As we see, however, the people of Iran, the students and Ayatollah Khomeini are taking a brave and just stand, not only against the American im-

perialist aggressors, but also against all their lackeys who, some under the gown of the priest and some dressed as diplomats and with "letters of recommendation" from their heads of state, are going to Iran to exert pressure in the form of advice or pleas to Ayatollah Khomeini to release the hostages, because he is allegedly violating the diplomatic rights established by the United Nations Organization and the traditions of diplomacy. But it is quite clear and it should be realized that none of these individuals takes the slightest account of the supreme interests of the people of Iran and all the other peoples oppressed by American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and world capitalism, but all of them have their own interests, the interests of their cliques who are united with these imperialists in the struggle against the people of Iran and other peoples.

All these individuals who are demanding that Iran take incorrect decisions favourable to the Americans and disadvantageous to its own national interests, have disguised themselves under the mask of "friendship" with Iran, under the mask of alleged democracy and good behaviour. But there is no good behaviour towards the enemies of the peoples, there can be no justice in diplomatic attitudes, when these are violated by others, by the mightiest or even by the cunning little ones. Imperialism, its tools and actions, must be fought tooth and nail.

THURSDAY
JANUARY 3, 1980

WE SUPPORT THE STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLE OF AFGHANISTAN AGAINST THE SOVIET INVADERS

We must condemn and denounce the military aggression of the Soviet Union against the people of Afghanistan. We must publish an article[1] about this in which we point out that the Soviet social-imperialists and their agents in Afghanistan exploited the overthrow, first of all, of King Mohammed Zahir Shah and then of Prince Daoud as well as the desire for liberation of the Afghan people who suffered the oppression of the absolute monarchy and its foreign friends, first of all the Soviets, who financed and kept it in power.

In this article we should speak well and make a positive evaluation of the resistance movement against the Soviet invaders, which is spreading in Afghanistan. This is a just struggle of the Afghan people and cannot be suppressed. The people of that country have long-standing traditions in the fight against foreign invaders. They taught the armies of the British imperialist invaders a lesson they won't forget.

In this instance we must express the solidarity of our people with the Afghan people who are fighting in the mountains and the cities against the

[1] The article was published in the newspaper "Zëri i popullit," January 5, 1980, under the title "Aggressors Get Out of Afghanistan!"

revisionist invaders, the Soviet social-imperialists and their tools.

Our article will serve to make things clear to the peoples, to make them aware of the military aggression of the revisionist Soviet Union against Afghanistan and the aims of the Soviet social-imperialists in this region of the world and of the justice of the struggle of the Afghan people against the foreign invaders.

SATURDAY
JANUARY 5, 1980

THE SOVIET MILITARY AGGRESSION IN AFGHANISTAN AND AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

Today the American president, Carter, announced that as a sign of disapproval of the military invasion of Afghanistan, the United States would not fulfil the contract for the sale of 17 million tons of wheat to the Soviet Union, that is, he announced that this contract was suspended. Carter also announced that he is postponing the approval of the SALT-2 agreement by the Senate, that he will supply arms to Pakistan, etc.

With these activities the United States of America is trying to raise its own morale and that of its allies. We shall see what counter-measures the Soviet Union will take, but it has certainly taken such things into account. Both Canada and Australia supply wheat to the Soviets.

THE EVENTS WHICH ARE TAKING PLACE IN THE MUSLIM COUNTRIES MUST BE SEEN IN THE LIGHT OF DIALECTICAL AND HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

The international situation is very tense at present. In many regions of the world and mainly in the large zone of the oil-producing countries, especially those of Asia, the struggle between the two imperialist superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, not excluding imperialist China and the other capitalist powers, over the division and re-division of markets and spheres of influence, as they try to elbow one another out, has reached new, major proportions just as our Party correctly predicted long ago. Their pressures and plots are accompanied with diplomatic efforts and a propaganda clamour about "agreements and compromises" allegedly to preserve the peace and the balance of power. In fact, as recent events have shown, we see that agreements and compromises are still the basic principle of their policy towards each other regardless of their very acute rivalry. One day, however, the rivalry between them may reach such a point that they can no longer overcome it and settle matters except through military confrontation. The consequences of such a confrontation will descend upon the peoples, just as has occurred in previous imperialist wars.

The most recent result of this rivalry is the military aggression of the Soviet social-imperialists against Afghanistan, the occupation of that country through armed force by one of the imperialist superpowers. The fact is that what is now being done openly by the Soviets through their armed forces against the sovereignty of the Afghan people had long been prepared by the Soviet social-imperialist chauvinist politicians and military leaders and their Afghan agents. In order to arrive at the present situation, both the former and the latter exploited the overthrow, first of King Mohammed Zahir Shah in 1973 and, later, of Prince Daoud in 1978. They also exploited for their evil aims the desire of the Afghan people for social liberation from the oppression they suffered under the absolute monarchy and its foreign friends, first of all, the Soviets, who financed the monarchy and kept it in power. So, irrespective of the "alliance" which they had with the king of Afghanistan, the Soviet social-imperialists worked and acted for his overthrow. In order to disguise their imperialist aims, at first they brought their men, allegedly with more progressive sentiments, to power. Later, these, too, were changed one after the other, through actions in which blood was shed, by means of putsches and tanks, and Noor Mohammed Taraki and Hafizullah Amin were sent to the slaughter.

Nevertheless, no foreign occupier, however powerful and heavily armed, can keep the people, against whom aggression has been committed, subdued forever. In every country which is invaded the people, apart from anti-national and anti-popular cliques of agents, receive the foreign aggressors

with hatred and resistance, sporadic at first and later with more organized revolts which gradually turn into popular uprisings and liberation wars. We are seeing the proof of this in Afghanistan, where the people have risen and are fighting fiercely in the cities, villages and mountains against the Soviet army of occupation. This war of the Afghan people enjoys the support and sympathy of freedom-loving peoples and revolutionary forces throughout the world. Our people, too, support it with all their might. The war of the Afghan people against the Soviet social-imperialists is a just war, and therefore it will triumph.

The current war of the Afghan people against the Soviet military aggression and the anti-feudal, anti-imperialist, anti-American uprising of the Iranian people must make us reflect somewhat more profoundly, from the political, theoretical and ideological aspects, about another major problem which, in the existing situation of complicated developments in the world, is becoming ever more prominent: the popular uprisings of "Islamic inspiration," as the bourgeoisie and the revisionists like to describe these movements, simply because the Muslim peoples of the Arab and other countries have placed themselves in the vanguard of the liberation movement. This is a fact, an objective reality. There are insurrectionary movements in those countries. If we were to examine and judge these movements and uprisings of Muslim peoples in an over-simplified and very superficial way as movements simply of an Islamic character, without probing deeply into the true reasons which impel the broad masses of the peoples to advance, we

could fall in the positions of the revisionists and imperialists, whose assessments of these movements are denigrating and conceal ambitions to enslave the peoples.

We Marxist-Leninists always understand clearly that religion is opium for the people. In no instance do we alter our view on this and we must not fall into the errors of "religious socialism," etc. The Muslim religion is no different in this regard. Nevertheless, we see that at present the broad masses of the Muslim peoples in the Arab and other countries have risen or are rising in struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism for their national and social liberation. These peoples, who were deliberately left in ignorance in the past and remain backward in their world outlook to this day, are now becoming aware of the great oppression and savage exploitation which were imposed on them by the old colonizers and which the new colonizers and the internal feudal-bourgeois capitalist cliques continue to impose on them. They are coming to understand the political-economic reasons for their oppression and, irrespective that they are Muslims and have been left in backwardness, they are displaying great vitality and making an important contribution to the anti-imperialist bourgeois-democratic revolution which opens the way to the proletarian revolution. Those who have adopted and exploited the Muslim religion to exert social oppression over these peoples and to exploit them in the most ferocious ways are the anti-popular oppressive regimes and the reactionary clergy. They have protected and continue to protect their bloodthirsty power through the weapons and sup-

port which they have received from abroad, that is, from the imperialist powers, the neo-colonialist robbers, as well as through inciting and developing religious fanaticism. Thus, the development of events is more and more confirming the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the internal enemies collaborate closely with the external enemies to suppress their own peoples and that they use religion as a weapon to oppress the peoples and keep them in darkness.

The events taking place before our eyes show that the Muslim Arab peoples are fighters. Their anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist and anti-feudal struggles and uprisings are accompanied with and result in armed clashes. These struggles and uprisings have their source in the savage oppression which is imposed on these peoples and in their freedom-loving and progressive sentiments. If you are not progressive and freedom-loving you cannot rise in struggle for freedom and national independence against the twofold internal and external oppression.

Another social cause and powerful impulse to anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist and anti-feudal uprisings is the grave economic situation of these peoples, the burden of hunger and suffering under which they live. Hence, we cannot fail to take into account their political awakening and. to some extent, also their social awakening.

Looking at the whole struggle of the peoples of Muslim belief, we notice that there are marked differences in its level of development: there are periods when it mounts, but also periods of decline or stagnation, the latter caused by various factors and

especially, by the pseudo-progressive bourgeoisie which places itself at the head of these peoples.

In Morocco, for example, there has been some movement, but the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist movement of the people of that country is not at the same height as that of other countries. On the contrary, the monarchy and feudalism dominate the Moroccan people, through violence and liberal pseudo-reforms, as well as by exploiting their religious sentiments.

In Algeria the people waged the national liberation war against the French colonialists and, although it was not led by a Marxist-Leninist party but by the national bourgeoisie, the war for national liberation ended with the withdrawal of the foreign occupiers, but it was carried no further...

In Tunisia the people seem to be asleep and very apathetic, are showing little sign of awakening, but they are not all that backward. Recently there was talk about a trade-union movement there and the general secretary of the trade-unions was arrested, but nothing more happened.

In 1952 there was a revolt in Egypt, too. The monarchy was overthrown without bloodshed. King Farouk was expelled from Egypt by a group of officers. Those who removed him from the throne accompanied him to Alexandria, gave him money, put him on board a ship and helped him to get away and save his neck. In other words, they told the monarch he had better leave of his own accord and save his skin, because he could no longer stay in the country, he no longer had any basis there. Thus, the group of officers, headed by Nasser, Naguib and Sadat, carried out what you might

call a bloodless military coup against an utterly degenerate monarchy and seized power. What was this group of Egyptian officers that carried out the putsch and what did they represent? These officers were of the bourgeoisie, its representatives, they were anti-British, but amongst them there were also pro-Hitlerites. As I have mentioned, Anwar el-Sadat himself declares he collaborated with the "Desert Wolf," the Nazi field-marshal Rommel.

This event, that is, the removal of Farouk from the throne, was exaggerated to the point of being called a "revolution." However, the Egyptian people, the working masses of that country, gained nothing from this whole affair. Virtually no reform to the benefit of the people was carried out. The so-called agrarian reform ended up in favour of the feudals and wealthy landowners. Under the disguise of the unity of Arab peoples the newcomers to power tried to bring about the "unification" of Egypt with Syria. However, every effort in this direction was in vain because in Syria, too, at this time the capitalist bourgeoisie in the leadership of the state had simply changed their horses and their patron. The imperialist Soviet Union had replaced France. It sabotaged this baseless "unification" and established itself firmly in that country.

As is known, in 1969 there was a revolt in Libya, too; the dynasty of King Idris was overthrown and a group of young officers, headed by Qaddafi who poses as anti-imperialist, came to power. We can describe this revolt, this movement, as progressive at first, but later it lost its impact and at the moment it has fallen into stagnation. Qaddafi who came to power and claims to be the head of

Islam, exploited the Muslim religion to present Libya as a "progressive" country and even called it "socialist," but in reality the great oil wealth of the country is being exploited for very dubious adventurous and sinister aims. Of course, for purposes of demagogy and because the income from the sale of oil is truly colossal, some changes have been made in the life of the people in the cities, while the poverty-stricken nomads of the desert remain a grave social problem. As we know, Qaddafi was a disciple of Nasser's in politics, ideology and religious belief, as well as in his aims.

A somewhat more advanced and more revolutionary uprising against the monarchy took place in Baghdad, the capital of Iraq, in 1958. It ended with the killing of King Faisal and his prime minister, Nuri Said. The "communists" took power there together with General Kassem, a representative of the liberal officers. Only five years later, however, in 1963, there was a coup d'état and Kassem was executed. He was replaced by another officer, Colonel Aref. In 1968 General Al-Bakr came to the head of the state and the "Baath" Party, a party of the reactionary feudal and comprador bourgeoisie, returned to power.

The events which are occurring in Iran and Afghanistan are a positive example for the peoples of neighbouring states, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, the Emirates of the Persian Gulf, Syria, Egypt and many others, but they also constitute a great danger to the ruling cliques of some countries in this region. Hence, the whole Arab world is in ferment, in evolution.

The echo of this anti-feudal, anti-imperialist up-

rising of the Iranian people which is shaking the economic foundations of imperialism and its ambitions for world hegemony extends as far as Indonesia, but there the movement is weaker than in the countries of Central Asia, the Near and Middle East or even North Africa, where the Islamic religion is more compact and the assets are greater. In those regions, for instance in Iran, there is a progressive awakening of the masses, which for the moment is led generally by religious elements who know how to exploit the sentiments of these peoples for freedom and against oppressive imperialism, the monarchist leaders and rapacious feudal cliques of robbers and murderers, etc., etc. Therefore, we must make a Marxist-Leninist analysis of this situation. We cannot accept the tales that the bourgeois-revisionist propaganda, American imperialism and world capitalism are spreading that Ayatollah Khomeini or this one or that in Iran are people who do not understand politics or are just as backward as Imam Ali, Imam Hassan and Imam Hussein were. This is not true. On the contrary, the facts show that people like Khomeini know how to make proper use of the existing movement of these peoples, which, in essence and in fact, is a progressive bourgeois-democratic and anti-imperialist movement.

Employing various ways and means, the different imperialists and social-imperialists are trying to present themselves as supporters of these movements and win them over for their own aims. At present, however, these movements are in their disfavour, are against them. So true is this that the Soviet social-imperialists were obliged to send their

tank regiments and tens of thousands of Soviet soldiers into Afghanistan, in other words, to commit an open fascist aggression against an independent country, in order to place and keep in power their local puppets who were incapable of retaining power without the aid of the bayonets and tanks of the Soviet army, the armed forces of the Soviet Union.

Obviously, this event, this Soviet armed occupation of Afghanistan, was bound to have repercussions and cause concern in international public opinion, to arouse great anger and indignation among the freedom-loving peoples and progressive forces and, from the strategic standpoint, to provoke the anger of their rivals for hegemony, especially of the United States of America. In fact we see that these days the American president, Carter, seems to want to make a move, apparently to create difficulties for the Soviet Union and to strengthen his own positions which are growing steadily weaker, wants to take measures to prevent a possible Soviet invasion of Pakistan, or rather, to stop the Soviet social-imperialists from exploiting the anti-imperialist revolutionary sentiments of the Muslim people of Pakistan for their own ends. The Pakistani people nurture sympathy for the anti-imperialist movement of their Iranian neighbours, and what is occurring in Iran could occur there, too. Precisely to forestall this eventuality, the United States of America, through President Carter, has proposed to the Pakistani government to dispatch 50,000 soldiers to Pakistan and to increase the supplies of arms, allegedly to cope with the Soviet danger. The United States of America

sent its Secretary of Defence to China to concretize and activate the Sino-American alliance. During this visit both sides expressed their concern over the extension of the Soviet social-imperialist expansion in this region and, in connection with this, their determination to defend their own and each other's imperialist interests. The United States of America promised China the most sophisticated modern armaments.

Is there really a Soviet threat to Pakistan? Yes, there is. However, in Pakistan the anger against Zia-ul-Haq, accompanied by sympathy for Khomeini, might erupt even without the intervention of the Soviets. In order to escape the Soviet pressure and the uprising of the Pakistani people, Zia-ul-Haq himself might link up with the Soviets and thus enable them to justify their intervention in Pakistan. That is why the United States of America is revising its military agreements with Pakistan.

For his part, Carter is trying to preserve the balance, because an intervention of the Soviet Union in Pakistan constitutes a threat to American imperialism in that region of the world. Carter must have influence in Pakistan, also, because that country has a "defence treaty" with the United States of America. Apart from this, in the new situation which has been created in these times in Central Asia, Carter also sees other dangers, such as the return to power of Indira Gandhi who is pursuing her pro-Soviet policy. If the Soviets are able to strengthen their position in India, which is in conflict with Pakistan, the latter country might be more vulnerable from the Soviet side, in other words, the penetration of Soviet influence there

would be made easier and would increase. That is why the American imperialists want to forestall the eventuality of a military intervention or the build-up of the Soviet influence in Pakistan. On the other hand, the United States of America is very concerned about the possibility of Soviet pressure on Iran under the pretext of aid against the threats made to that country by American imperialism.

It is clear that the peoples of this region are Muslims and when we say this we have in mind the fact that the majority of them are believers, but their belief is relative and does not predominate over politics. There are also progressive people there who believe in and respect the Quran and religion more as a custom and tradition. When we speak about the overwhelming majority, we have in mind that part of the people to whom the Muslim religion has been presented as a liberal progressive religion which serves the interests of the people and to whom everything preached in its name "is for the good of the people," because "to wash, to pray and to fast is for the benefit of the health, the physical strengthening and spiritual satisfaction of man," etc., etc. In other words, people are told that the rites of this religion are "useful" not only for this life but also for the "next life," after death. This is preached openly. However, the poverty and oppression, schooling and a certain political development have shaken the foundations of this belief.

In general, from all these events and developments, we see that the imperialists and the social-imperialists are in difficulties in these regions of the world. It is understandable that their puppets, likewise, are in difficulties. Both for the former and

for the latter it is the progressive, anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist and anti-feudal revolutionary movement of the popular masses of the Muslim Arab peoples, whether Shia or Sunni, that is the cause of these great difficulties. The whole situation in this region is positive, good, and indicates a revolutionary situation and a major movement of these peoples. At the same time, though, we see efforts made by the enemies of these peoples to restrain this movement or to alter its direction and intensity.

Hence, we must regard these situations, these movements and uprisings of these peoples as revolutionary social movements, irrespective that at first sight they have a religious character or that believers or non-believers take part in them, because they are fighting against foreign imperialism and neo-colonialism or the local monarchies and oppressive feudalism. History gives us many positive examples in this direction when broad revolutionary movements of the popular masses have had a religious character outwardly. Among them we can list the Babist movements in Iran 1848-1851; the Wahabi movement in India which preceded the great popular uprising against the British colonizers in the years 1857-1859; the peasant movements at the time of the Reformation in the 16th century which swept most of the countries of Europe and especially Germany. The Reformation itself, although dressed in a religious cloak, represented a broad socio-political movement against the feudal system and the Catholic Church which defended that system.

When the vital interests, the freedom and inde-

pendence of a people are violated, they rise in struggle against any aggressor, even though that aggressor may be of the same religion. This is what occurred, for example, in North Yemen in 1962 when Nasser sent the Egyptian army allegedly to aid that country. Later he was compelled to remove the troops he had sent to Yemen, because a stern conflict began between the people of that country and the Egyptian army, irrespective that both sides professed the one religion.

In South Yemen, with a population of Muslim believers, there was a popular revolutionary movement against British imperialism which owned the port of Aden. Britain would never have left the port of Aden voluntarily, because it constitutes a very important strategic key to the Indian Ocean and the entrance to the Red Sea, but it was the anti-imperialist struggle of the people of Yemen that compelled it to clear out, because remaining there became impossible. After this, in 1970 a "popular democratic" regime which gradually came under the influence of the Soviet social-imperialists, was formed in South Yemen. The revolutionary movement against Soviet social-imperialism is bound to flare up there, if not today certainly in the near future.

Throughout the Principality of Oman there is an anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist revolutionary movement which is also opposed to the ruling Sultan. A similar situation will develop in Ethiopia, Somalia, the countries of the Persian Gulf, etc.

The peoples of the countries of this region are all religious, believe in the Quran and Mohammed, and link the question of the struggle against impe-

rialist oppression with their religion. This is a reality. Obviously, however, we cannot come to the conclusion that it is religion which is causing these revolts and this revolutionary awakening. By no means. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the fact that these peoples believe in the Muslim religion and, at the same time, are fighting heroically for their national and social liberation against imperialism of every hue.

Before Liberation there were people who professed the Muslim religion in Albania, but there was no fanaticism. In the Arab or Muslim countries of Central Asia, too, the classical fanaticism of the past cannot exist, especially today. Such fanaticism can exist neither among the Muslims nor among the Catholics, the Calvinists and other schisms of Christianity. We must not forget the epoch in which we are living. We cannot fail to bear in mind the great development of science today, the growth and strengthening of the revolutionary proletariat and the spread of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. Today the reactionary religious leaders, lackeys of the feudal order and oppressive monarchies linked with them, who want to keep the people in ignorance and bondage and to combat their liberation movements, incite fanaticism in its classical sense in those countries.

In regard to Khomeini, he is a religious leader, a dedicated believer and an idealist philosopher. He may even be a fanatic, but we see that, at the same time, he is in accord and united with the revolutionary spirit of the Iranian people. Khomeini has taken the side of the opponents of the monarchy. The imperialist bourgeoisie, the supporters of

the Pahlavi monarchy and other reactionary forces in the world say that he wants to become a monarch himself. Let them say this, but the fact is that the anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist and anti-feudal liberation movement in Iran is in the ascendancy and Khomeini still maintains a good stand in regard to this movement.

What is occurring in Iran might occur also in Pakistan or in the countries of the Arabian Peninsula, it may spark off a revolutionary situation in some other neighbouring country and even in the Soviet Union itself, because social-imperialism and revisionism carry national oppression everywhere and, as a consequence, arouse the national liberation sentiments of the peoples. Socialism and the Marxist-Leninist theory alone provide a just solution to the national question. Today the national rights of nations and peoples have been violated and trampled underfoot in the Soviet Union and wherever American imperialism and international capitalism rule. There is great oppression there, logically, therefore, there will certainly be movement.

We must examine and analyse the present events in Iran as they take place and draw conclusions from them on the basis of the teachings of our Marxist-Leninist theory. In the vanguard of the active forces in the uprising against imperialism and the monarchy in that country, are the religious zealots, the student youth, the workers and intellectuals. So, neither the proletariat nor a genuine Marxist-Leninist party is in the leadership of the movement. On this question we must also bear in mind the fact that we do not really know the strength and

the basis of the different political currents in that movement. We know from experience that in our country, too, the working class was not developed, nevertheless, since the objective and subjective factors existed in the conditions of the occupation and the National Liberation War, the Party led the people to victory by basing itself on Marxism-Leninism, which means it put the working class and its vanguard, in other words itself, in the leadership. This is not the case in Iran. In that country there is a Marxist-Leninist party, the Workers and Peasants' Communist Party of Iran, a young party which, has just been formed, but it is still small, untempered, not linked with the working class and the masses, etc., while the revisionist "Tudeh" Party has existed legally and illegally, is now legal again, but is a tool of the Soviet Union. Hiding behind Marxist-Leninist slogans, this party is sabotaging the anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle of the Iranian people and trying to bring Iran into the sphere of influence and under the thraldom of the Soviet Union. That is why the Muslim people of Iran, who have risen in revolution, are not acquainted with Marxism-Leninism either as a theory or a revolutionary practice. The students who are studying at Iran's Muslim universities with great traditions and of the Shia Muslim sect, are both believers and non-believers in religion. In regard to the secular progressive elements there are those who believe in and are fighting for a liberal bourgeois-democratic state, those who believe in a "progressive" capitalist but anti-communist society, and those who still think that the Soviet Union is a socialist country which represents and applies

Leninism. This is one of the reasons that genuine Marxism-Leninism has still not won acceptance in Iran, therefore the people there are fighting for liberation from the yoke of American imperialism and from Soviet influence, but under the banner of Islam. This means that the Shia Muslim clergy are in the leadership, in the vanguard of the uprising, but we have no illusions and know that they are for a bourgeois capitalist regime with religious predominance, hence, a theocratic regime. As to what course the movement against American imperialism and the barbarous comprador monarchy of the Pahlavis will take in the future, this depends mainly on the seething internal forces.

What general definition can be made of these forces?

In the present world situation and at the existing stage of the movement of the peoples for their national and social liberation, the popular revolution in Iran represents a new stage. Regardless of what others do or say, we must document this stage more carefully and make a critical Marxist-Leninist analysis of it.

Iran is a country very rich in oil, hence, has a working class comprised of oil workers and other industrial workers, but also has artisans. Of Iran's 33 million inhabitants about 17 million are in the countryside and work the land. They are poverty-stricken, oppressed and exploited to the limit by the mullahs, the religious institutions, the big-landed bourgeoisie in the service of the Pahlavis, by the wealthy mercantile and money-lending bourgeoisie linked with the monarchy. Of the total population of Iran 99 per cent are of the Muslim

religion and the majority of the Shia sect.

The Pahlavi regime was one of the most barbarous, the most bloodthirsty, the most exploiting, the most corrupt of the modern world. It employed bloodshed and terror to suppress any progressive movement, any even mildly liberal demonstration, any protest or strike of workers or students, and any attempt to develop a small-scale, auxiliary subsistence economy. The savage dictatorship of the Pahlavis was based on the big feudal landowners, the wealthy property-owners that the regime created, the reactionary army and the officer caste which ran it, and on SAVAK, the secret police, which the Shah himself described as "a state within a state." The Pahlavis ruled by means of terror, robbed the people, enriched themselves in scandalous ways, were the personification of moral and political degeneration, were partners with and sold out to British and American and other imperialisms. The Pahlavis had become the most heavily armed gendarmes of the Persian Gulf under the orders of the CIA.

Iran was oppressed, but the people were seething with revolt, although wholesale executions were carried out every day. The ayatollahs who were discontented with the regime began to move. In 1951, Mossadeq, a representative of the bourgeoisie, supported by the mullahs opposed to the Shah, and by the "Tudeh" Party, seized power. In 1953 the Shah was driven out, but his overthrow and departure were not final, because the CIA organized a putsch, overthrew Mossadeq, brought the Shah back to Iran and restored him to the throne. Thus, Iran became the property of the

Americans and the Shah and its oil became their powerful weapon.

It is characteristic of the revolt of the Iranian people that, despite the great terror, it was not quelled, but continued spasmodically, in different forms and in different intensities. This revolutionary process steadily built up in quality and overcame the stage of fear of suppression.

Despite the great terror, in 1977 the opposition to the Shah began to be displayed more forcibly, became more open and active. If we follow these trends opposed to the Shah and his regime separately we shall see that they are to some extent autonomous, but have a common strategy. Thus, we see the opposition of Mossadeq's supporters, the resistance of the religious forces, the actions and demonstrations of the students, the stands of intellectuals, officials, writers, poets and artists against the regime expressed at rallies, in the universities and in other public places, etc., and together with all these currents we also see the self-defence and resistance of the working class and the whole oppressed and exploited people. SAVAK attacked mercilessly, but the suppression and executions only added to the anger of the masses. This resistance turned into a permanent activity.

In the same period we see the re-awakening of the political opposition of Mossadeq's supporters in the National Front. One of the elements of this current was Shapour Bakhtiar, who became prime minister on the eve of the overthrow of Shah Pahlavi. This was the last shot of the Shah and the American imperialists against the Iranian anti-imperialist revolution and Khomeini.

In the course of the development of this political opposition, the "Movement for the Liberation of Iran," the "Iran Party," and the "Socialist League of the National Movement of Iran," broke away. The "Movement for the Liberation of Iran," which was headed by Bazargan, who became prime minister after the departure of the Shah, was closer to Khomeini and the other imams.

We must always bear in mind that neither this political opposition, nor the religious opposition to the Pahlavis was united. Some of those who comprised this opposition were against the so-called agrarian reform, against the right of women to vote, etc. This section, which comprised conservative clergy, was steadily losing its influence amongst the masses, who were moving closer to that part of the clergy who openly fought the dictatorship of the Shah on the basis of the Shia principles of the Muslim religion. One of these was Ayatollah Khomeini, who was imprisoned, tortured, imprisoned again, and sent into exile and his son murdered. This enhanced the influence of the imam among the people, in the "Bazaar" (the main market centre of Tehran), hence, amongst the merchants, and also amongst the workers. In the rising tide of agitation and the great demonstrations against the Shah, the masses demanded the return of the Imam to the homeland. The death of his son and of a political personality, Ali Shariat, in mysterious circumstances led to the emergence of the religious elements in the forefront of the clashes and the whole people united with them, especially in Tabriz on February 18-19, 1977, as well as in Tehran, Qum and other Iranian cities. All this testifies to

the fighting spirit of the people of Iran. As a result the Pahlavi monarchy was quite incapable of resisting the repeated waves of the onslaught of the insurgent people.

Hence, in this climate of progressive insurgency against feudalism, the monarchy and imperialism, the Marxist-Leninists must analyse the various political trends, the orientations of these trends, the alliances and contradictions between them inside Iran and with the capitalist-revisionist world outside that country.

At present we see an active and militant unity of the uprising against American imperialism and the Shah and, to some extent, also against Soviet social-imperialism, and, at the same time, we also see increased vigilance and opposition towards all other capitalist states, though not so open and active as against the Americans. This situation will certainly undergo evolution. We see that the universities in Iran have become centres of fiery manifestations with both political and religious tendencies, and likewise see that the religious opposition and the political opposition are uniting. Thus, despite the contradictions which exist between them, it seems that the supporters of Mossadeq and those of Khomeini are moving closer together. In Tabriz, which has an important working class, apart from the oil workers, we can say that this unity has been brought about. Similar things are taking place at Abadan and the other regions where there are oilfields and refineries.

The Iranian Marxist-Leninists must, in particular, submit the strength and orientations of the working class to a Marxist-Leninist analysis and

then their party must base its activity on this analysis, go among the working class, educate it and clarify it politically and ideologically, while tempering itself together with the working class in this revolutionary class struggle which, far from being ended, has only begun and will certainly assume diverse aspects. The revolutionary activity of the working class and the Marxist-Leninist ideology alone must become the factor deciding the correct directions which this anti-imperialist revolution must take. Certainly, in the present situation in Iran much can and must be gained from the revolutionary force of the Iranian working class, by the progressive elements, and especially by the students and the poor and middle peasantry.

The Marxist-Leninists will be committing a mistake if they do not understand the situation created and do not utilize it in the right way, if they come out as anti-religious fighters and thus damage their anti-imperialist and anti-feudal unity with the followers of Ayatollah Khomeini and the followers of Mossadeq's, Bazargan's or others' anti-imperialist bourgeois-democratic parties and movements.

Although anti-religious in their principles, the Iranian Marxist-Leninists must not for the moment wage a struggle against the religious beliefs of the people who have risen in revolt against oppression and are waging a just struggle politically, but are still unformed ideologically and will have to go through a great school in which they will learn. The Marxist-Leninists must teach the people to assess the events that are taking place in the light of dialectical and historical materialism. However, our world outlook cannot be assimilated easily in iso-

lation from the revolutionary drive of the masses or from the anti-imperialist trends that are trying to remain in the leadership and to manoeuvre to prevent the bourgeois-democratic reforms of the revolution. The Iranian Marxist-Leninists and working class must play a major role in those revolutionary movements, having a clear understanding of the moments they are going through; they must not let the revolution die down. The working class and its true Marxist-Leninist vanguard should have no illusions about the "deep-going" bourgeois-democratic measures and reforms which the Shia clergy or the anti-Shah elements of the old and new national bourgeoisie might carry out. Certainly, if the working class, the poor peasantry and the progressive students, whether believers or non-believers, allow the impetus of the revolution to ebb away, which means that they do not proceed with determination and maturity towards alliances and activities conducive to successive political and socio-economic reforms, then the revolution will stop halfway, the masses will be disillusioned and the exploitation of them will continue in other forms by pseudo-democratic people linked in new alliances with the different imperialists.

These special new revolutionary situations which are developing among the peoples of Islamic religious beliefs must be studied, conclusions must be drawn from them and new forms of struggle, action and alliances must be found. These revolutionary situations are much more advanced than those in Europe and Asia and, to some degree, even Latin America, where the revolutionary movements have assumed a petrified form, linked with and led by

reformist and counter-revolutionary social-democracy and modern revisionism.

For instance, we do not see such revolts of a marked revolutionary political spirit occur in Europe where there is a big and powerful proletariat. For what reasons? For all those reasons which are known and have to do with the grave counter-revolutionary influence and sabotage of social-democracy and modern revisionism. The question is not that there is no exploitation on our continent, and therefore there are no movements. No, here, too, there is exploitation and there are movements, but they are of another nature. They are not "very deep-going, Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movements" which are waiting "for the situation to ripen," etc., as the social-democrats, revisionists and other lackeys of the capitalist bourgeoisie describe them. No, the capitalist bourgeoisie itself and its lackeys do not permit such situations to ripen, do not permit such occurrences as are going on at present in the Arab-Muslim countries, where the revolutionary masses rise in struggle and create difficult situations for imperialism, feudalism and the cosmopolitan capitalist bourgeoisie.

Some claim that the Arab peoples and the peoples of the other Muslim countries are moving, because they are "poor"! Indeed, they are poor. But those who say this must admit that they themselves have become bourgeois and that is why they do not rise against oppression and exploitation, while the truth is that capitalism barbarously oppresses and exploits the peoples everywhere, without exception.

It is claimed, also, that in the countries of Is-

lamic religion, the "masses are backward," therefore, they are easily set in motion. This means that those who support this reasoning have degenerated and are not for revolution, because at a time when capitalism is in decay, honest people must be revolutionary and rise in struggle against capitalism, aiming the weapons they posses against it. Here, in Europe, however, we do not see such a thing. On the contrary, we see the "theory" of adaptation to the existing situation being preached.

Political debates are organized all over the capitalist countries. It has become fashionable for the social-democrats, the Christian-democrats, the revisionists and all sorts of other people in these countries to talk about "revolution" and allegedly revolutionary actions, and each of them tries in his own way to confuse and mislead the working masses with these slogans. The "leftists" scream for "revolutionary measures," but immediately set the limits, "explaining" that "revolutionary measures must not be undertaken everywhere and in all fields," but that only "certain changes must be made," that is, a few crumbs must be thrown to the masses, who are demanding radical revolutionary changes, in order to deceive them and to hinder and sabotage the revolutionary drive of the masses.

We must analyse these situations and phenomena in theoretical articles or in other forms and with other means of our propaganda on the Marxist-Leninist course, with the aim of explaining the essence of the revolt and uprisings of peoples against imperialism, neo-colonialism and local rulers, of explaining the question of the survival of old religious traditions, etc. This does not rule out our

support for liberation movements, because such movements occurred even before the time of Marx, as mentioned above. To wait until religion is first eliminated and carry out the revolution only after this, is not in favour of the revolution or the peoples.

In the situation today, the people who have risen in revolt and believe in religion are no longer at the stage of consciousness of Spartacus, who rose against the Roman Empire, against the slave-owners, but they are seething with revolt against the barbarous oppression and exploitation and policy of imperialism and social-imperialism. The slaves' revolt led by Spartacus, as Marx and Engels explain, was progressive, as were the beginnings of Christianity.

In these very important situations we see that the other peoples of Africa have risen, too, but not with the force and revolutionary drive of the Arab peoples, the Iranians, etc. This is another problem which must be examined in order to find the reasons why they, too, do not rise and why they are not inspired to the same level as the peoples that I mentioned. It is true that the African peoples are oppressed, too, indeed, much more oppressed than the Arab peoples, the Iranians and others. Likewise, Marxism has still not spread to the proper extent in Africa, and then there is also the influence of religion, although not on the same scale as in the Muslim countries. Work must be done in Africa to disseminate the Marxist-Leninist theory more extensively and deeply. That is even more virgin terrain, with oppressed peoples, amongst whom the sense of religion is still in an infantile stage. There

are peoples in Africa who still believe in the heavenly powers of the sun, the moon, magic, etc., they have pagan beliefs which have not crystallized into an ideology and a concrete theology such as the Muslim religion, let alone the Christian or Buddhist religions and their sects. Although there is savage oppression and exploitation in Africa, the movement in this region of the world is developing more slowly. This is because the level of social development in Africa is lower.

If we take these questions and examine them in unity, we shall see that at the present stage of development, Islam as a whole is playing an active role in the anti-imperialist liberation struggles of the Muslim peoples, while in the European countries and some other countries where the Catholic religion operates, preaching the submissive Christian philosophy of "turn the other cheek," its leaders take a reactionary stand and try to hinder the movement, the revolt, the uprising of the masses for national and social liberation. Of course, in those countries the oppressive power of the bourgeoisie and capitalism, social-democracy and modern revisionism is greater, but the Catholic religion, too, serves to suppress the revolutionary spirit of the masses in order to keep the situation in stagnation.

From the standpoint of economic development the Muslim peoples have been held back; as a consequence of colonialist occupation and colonialist and neo-colonialist exploitation in past decades the Muslim religion in those countries was suppressed by the Catholic or Protestant religions which were represented by the foreign invaders, a thing which

has not passed without consequences and without resistance, and herein we might find a political and ideological-religious reason for the anti-imperialist revolution of the Muslim peoples.

The question presents itself that we should look at the present stage of development of the Muslim religion as compared with past centuries. The development of human society has exerted an influence that has made the Muslim religious belief less and less functional. That is, it has been infiltrated by a certain liberalism which is apparent in the fact that, while the Muslim believer truly believes in the Islamic religion, today he is no longer like the believer of the Middle Ages or the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries.

Today the veiled women in the Muslim countries have those same feelings which our veiled women had before Liberation, as for example in Kavaja,[1] although, of course, not completely those of women as progressive as ours were. Nevertheless, the feelings of revolt exist deep in their hearts, and are expressed to the extent that public opinion permits. Today the Iranian women are involved in the broad movement of the Iranian people against the Shah and imperialism.

Hence, we see that religious oppression exists in the countries with Muslim populations, too, but the religion itself has undergone a certain evolution, especially in its outward manifestations. Let me make this quite clear, religion has not disappeared in those countries, but a time has come in which the spirit of revolt, on the one hand, and the

[1] Town in Central Albania.

liberalization of the religion, on the other, are impelling people who believe in the Islamic dogmas to rise against those who call themselves religious and want to exercise the former norms of the religion in order to suppress the peoples and keep them in poverty. Their struggle against imperialists, whom they continue to call infidels, that is, their enemies, enemies of their religion, is linked precisely with this. These peoples understand that the foreign occupiers are people of Catholic or Protestant beliefs who want to oppress both countries and religions. The westerners call this religious antagonism, which also contains the class antagonism against foreign occupiers, simply a religious struggle, or apply other incorrect denigrating epithets to it. This is how they are treating the liberation struggles of the Muslim peoples of Arab and non-Arab countries in Asia and Africa today and even the liberation struggle of the Irish people, most of whom are Catholics, against the British occupiers who are Protestants. At the same time, we see incorrect manifestations also among the Muslim peoples who have risen in revolt. They, too, say: "The Giaours, unscrupulous people who are against our religion, are oppressing us," etc. In this way they link the question of national liberation with the religious question, that is, they see the social and economic oppression which is imposed on them by imperialism as religious oppression. In the future the other Muslim peoples will certainly reach that stage of development which the people of Algeria, Syria and some other countries have reached on these matters.

These struggles lead not only to increased sym-

pathy for the peoples who rise in revolt, but also to unity with them, because they are all Muslims. If a people rise against imperialism and the reactionary chiefs ruling their country, who use religion as a means of oppression, this uprising destroys the sense of religion even among those who believe in it at the moment. When a people rise in insurrection against oppression, then the revolutionary sentiment is extended and deepened and people reach the stage which makes them think somewhat more clearly about the question of religion. Until yesterday the poor peasant in Iran said only "inshallah!" and comforted himself with this, but now he understands that nothing can be gained through "inshallah!" In the past all these peoples said, "Thus it has been decreed," but now the masses of believers have risen united and come out in the streets, arms in hand, to demand their rights and freedom. And certainly, when they demand to take the land, the peasants in those countries will undoubtedly have to do battle for the great possessions of the religious institutions, that is, with the clergy. That is why the sinister forces of reaction are making such a great fuss about the fanatical aspect, about the question of putting the women back under the veil, etc., etc., because they are trying to discredit the Iranian revolution, because imperialism and world capitalism have a colossal support in religion. This is how matters stand with the Vatican, too, with the policy of that great centre of the most reactionary world obscurantism, with the mentality and outlook of Catholics. But the revolution disperses the religious fog. This will certainly occur with the Arab peoples, with the other Mus-

lim peoples, who are rising in insurrection, and with the peoples of other faiths, that is, there will be progress towards the disappearance, the elimination of religious beliefs and the religious leadership. This is a major problem.

Here we are talking about whole peoples who are rising in revolt in the Muslim countries, whether Arab or otherwise. There are no such movements in Europe. On this continent social-democratic reformist parties and forces operate. The number of Marxist-Leninist parties here is still small, while there are big revisionist parties, which operate contrary to people's interests and sentiments, have lost credibility among the masses, and support capitalism, imperialism and social-imperialism. The Muslim peoples of the Arab and non-Arab countries trust neither the American imperialists nor the Soviet social-imperialists, because they represent great powers which are struggling to oppress and plunder the Muslim peoples; also, as Muslims they put no trust in the religious beliefs of those powers.

As a result, the uprising which is developing in Iran and Afghanistan is bound to have consequences throughout the Muslim world. Hence, if the Marxist-Leninist groups, our comrades in these and other countries of this region properly understand the problems emerging from the events in Iran, Afghanistan and other Muslim countries, then all the possibilities exist for them to do much work. However, they must work cautiously there. In those countries religion cannot be eliminated with directives, extremist slogans or erroneous analyses. In order to find the truth we must analyse

the activity of those forces in the actual circumstances, because many things, true and false, are being said about them, as is occurring with Ayatollah Khomeini, too. True, he is religious, but regardless of this, analysis must be made of his anti-imperialist attitudes and actions, which, willy-nilly, bring grist to the mill of the revolution.

This whole development of events is very interesting. Here the question of religion is entangled with political issues, in the sympathy and solidarity between peoples. What I mean is that if the leadership of a certain country were to rise against the revolt of the Iranian people, then it would lose its political positions within the country and the people would rise in opposition, accuse the government of links with the United States of America, with the "giaours," because they are against Islam. This is because these peoples see Islam as progressive, while the United States represents that force which oppresses them, not only from the social aspect but also from the spiritual aspect. That is why we see that none of these countries is coming out openly to condemn the events in Iran.

Another obstacle which reaction is using to sabotage the revolution of the Iranian people is that of inciting feuds and raising the question of national minorities. Reaction is inciting the national sentiments in Azerbaijan, inciting the Kurds, etc., etc., in order to weaken this great anti-imperialist and "pro-Muslim" uprising of the Iranian people. The incitement of national sentiments has been and is a weapon in the hands of imperialism and social-imperialism and all reaction to sabotage the anti-imperialist and national liberation wars. Therefore,

the thesis of our Party that the question of settling the problems of national minorities is not a major problem at present, is correct. Now the Kurds, the Tadjiks, the Azerbaijanis and others ought to rise in struggle against imperialism and its lackeys and, if possible, rise according to the teachings and inspiration of Marxism-Leninism. The Kurds, the Tadjiks and the Azerbaijanis who live in the Soviet Union and are oppressed and enslaved today, must rise, first of all, against Russian social-imperialism.

In broad outline this is how the situation in these regions presents itself and these are some of the problems which emerge. The events will certainly develop further. Our task is to analyse these situations and events which are taking place in the Muslim world, using the Marxist-Leninist theory as the basis, and to define our stands so that they assist a correct understanding of these events, and thus, make our contribution to the successful development of the people's revolutionary movement.

WEDNESDAY
APRIL 9, 1980

WE MUST DEFEND THE JUST ANTI-IMPERIALIST STRUGGLE OF THE IRANIAN PEOPLE

I talked with Comrade Ramiz about an editorial article in defence of Iran.[1] In it we should expose and condemn the coercive measures which the United States of America has taken and which were announced by Carter personally, should condemn the preparations American imperialism is making for military aggression and try to arouse world opinion in defence of Iran. The anti-Iranian coalition which Carter advocates should be smashed. We should point out that the entire blame for the Iranian crisis falls on American imperialism, its agent, Shah Pahlavi, the plots of the CIA and the contradictions between the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

The objective of the two superpowers is oil. The Iranian people must use this powerful weapon to smash the plans of American imperialism and those who will follow Carter in the struggle against Iran. In the article we should also expose the Soviet pseudo-defence of Iran. We should point out that through its demagogy the Soviet Union is exacerbating the situation and preparing the intervention, attempting through this pseudo-defence to cover

[1] "The Iranian People Resolutely Reject the New Threats of American Imperialism," "Zëri i popullit," April 13, 1980.

up its own crime against Afghanistan. The thesis that secret agreements exist between the United States of America and the Soviet Union to stabilize their spheres of influence in this region cannot be rejected. In the article we should stress the need for strengthening the unity of the Iranian people in the face of the threat from outside, should stress the national moment which demands this unity in order to emerge with success from the struggle against the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists. We should cite the example of the stand of our country against the threats, blackmail and blockades of enemies. We have been able to smash them all and advance; hence Iran, too, will triumph.

SUNDAY
APRIL 27, 1980

CARTER'S GANGSTER ACT WHICH SUFFERED IGNOMINIOUS DEFEAT

The barbarous American operation with commandos landing in Iran[1] to rescue the gang of agents caught in that nest of spies in Tehran, which is called the American embassy, failed ignominiously. This gangster act covered American imperialism and the president of the United States of America, Jimmy Carter, with the disgrace of another scandal.

In a televised speech which he made two days ago, Carter admitted that the preparations for the operation had begun in November 1979 and that he, personally, took full responsibility for ordering the abandonment of the project when it failed, because some of the airplanes and helicopters collided or suffered mechanical breakdowns. Carter announced that 8 officers from the crews of the aircraft were killed, some tens of others were wounded, while the remainder were withdrawn. And he expressed his condolences to the families of the dead, praising the bandits as heroes. Jimmy Carter said these things and covered himself with shame.

This gangster act discredited one of the biggest powers in the world, with the most sophisticated equipment, the American military machine, and showed the weakness and decay of the United

[1] Reference is to the air operation in Tabas.

States of America. The American people have been shocked and Carter, this "Hamlet of the White House," as Andre Fontaine called him in a recent article in the newspaper "Le Monde," who wanted to prove himself a "lion," is being shunned even by his friends.

This barbarous act is being denounced throughout the world, not only by the peoples, but also by the allies of the United States of America who, like rats abandoning a sinking ship, are finding a thousand and one excuses to throw off the American yoke, by accusing Carter of not informing them in advance. Thus, they are washing their hands like Pontius Pilate. Only the prime minister of Britain, Thatcher, and Trudeau of Canada praised Carter's tragic "valour." In fact the capitalist world, wallowing in great confusion, in doubt and fear about the American defence and desperately worried about the energy crisis, especially the cutting off of Iranian oil supplies, is trying to stick "the broken pieces together." For their part the Soviet aggressors are rubbing their hands in glee. They think that the American intervention and the failure of the operation will overshadow their aggression in Afghanistan. However, both the United States of America and the Soviet Union are imperialist aggressors. The actions of both of them are aggression. That of the Soviets was carried out and is suffering defeat, while this of the Americans was aborted as soon as it began, although it could be repeated some time later. The imperialists are arrogant, warmongering gangsters, they will never renounce such barbarous acts, therefore we must fight them and unmask them to the end.

The American aggression against Iran, like the Soviet aggression against Afghanistan and the Chinese aggression against Vietnam, will have permanent consequences in the international arena. They are clear signs which forewarn of a new imperialist world war.

Therefore we must be very vigilant, must strengthen our economy, defence and unity and our proletarian discipline in our work everywhere. We must be strong within the country, but in the international arena, too, through our just stands, we must try to extend the circle of friends and peoples in favour of our socialist country. We must attack, attack and go on attacking the most ferocious enemies of the peoples, American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, Chinese social-imperialism, the various revisionists and the whole of world capitalism.

I recommended that an article should be written for "Zëri i popullit"[1] in which, among other things, we should demonstrate the falsity of the arguments of the Americans and their friends who are giving all sorts of excuses for the catastrophic defeat of the aggressive American operation.

First, it should be said that the excuses which Carter gave are fabricated and false. No one can swallow the tale that the biggest aggressive force in the world, with the most sophisticated armaments, suffered the breakdown of one helicopter, then a second, and a third, and a fifth..., all this is just to save the face of the authors of the aggression. How

[1] "Down with the Fascist American Aggression against Iran," "Zëri i popullit," April 29, 1980.

is it possible that such an operation, prepared intensively over a period of a hundred days, suffered a Waterloo? Moreover, some of the bandits who escaped were withdrawn in panic, leaving the dead American officers in the hot sands of Iran as food for the crows, and the burned out aircraft on the plain of Tabas. Carter admitted that he gave the order to stop the operation, that is, the withdrawal of the commandos in panic, allegedly because of mechanical defects. The failure, the withdrawal in panic, and the political catastrophe for the United States of America are true, all the rest is false.

Second, the other version alleging that the Soviets confused the Americans' communications by means of satellites is not true, either. Such a thing could be done, but not against the Americans, who are quite as well acquainted as the Soviets with these means, therefore there can be no doubt that the Americans had taken measures in advance against the possibility of such action by the Soviets. The precise order for the hasty withdrawal reached the aircraft — why was this order not confused by the Soviets? So that version doesn't hold water either.

Third, there is a basis for the supposition that the Soviets, observing these moves of the Americans, left them till they were committed to the action at Tabas and immediately issued the ultimatum that they must cease the operation and withdraw within a record time, certainly within a matter of hours, otherwise the Soviets would intervene with their troops, allegedly to save Iran, in other words, they would occupy that country, just as they did with Afghanistan. In this way the Soviets

avenged the slap in the face which the Khrushchevites received 18 years earlier.[1] At that time the Soviet revisionists were covered with shame, this time the American imperialists were covered with shame. Like Khrushchev in the past, Carter ran away in panic with his tail between his legs. Possibly the Soviet Union was bluffing, but it had the possibility to invade Iran, because it had the troops and supplies deployed on the border of Iran, just as it had in Afghanistan.

Carter had not taken account of the Soviet factor. He had not prepared for a large-scale confrontation which would lead to an imperialist world war. He had reckoned that the operation would be carried out at lightning speed, but the Soviet social-imperialists did not allow him to act in this way. He kept the aggressive operation secret from the Senate, from his closest collaborators and also from the NATO allies. If we accept this version, the Soviet Union discovered the plan and ensured its defeat without any publicity. Carter himself made all the fuss about it. He, personally, announced the failure, the panic, the distrust which the failure of the operation caused and the discredit to the United States of America, which are on the agenda today. Carter himself worked in favour of the Soviets who are having a great deal to say about the failure of the American aggression, because this has

[1] In November 1962, at the time of the Caribbean crisis, the Soviet revisionists, under the pressure and threats of American imperialists, were compelled to withdraw their missiles from Cuba and allow the American warships to control this operation on the high seas.

drowned out the clamour about the Afghan problem and all the other vile deeds of the Soviet aggressors.

Fourth, one more supposition: the Americans may have landed a big group of troops in Iran and left them there with the task of dispersing through the country and assembling later, together with the agents the Americans have in that country and in Tehran in order to spark off a civil war. Carter may have preferred to accept a great temporary disgrace in order to score another greater victory later, on the eve of the presidential elections. This action could be considered as a feint leading to another greater action in the future. Time will reveal which version is true.

The Iranians must be very vigilant. The peoples likewise must be very vigilant and must fight the American, Soviet, Chinese and other imperialist bandits. In this dangerous situation the world crisis is growing deeper and there will certainly be disagreements between the Americans and their NATO allies. The Chinese could make a 90 degree-turn towards the Soviets, simultaneously with the 90-degree turn they have made towards the Americans and thus take the positions of Titoism. The contradictions between their enemies are a victory for the peoples, therefore we must deepen these contradictions, expose them and take advantage of them and help the peoples to win their freedom and genuine independence and foil the preparations for war which are being made by the Soviets, the Americans and world capital.

FRIDAY
JANUARY 2, 1981

THE AFGHAN PEOPLE ARE NOT SUBMITTING

The Afghan patriots marked the anniversary of the occupation of their country by the Soviet social-imperialist army with big demonstrations and armed struggle. In some regions the occupiers were attacked with weapons or stones according to the possibilities and local conditions.

From what I have read in the news agency reports in recent days there was a big explosion at an important target of the Soviets in the central sector of Kabul. Many other government buildings have been stoned, while the Soviet soldiers have opened fire on demonstrators, students, workers and ordinary citizens. Some have been wounded and many arrested.

The Afghans are a poor people but proud and with traditions of valour. Therefore, neither the large number of the occupying forces, their modern weapons, nor their savage terror can subjugate the Afghans. At present their actions are still on a small scale, but in the future they will increase and be turned into fierce devastating battles against the Soviet social-imperialist hordes, until they are driven right out of the territory of Afghanistan.

Oppression by foreigners does not quell, but fans up the hatred of peoples. This we Albanians learned from bitter experience, until we achieved the final victory over the nazi-fascist occupiers and their local lackeys.

SATURDAY
JANUARY 10, 1981

KISSINGER IN THE MIDDLE EAST AGAIN

For some days, one of the most ferocious enemies of the Palestinian people and the other Arab peoples, the notorious Henry Kissinger, a dyed-in-the-wool supporter of Zionism, has been prowling around the Middle East. This time he has gone there not as a state functionary but as the special envoy of President Reagan, to poke and probe and plot against the Arab peoples and above all to look after the interests of the American oil and arms monopolies.

Wherever he has gone, to Saudi Arabia, Israel, Oman or elsewhere, not without purpose he has boosted Camp David and the Israeli-Egyptian peace treaty, about which he boasts that he has "contributed his efforts" to bring it about. Everywhere he has appealed for "regional understanding," in other words, for ending the fight against the Israeli aggressors, for accepting the Israeli occupation of Arab territories on the West Bank of the Jordan, the Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights and parts of Sinai — what is called the state of Israel with secure borders, as an accomplished fact.

More than once he has made open and arrogant threats about "the determination of the American government for a greater military involvement in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf."

This is Henry Kissinger, the strategist who formulated the anti-Arab policy of Kennedy, Johnson,

Nixon, Carter and now Reagan.

THURSDAY
JANUARY 22, 1981

A HEAVY BLOW TO AMERICAN ARROGANCE

The news agencies are again carrying reports of a new event with grave effects for the authority of the United States of America in the international arena. The Iranian government released the 52 hostages whom the people and revolutionaries of Tehran captured in the American embassy on November 4, 1979. They comprise diplomats of various ranks, technicians and other employees as well as the guards from the United States marines who had been charged with the task of defending their embassy in Tehran. They were held prisoner and interrogated for 444 days, regardless of the many political and economic pressures and the blackmail and threats of military intervention made by the government in Washington.

The staff of the American embassy in Tehran were taken prisoner because, contrary to and in violation of the different international laws and conventions, they had engaged in illegal activities and interference in the internal affairs of the Iranian people. The embassy itself had been turned into a dangerous centre of espionage and subversion by agents of the CIA. In 1953 it organized and, with the aid of supporters of the Shah, carried out the military coup which overthrew the Mossadeq government and sabotaged the Iranian people's struggle against the Shah and the American imperialists.

In this centre of hardened CIA agents the Ira-

nians captured a large number of compromising documents about the activity of American imperialism in organizing sabotage and plots, not only in Iran, but also in other countries in the oil-bearing zone of the Middle East.

The capture and holding under arrest for a long period of these American diplomat-spies by the Iranian people was a serious blow to the political-economic and military despotism and arrogance of the United States of America. It had very great repercussions throughout the world. The United States of America was infuriated and made every effort to get out of the ignominious situation in which it was placed as painlessly as possible, but it could not do a thing. In the end it was obliged to accept the onerous but just conditions laid down by the Iranian Majlis (parliament) for the release of the hostages, concretely: lifting the freeze on Iranian assets deposited in the United States of America; placing all the assets which belonged to Iran at the disposal of Iran; recognition of the fact that the wealth of the former Shah and his relatives belongs to the Iranian people, etc.

Apart from this, in the communique published by the Iranian government about the release of the hostages, all the political and military intervention of the American imperialists and the bombastic threats of President Reagan were firmly denounced once again.

The release of the American hostages after the government of the United States was forced into accepting the conditions laid down by the Iranian Majlis constitutes another victory of the Iranian people in their revolution against the feudal mon-

archy of the Pahlavis and imperialism. It shows that they are a valiant people, determined and ready to deal further blows at the American imperialists and all other imperialists who try to hinder them on their course towards a truly free and independent Iran.

This act of the Iranian government and people merits congratulations, and we shall offer our congratulations through the press, describing it as a splendid example which shows that no imperialist or social-imperialist power, however big or heavily armed, can impose itself on and conquer the will of peoples for freedom and independence.

REPRISALS OF THE SOVIET ARMY IN AFGHANISTAN

News agencies carry repeated reports about the courageous fight of the Afghan patriots against the Soviet army of occupation in Afghanistan as well as about their frequent actions in the rural zones, especially around Kabul. They also speak about the savage and barbarous reprisals of the Soviet forces against the Afghan people. The measures of reprisal are severe, especially in the rural zones where there is resistance and the people support the freedom fighters. The units of the Soviet army carry out ceaseless indiscriminate attacks with artillery, aircraft and helicopter gunships over whole zones. It is said that thousands have been killed amongst the defenceless population.

These days the Soviet occupation army has also shelled the city of Kandahar, including a technical school. Now the centre of the city is patrolled by tanks and other armoured vehicles.

News agencies quite rightly describe these piratical actions of the Soviets as the severest reprisals since December 1979.

SATURDAY
APRIL 11, 1981

THE PALESTINIANS OPPOSE THE ISRAELI TERROR

For some days we have been reading many reports about demonstrations of the Palestinian people against the violence and terror which the Israelis employ against them in the occupied Arab territories as well as in the Palestinian camps in southern Lebanon. The resistance of the Palestinian forces is great everywhere and especially on the West Bank.

Meanwhile there is talk about a landing on a mass scale of Israeli special units supported by a heavy artillery barrage, at a number of points in the region north-west of Beirut, at Nabataea, Tyre and elsewhere. Fighting is taking place. There are dead and wounded. The Israelis have suffered heavy losses.

Besides their military activities, the Israelis are also continuing their expropriation of the land and property of Palestinian families in order to set up new Jewish settlements on them.

These inhuman actions, this savage terror against the Palestinians increases the grief which I have been feeling these days for our brothers of Kosova, who have been subjected to savage terror by the Great-Serb Titoites.[1] Just like the racist Zi-

[1] See the collection of articles, "About the Events in Kosova," "8 Nëntori" Publishing House, Tirana 1981, Eng. ed.

onists of Tel Aviv, the Great-Serb Titoites too, are employing illegal means and inhuman violence and terror against the Albanians of Kosova simply because they are demanding their political and economic rights on the basis of and within the Constitution of Yugoslavia itself. With these actions, however, both the Israelis and the Great Serbs are harming only themselves.

WEDNESDAY
MAY 27, 1981

THE PALESTINIANS' MURDERER IN MOSCOW

King Hussein of Jordan is on an official visit to Moscow where he has been welcomed with all the honours befitting him as a monarch and an old friend of the Soviet social-imperialists and also as a buyer of their weapons. Hussein has met Brezhnev to exchange ideas about an "international conference which will settle the problem of the Middle East."

Hussein, the murderer of Palestinians, is received by Brezhnev, "a friend" of the Palestinians, in order to settle the problem of the Middle East in the centre of which is the Palestinian people!

That is how far the "friendship" of the Soviet social-imperialists goes for the Palestinian people and the other Arab peoples! For the Soviet social-imperialists the problem is the arms traffic and not genuine friendship with the peoples. The Arab peoples and especially the long-suffering and heroic Palestinian people must never forget this for one moment.

MONDAY
AUGUST 10, 1981

ON THE MIDDLE EAST, ON THE STRUGGLE OF THE ARAB PEOPLES

Notes

In the chapter on the international situation in the report to the 8th Party Congress[1] we must certainly devote as much space as the conditions allow to events which are connected with the Middle East. Amongst other things we must point out:

1) The struggle of the Arab peoples against the Israeli occupiers and their American patrons has assumed greater dimensions and intensity. In the centre of this struggle stand the heroic Palestinian people who, for decades on end and in extremely difficult conditions, have been waging a titanic battle to return to their homeland captured by the Israelis and to ensure their right to live free and independent on their mother soil.

2) The revolution of the Iranian people against the feudal monarchy of the Pahlavis and its patron, American imperialism, is a heavy blow to imperialism in general. It swept away the Shah and his medieval regime and threw out his American patrons. The United States of America is incapable of repairing this major political defeat which it suffered, either in diplomatic ways, through economic blackmail, or even through military intervention.

[1] The 8th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania, held in November 1981.

— In Iran, American imperialism lost one of the most important sources of oil, the colossal profits it had from this source as well as the trust which the Arab "allies" of the Persian Gulf had in it as an invincible protector.

— The Egyptian-Israeli compromise of Camp David was shaken; open and hidden disagreements with the NATO partners arose.

3. The people of Afghanistan are fighting valiantly and boldly against the Soviet social-imperialists and their local lackeys to regain their national independence.

* * *

We have been and are in support of the just anti-feudal and anti-imperialist struggle of the Iranian people, in support of the just struggle of the Palestinian people and other Arab peoples and in support of the courageous resistance of the people of Afghanistan for the liberation of their country from the Soviet occupiers.

NOTE

Yesterday the prime minister of Israel, Menachem Begin, arrived in Washington for talks with the American president, Reagan.

As on every other occasion, this visit, too, is linked with the demand of the Israeli government for political and military support from American imperialism on the eve of its new anti-Arab adventures.

In fact, during the whole of the recent period the Israeli army has continued to bombard Palestinian camps in Lebanon, has continued its campaign of terror against the Palestinians and the implanting of Jews on the territories of the Palestinians. Israeli military provocations against Lebanon and the other Arab countries have been stepped up.

As the signs show, Israel is preparing for new military attacks, not simply raids against the Palestinians, but a large-scale military intervention in Lebanon and even for provocations against the Syrian military forces stationed in that country.

WEDNESDAY
OCTOBER 7, 1981

SADAT HAS BEEN ASSASSINATED

At a time when a military parade was being held in Cairo, a commando of Egyptian soldiers shot and assassinated Anwar el-Sadat.

Who assassinated him? Terrorists?

We shall see on whom they will put the finger? It was not in the interests of the United States of America and Israel to kill him. The Soviets, yes, they were interested in assassinating him for their global strategy and their strategy in the Middle East where the situation has become more complicated than it was. Qaddafi of Libya who, under the Soviet "umbrella," encircled Egypt with the alliances he made with Syria, Ethiopia and South Yemen, was directly interested in having him assassinated. Qaddafi openly assailed Sadat and Nimeiri of Sudan and also attacked Chad. Other Arab countries which are pro-Palestinian and against Israel were also interested, although on a more remote level, in having him killed. Assassinating him was of interest to these countries also for blackmail against the United States of America.

Without doubt, Sadat's assassination was carried out by adventurers in the interests of other even greater adventurers. Even before the assassination the situation was dangerous but now it becomes even more so. The superpowers are in conflict and are setting the world more and more each day on the course of nuclear war.

The peoples must step up their struggle against

these warmongers and their tools.

TUESDAY
NOVEMBER 3, 1981

CONTINUOUS ATTACKS ON THE SOVIET OCCUPIERS

Although I am fully occupied with the proceedings of the Party Congress, I read the news from various news agencies carefully. I do this not only to see the response to the proceedings of our Congress, but also to follow the main international events.

These days I have noticed that the Afghan patriots have waged bloody battles with the Soviet social-imperialist occupiers and have taken control of the whole region near the main centre of the northern province of Takhar. The patriots' actions have been stepped up greatly also inside Kabul where the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the terrible Pul-el-Shakr prison have been attacked. The patriots control a number of roads which link Kabul with the main provinces of the country where there are major Soviet military concentrations and especially the road which leads to the border with the Soviet Union. At an airport near Kabul the patriots have shot down a Soviet helicopter.

The Soviet army and the remnants of the Afghan puppet army have apparently undertaken a large-scale offensive to "liberate" Kandahar, the second largest city of Afghanistan, which has been held for more than two months by the patriotic forces.

Bravo the Afghan patriots! Their resistance and struggle will certainly be crowned with victory.

WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 13, 1982

NEW PLOTS AGAINST THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE

The great imperialist-Zionist plot against the Arab peoples and, first of all, the martyred Palestinian people, is becoming more and more concrete. I read in news agency reports that the American president, Reagan, has sent a new message to the Israeli prime minister, Begin, to assure him publicly that the United States of America is determined to guarantee the "security of Israel" at all times.

This message, along with the large amounts of financial and military aid for the Begin government, which the American imperialists have recently been increasing day by day, speaks of a new premeditated step on their part, which will be a further encouragement to the Israelis' aggressive and adventurous anti-Arab policy to legalize what are called the "secure borders of Israel." Through this policy of "secure borders" Israel intends to keep the main parts of the occupied Arab territory, especially the West Bank of the Jordan River, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Heights, under permanent occupation.

There will be fresh developments in the Middle East, especially in the anti-Palestinian policies of imperialism, Zionism and reaction.

NOTE

Recently top-ranking American politicians and military men have been making pilgrimages to the Middle East. Through these visits American imperialism is, of course, trying to consolidate the positions and privileges which it has won in this region of the world, especially in the context of economic and military strategy.

This time the Secretary of Defence, Weinberger, has set out on a new tour of the Middle East. Apart from the aims of tightening the screws on the vassals of the United States and concretizing its anti-Arab and anti-Palestinian plots, he is going there as the intermediary of the American monopolies and armaments industry to sell modern armaments to the lackey-allies of the United States of America. Weinberger commenced his present tour in Saudi Arabia to which, according to news agencies, the United States is going to sell the most modern armaments, including F-15 supersonic aircraft and AWACS radar aircraft, after first receiving assurances from the ruling monarchy of that country that these armaments will not be used against Israel. Then against whom will these modern armaments be used? Obviously, they will be used to suppress the national liberation movements of neighbouring Arab peoples and, as some say, they might also be used against Iran.

WEDNESDAY
FEBRUARY 10, 1982

THE THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE TRIUMPH OF THE IRANIAN PEOPLE'S REVOLUTION

Tomorrow the Iranian people will celebrate the third anniversary of the triumph of their revolution against the bloodthirsty medieval regime of the Shahanshah, Mohammed Pahlavi, and his detested patron, American imperialism.

Three years of stern battles and powerful resistance against the savage pressure of American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and other reactionary forces. Three years of stern battles also against the supporters of the Shah and foreign agents within Iran.

The anti-imperialist struggle and resistance of the Iranian people deserves praise and support. We shall write about the third anniversary of this anti-imperialist revolution, will congratulate the Iranian people on this outstanding event and wish them success in their work and struggle for the development and progress of their country and for their national freedom and independence against the plots of the superpowers.

MONDAY
APRIL 26, 1982

ISRAEL'S GRAVE THREATS

In recent days events in Lebanon are assuming a more acute and savage character. Fratricidal war is going on in Beirut amongst various factions of the Lebanese people, with special emphasis on armed provocations against the Palestinian forces in the southern regions of the city.

Directly involved in all these events are the American imperialists and especially the Israelis, who are trying to liquidate the organized Palestinian forces in Lebanon.

As Western news agencies report, prime minister Begin has made an arrogant declaration threatening the sovereignty of Lebanon. Speaking about recent events in that country and about the situation in Beirut, in particular, he said amongst other things: "We shall consider the possibility of the occupation of Lebanon." This declaration has made an impression on world opinion, because it is an escalation of the already tense situation, constitutes a forewarning of imminent dangers and shows that the Israeli aggressors are preparing new plans for war against the Arab peoples, first of all, against the Palestinian people.

In this arrogant stand, disdainful of world opinion, Israel has the open support of American imperialism and the secret support of Soviet social-imperialism, both of them interested in increasing the tension in this region of the world and liquidating the resistance of the Palestinian people. The impe-

rialist and social-imperialist wolves and their jackals want to fish in troubled waters because this makes it easier for them to hatch up plots and plunder the wealth of the peoples of the Middle East.

It is essential that the Arab peoples and, first of all, the Palestinian people increase their vigilance and combine in a genuine unity to cope with the danger which is threatening them. Only through uncompromising struggle can the Israeli aggressors and their imperialist and social-imperialist patrons be dealt with.

THURSDAY
JULY 8, 1982

THE ISRAELIS OCCUPY BEIRUT DE FACTO

I am carefully following developments in Lebanon where, as I have written previously, there is a very grave and dangerous situation. For several days the Israeli air force and naval and land artillery have been severely bombing the capital of that country, Beirut, especially the outlying suburbs where the Palestinian population and their organized forces are concentrated.

News agencies are talking about an advance of tens of thousands of troops of the Israeli army, heavily armed and with modern mechanized means, towards Beirut.

From what we read in news agency reports and see on TV, we are faced with the *de facto* occupation of Beirut by the Israeli army and the implementation of long-standing plans for driving the Palestinians out of Beirut and the whole of Lebanon.

Where do the Israeli aggressors find the boldness to challenge the sovereignty of an independent state like Lebanon and attack the freedom of its people?

American imperialism is defending them. Today I read a report which said that Yitzhak Shamir, the foreign minister of Israel, has declared: "The United States of America has worked out plans to use its land and naval forces to settle the Lebanese crisis." And Shamir does not make these state-

ments, so compromising to the Americans, for nothing. On the contrary, he is sure of such a support, because he himself was recently in Washington and received all-round assurances from the American government. In fact, the American 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean, with several hundred aircraft and about 8,000 American marines specialized in urban warfare, is being reinforced and directed towards the shores of Lebanon.

We shall see how events develop. Will the Lebanese tolerate the occupation of their country by the Israelis? Will the Palestinians yield to the brutality of the Israelis? Will the other Arab countries reconcile themselves to the occupation of Lebanon?

The coming days will give us the answers to these questions. I think that the Israelis will make every effort to implement their plans of conquest, but will encounter stern resistance in Lebanon, especially from the Palestinian fighters.

One thing attracts attention. While Israel is operating openly and has the open support of the United States of America, the Soviet Union is merely making "threatening" statements in the press about the possible consequences of the deterioration of the situation, setting its Mediterranean naval fleet in motion, and nothing more.

SUNDAY
AUGUST 22, 1982

A HEAVY BLOW TO THE PALESTINIANS

What I had foreseen about the real aims of the Israeli military aggression against Lebanon, that is, the destruction of the organized forces of the Palestine Liberation Movement, is coming to pass. Yesterday news agencies began to say that after fierce fighting between the Israeli military forces and Palestinian forces in Beirut, the Palestinians were withdrawing from Beirut to the regions north of that city, under the pressure of the Israeli army.

Besides this, another very cunning manoeuvre is being carried out. Under the pretext that the withdrawal from Beirut of Palestinian forces, unharmed by the Israelis, must be "ensured and guaranteed," an agreement has been sought and apparently achieved, that a large number of troops of the United States of America, France and Italy should be sent to Lebanon. These units, which will be called the "multi-national force," are supposed to supervise the withdrawal of the Palestinians. Each of these units will be under independent command and will be armed with all fighting means.

I am following the events in Lebanon with special attention because they could have consequences for the whole of the Mediterranean, the Balkans and Central Europe, that is, they could affect our country, too.

I have talked with the comrades and given instructions that we should continue through the

press to expose the aggressive aims of Israel and the plots of American imperialism. We must continue to support the just struggle of the Palestinian people for their rights.

WEDNESDAY
AUGUST 25, 1982

THE AMERICANS LAND IN LEBANON

News agencies report that 800 American marines landed from the ships of the 6th Fleet in Beirut today "to restore order" and to maintain "peace" between the warring factions. In reality we have to do with an American military occupation of Lebanon in implementation of the "strategic agreement" recently reached between Reagan and Begin. On the basis of this agreement the American government has pledged to use every means to defend the Israeli aggressors in their war against the Arabs and the Palestinians.

It is said that besides the American troops, special detachments of the Italian army have arrived, too, while the French detachments arrived some days ago. These troops, called the "multi-national force," are charged with the mission of "calming" the situation in Beirut and "supervising" the withdrawal of the Palestinians from the Lebanese capital.

TUESDAY
SEPTEMBER 21, 1982

A GRAVE CRIME AGAINST THE PALESTINIANS IN BEIRUT

A very grave crime has been perpetrated these days in two Palestinian camps, Sabra and Shatila, on the western outskirts of Beirut. From dawn September 17 to September 18, armed units, said to be of the Lebanese Phalangist militia and a dissident unit commanded by a certain Major Haddad, which is equipped, trained and financed by the Israeli government, entered these two camps which were surrounded by detachments of the Israeli army. They opened fire in the most barbarous way, massacring about 1,500 innocent, defenceless Palestinians, women, children, elderly men, boys and girls, sick people, and so on, without discrimination. In some cases they wiped out whole families in the shelters where they had taken refuge. This crime was carried out in the darkness of the night and a complete news blackout was maintained about it for more than 24 hours. Meanwhile, the aggressors have departed and have been able to cover their tracks.

As news agencies report, journalists learned about this hideous crime after some delay and mainly from the efforts of Palestinians still alive but too terrified to leave the site of the crime.

This event has caused profound indignation everywhere. Protests have begun and demands are being made that the perpetrators of this inhuman crime must be brought to book. Israeli political and

military circles are trying to exonerate themselves by saying that they "know nothing about it," "do not know who the murderers are," and so on. However, a number of contradictory statements, as well as the fact that these two camps were in the region which the detachments of the Israeli army control, speak of the opposite. Not only the high command of the Israeli army of occupation in Beirut, but also the War Ministry and prime minister Begin personally knew of this crime and had a hand in it. It is said that the minister of defence, Sharon, who heads the Israeli military units in Lebanon, and the chief of the General Staff, Aton, authorized the perpetration of this crime under the silent protection of Israeli units and subsequently imposed the news blackout.

The crime committed at Sabra and Shatila is so grave that even in Tel Aviv itself a commotion has begun demanding "the revelation of the truth" and "the punishment of those responsible" in order to save the "honour" of the Israeli people!

On television these days I have seen horrible scenes of the massacres which have been committed in these two Palestinian camps, piles of corpses, children crying for their parents, grief-stricken women searching amongst the victims for members of their families, and so on. These are painful scenes which arouse indignation and hatred for these new barbarians. Only the German nazis have perpetrated such monstrosities. All progressive mankind must sternly denounce the authors of this crime.

How sorry I feel for the Palestinian people, expelled from their homeland and persecuted in the

cruellest ways by the Israeli aggressors and other reactionary forces. And why? Because they are fighting for their rights, to return to their homeland, because they demand justice from those who do not want to know what justice is, but simply trample the rights of other peoples underfoot, as the Israelis and their patrons, the American imperialists, do.

Through the press we shall indignantly denounce this barbarous crime against the Palestinian population and expose its direct authors and their savage supporters as war criminals.

TUESDAY
SEPTEMBER 21, 1982

THE "CONDOLENCES" OF THE SOVIET SOCIAL-IMPERIALISTS

Today I read a report of the Palestinian news agency VAFA according to which the ambassador of the Soviet Union to Syria has received the chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Yasser Arafat, and handed him a message from Brezhnev in which the massacres of recent days in the Sabra and Shatila camps are "condemned."

The whole content of the message is not disclosed, but the very fact that it was handed to Arafat by the Soviet ambassador in the offices of the Soviet embassy in Damascus shows that it is of no greater value than any other message of condolences. Hence, with this message Brezhnev tells Arafat, "Accept my condolences over the deaths at Sabra and Shatila"!

The stand which the Soviet Union is taking about recent developments in the Middle East and, in particular, towards the great plot for the destruction of the Palestinian movement and the physical liquidation of the Palestinian people, is a very clear indication of the treacherous anti-Arab policy of the Soviet social-imperialists. Their friendship and military aid are false and ineffectual.

It is known that the Soviet Union sells Syria armaments, including supersonic aircraft and missiles of the latest types. However, they were not used to counter the attacks by the Israelis with modern American weapons. Why? Because their

"firing mechanism" remains in the hands of Soviet military experts. The same thing occurred with Egypt, too, and the consequences are known. The modern weapons which the Soviet Union supplies to Syria under the label of sincere friendship are not to defend Syria and the Palestinians, but to say to the Americans and Israel: "I am here, too." Hence, the Soviet Union does this for its own interests as a superpower.

Whenever Israel has launched heavy military attacks on the Palestinians, Yasser Arafat and other Palestinian leaders have been invited urgently to Moscow and each time "stern" communiques have been issued, saying that "the struggle of the Palestinian people will be supported with every means." However, the "means" have always been messages of condolences. Israel is well aware of this.

Concretely, in the last two months the world has seen a number of serious military attacks made by Israel and the United States of America against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples, for instance, the occupation of Lebanon, the forced expulsion of the Palestinian fighters from Beirut, etc. Progressive mankind also saw a grave and inhuman event, the massacre of the innocent, defenceless Palestinian population in Sabra and Shatila. Notwithstanding this tragedy, Brezhnev is trying to get out of his official pledges towards the Arab peoples and countries with no more than a "message of denunciation" over the massacres of Sabra and Shatila addressed to Arafat.

This sort of stand simply encourages the unrestrained arrogance, of Israel and the United States

of America against the Arabs and the Palestinians.

THE ANTI-ARAB ACTIONS OF ISRAEL ARE APPROVED IN WASHINGTON

The United States of America is the main supporter of all the anti-Arab political and military actions of the state of Israel. If the anti-Arab plans are carried out by Tel Aviv, they are prepared and put on paper in Washington. This is a truth which the events and life have proved.

On January 4, Yitzhak Navon, the head of state of Israel, arrived in Washington for an "official visit and consultations" with the leading circles of the United States of America. As news agencies report, on this occasion he made a statement which has a well-defined aim and meaning. Among other things he said: "The prewar borders of 1967 do not guarantee the security of Israel," while the city of Jerusalem will remain an "undivided" city and indeed "the capital of Israel." After this he added: "Israel will never accept the creation of an independent Palestinian state."

The aggressive and arrogant character of these declarations, which constitute the essence of the anti-Arab and anti-Palestinian policy of Israel, requires no comment. These statements are made only with the approval of the patron, American imperialism, and are not pressure exerted by the government of Tel Aviv on the American government for further aid.

WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 26, 1983

THE AFGHAN FIGHTERS STRIKE HEAVY BLOWS AGAINST THE SOVIET OCCUPIERS

The armed resistance of the Afghan people against the Soviet social-imperialist occupiers is continuing successfully. Although the Soviets have established a strict censorship, from time to time facts are published which indicate that, despite the terror, the savage military oppression and the mass bombing by Soviet military aircraft, the struggle of the Afghan people has been stepped up and extended. A few days ago the news agencies reported a daring action at Mazar-i-Sharif in the north of Afghanistan, in which 16 top Soviet military advisers were captured. Yesterday there were reports of a powerful attack on the big airport of Jalalabad, near Kabul, in which 13 Soviet helicopters were destroyed. From time to time news agencies also report powerful attacks which are made on Soviet military command centres.

The build-up of the resistance and struggle of the patriotic Afghan people rejoices us because, apart from other things, it confirms the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the peoples, however small and unarmed they may be, when it comes to defending their freedom, independence and honour, can launch powerful attacks on and triumph over savage enemies, such as the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists, who are much better

armed and more powerful than they are.

The people of Afghanistan have a history of heroic struggles against foreign occupiers. They offered forcible resistance to the influence and pressure of the Russian tsars. They fought the British colonialists for decades on end. They waged three wars against British armies, teaching them a lesson they will never forget. In 1921 they drove them out of the country completely and won their national independence. This strengthens our conviction that the Afghan people will triumph over the Soviet occupiers, too, and that they will emerge from this struggle even more conscious about the need for the defence of their national and social rights.

FRIDAY
FEBRUARY 25, 1983

REAGAN THREATENS THE PALESTINIANS

At the beginning of the year a statement made in Washington by Yitzhak Navon, head of state of Israel, about the anti-Arab pretensions of his country, made an impression on me. On that occasion I noted that such anti-Arab declarations, especially when made on American soil, could not be made by Navon or any other Israeli state leader without the knowledge and approval of the American government.

Today I read in the news agency reports about a press conference of President Reagan in which he touches on the Palestinian people and their just struggle. What does Reagan say? The "package peace plan" for the Middle East which the Americans have drafted must include "something in the nature of a homeland" for the Palestinians. "No one," he says, "has expressed himself in favour of a Palestinian state." Hence, for the head of American imperialism, the Palestinians are and remain a refugee people without a homeland and, moreover, have no right to exercise their sovereignty.

Immediately after these anti-Palestinian statements, Reagan adds that "if need be" the American detachments which are part of the "multi-national force" deployed in Beirut, "will patrol Southern Lebanon," i.e., near the borders of Israel "in order to defend it."

Is this not complete and open support for the

anti-Arab declarations that Navon made and which had to do with guaranteeing the borders of Israel in the occupied Arab territories and refusal to recognize an independent Palestinian state?

SUNDAY
MARCH 6, 1983

THE SMILES OF SOVIET DIPLOMACY

To secure their predatory interests, the two imperialist superpowers are ready to set the world on fire. Their bloodstained hands were behind every local conflict, behind every clash between countries and peoples, which not merely have no opposing interests, but even have almost the same origin and are of the one religion.

TASS reports that in recent days the foreign minister of the Soviet Union received the ambassadors of Iran and Iraq in Moscow one after the other, and discussed "questions of bilateral relations and international problems" with them. It is known that the Soviet social-imperialists are selling Iraq the most modern weapons which it is using in the war against Iran, while they are putting pressure on Iran not to pursue a policy against the Soviet Union. The Iranian government has complained continually about the interference of the Soviet social-imperialists in the internal affairs of Iran, about the troubles which they bring it through the Kurds and the "Tudeh" Party (the revisionist party of Iran) and quite rightly describes them as devils, just like the American imperialists.

The Iraq-Iran conflict has become a fine source of profit from the sale of arms for both the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Therefore, although both of them swear they are against this conflict and for "calming things down," they

are striving and working to keep it ablaze as long as possible, unconcerned at the immense cost in blood and wealth to the peoples of Iraq and Iran. Gromyko's repeated smiles serve this aim.

WHEN A PEOPLE FIGHT NO GREAT POWER CAN DEFEAT THEM

The Afghan patriots have apparently attacked the Soviet embassy in Kabul again, irrespective of the exceptional strength of its multiple defences. In this country with a valiant people the Soviet social-imperialists are applying a scorched earth policy, but the ground under their own feet is ablaze and heavily sown with mines. They will never be secure and in peace anywhere in Afghanistan.

The reports about the armed resistance and the courageous actions of the Afghan patriots show that when a people fight for their own land, freedom and rights, no great power, however heavily armed, can defeat them.

AGENT-DIPLOMATS OF THE KGB

In January this year the Iranian government closed the office of the TASS news agency in Tehran because its employees "distorted Iranian reality." Today news agencies report that the Iranian government has also declared 18 Soviet diplomats *personae non gratae*, obviously because of their activity against the interests of the Iranian people and their interference in the internal affairs of Iran.

A similar thing is occurring with the Soviets everywhere in the world. This year Andropov's "boys" have begun their activity very badly. Although cloaked as diplomats, cultural or military attachés, journalists, interpreters or employees of "Aeroflot," they are being exposed and captured as agents of the KGB and condemned for espionage activity and interference in the internal affairs of other countries. In France alone, 47 Soviet employees were declared *personae non gratae* and expelled at the beginning of April. In the last two or three months, 10-15 others have been caught or expelled for the same reasons from Switzerland, Italy, Spain, Holland, etc.

POGRADEC,
JULY-AUGUST 1983

THE GLORIOUS PAST OF PEOPLES CANNOT BE IGNORED

(Notes)

It is a well-known and long-established tendency of the capitalist-imperialist propaganda to denigrate the peoples of the Asian, African and Latin-American countries and even the small peoples of the European continent itself, to ignore their ancient cultures, their fine traditions and characteristics, to disregard their mental capacities and even their spiritual feelings. Today this anti-scientific and reactionary tendency, which is widely propagated, is part of the hegemonic economic and military policy of imperialist and revisionist powers against those peoples who have taken up arms and are fighting for their national and social liberation.

Throughout the recent years, in order to justify their open and flagrant intervention in the great oil-bearing zone of the Middle East the imperialist and revisionist propagandists have been setting up a great coordinated clamour in order to "prove" that the Arab peoples are uncultured, ignorant, incapable of governing themselves and administering their colossal wealth, nomads in the desert, robbers, and all sorts of other evil things.

The ancient cultural traditions of the Arab peoples, who have given mankind famous scientists in various fields of knowledge, pioneers in medicine,

astronomy and mathematics, great philosophers and poets, cannot be denied and cannot be left in oblivion. The poverty, ignorance and backwardness of these peoples is linked solely with the policy of plunder and invasion which the colonialists of all types from the European metropolis, the neocolonialists of today, the American imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists and others have pursued and are pursuing in this region.

Since my school days, in my free time, I have read works of honest authors and scholars about the great culture of the ancient Arabs and Persians and about their influence on the development of world science and culture. Amongst other things, this has aroused in me feelings of profound respect and admiration for these peoples and their liberation struggle.

One cannot reach a judgement about the present state of a people, about their patriotic and freedom-loving spirit, their progressive and revolutionary spirit, about the future which awaits them, without knowing and studying their past, their cultural and spiritual history, which in the case of the Arab and Persian peoples is truly brilliant. To the extent that time and space permit, here I am setting out some of my thoughts and conclusions about Arab and Persian civilizations and about the Islamic religion which has its source in that region.

Arab civilization in the 13th century

(The 6th century according to the hegira)

In the 13th century of our era, or the 6th century according to the hegira, the Muslim calendar, Arab

civilization, supported and encouraged by the Umayyad and Abbasid caliphs, had assumed great development and reached its culmination. The Arab culture outstripped the occidental culture of that period. This great culture became predominant, the lantern radiating light in the dark night of the Middle Ages and the destructions which had been brought about by the Roman Empire, the Barbarian invasions, the noblemen who knew how to use only the sword and not the pen, the time of priests and monks with some learning who, shut away in monasteries and abbeys built in isolated places in the forests or lonely valleys where they also tilled the soil, thought more about the "other world" than about life on earth. Nevertheless it must be said that amidst the chaos through which occidental civilization was passing, the medieval priests, despite their mysticism, did their best and tried to garner that culture which was passing into decadence. In the monasteries, monks like St. Francis of Assisi and St. Thomas Aquinas and their followers hand-copied the old vellum manuscripts and interpreted the sacred books: the New Testament, the Bible, etc.

During this period, however, the Arab culture, greatly stimulated by the Almohad[1] and Abencerag[2] dynasties in Morocco and Andalusia of Spain, experienced its "golden age."

When we study these periods of history we see

[1] Berber kings who ruled in half of Spain and in Maghreb in 1147-1269.

[2] Moorish family which had a powerful influence in the kingdom of Grenada in the 15th century.

that to enter the ancient Forum Romanum one had to wade through cow dung and this famous Forum was called "Foro (Campo) Vaccino" (the cow yard), while the walls of the palaces in Baghdad and on the shores of the Tigris and Euphrates were faced with marble, the Arab cities had proper drainage, water supply and paved streets lit with lamps; there were public baths and university libraries containing hundreds of thousands of volumes, poetry competitions were conducted, while the refined Arab emirs of Baghdad and Cordova, two centres of Arab culture, the one in the East, the other in the West, erected magnificent buildings, patronized knowledge and the sciences and promoted the setting up of schools, libraries and scientific associations, at a time when most of Charlemagne's noblemen did not know how to write their own names.

Great scientists and men of knowledge of the Arab and Persian peoples were:

Al-Razi or **Rhazes**.[1] Persian physician, alchemist and philosopher. He discovered and defined the diagnosis of smallpox and measles, he was an outstanding surgeon, the first to discover the laryngeal nerve. Several times he operated on cataract of the eye. He compiled a 24-volume medical encyclopedia, the Latin translation of which was known throughout medieval Western Europe.

Al-Hazis (died 903). Physician. He made the diagnosis of goitre and described the operation of lithotomy, which is used to this day, indicating

[1] Abu Bakr Mohammed ibn Zakariya, (Rayy, Khorasan, 860-923).

where the incisions must be made.

Al-Hazin.[1] Outstanding Arab physicist and mathematician, author of many works and treatises on mathematics, physics, astronomy and philosophy, many of which, including the *Treatise on Geometrical Curves*, have come down to our days.

In his work *Optics* he was the first to give a precise description of the eye with the aqueous matter, the cornea, the lens and the retina. There he speaks about the principles of the dark chamber, etc. and defends the thesis that light radiates from the object to the eye and not vice-versa. With this he proves the materialist thesis that the cause and content of vision is the object and not the eye.

Avicenna.[2] Persian philosopher and physician. Student of the works of Aristotle. In the field of medicine, specializing on the veins and arteries, he was the first to present the idea of the circulation of the blood. Author of the famous work *Canon Medicinae* in which he gives accurate descriptions of many diseases such as meningitis, the fevers, pleurisy, apoplexy, etc., and a great deal of advice on therapy and hygiene. His work, translated into Latin, spread throughout Europe and became the basis for teaching in the medical faculties of that time, remaining in use till the middle of the 17th century.

Avenzoar.[3] Arab physician, lived in Seville,

---

[1] Abu Ali Mohammed ibn al-Hayyam al-Hazin, (Basra, 965 — Cairo, 1039).

[2] Abu Ali al-Hussayan ibn Sina (Afshana, near Bokhara, 980 — Hamadan, 1037).

[3] Abu Harun ibn Zuhr (Andalusia, 1073 — Seville,

Spain. Averroes was his pupil and friend. His work *Teusir* or *Theisur* is known. He was the first to practice bronchotomy and was outstanding for his collection of precise data on luxations, fractures, inflammation, the mediastinum, the pericardium and pulmonary oedema.

Averroes.[1] Physicist, physician, astronomer, mathematician and philosopher. A universal genius in the full meaning of the term. He wrote the *Theriac* (a treatise on antidotes to venomous bites) and studied poisons and fevers. He cured his patients by prescribing emetics and counter-irritants, applying mustard plasters and vaccination. He defended and wrote commentaries on the works of Aristotle.

Aben Bithar.[2] Physician and botanist. He edited the works of Dioscorides and of Galen (Claudios Galenos), the Greek physician and philosopher, left a kind of encyclopedia of the medical knowledge of his time which is entitled *Simples*.

What colossal changes these great scientists and men of knowledge brought about in the development of that time! The progress of the Arabs was especially great in mathematics, astronomy and medicine, and with this they marked a new stage in the history of sciences. Engels said:

> "*...the principles of accurate analysis of nature began to be developed for the first time only among*

1162).

[1] Abu al-Walid Mohammed ibn Ahmed ibn Mohammed ibn Roshd (Cordova, 1126 — Marrakesh, 1198)

[2] Abdullah ibn Ahmed ibn Ali Bithar (Benandi near Malaga — 1248).

the Greeks of the Alexandrian period and later, in the Middle Ages, were developed further by the Arabs."[1]

* * *

The works and thoughts of the Greek philosophers of Antiquity, which were translated by groups of translators sponsored by the caliphs in Baghdad and Cordova, undoubtedly exerted an influence on the thinkers of Islam as early as the 9th century.

Those who were inspired by these works were called *fajlasuf* (philosopher) and the discipline itself was called *fajlasafia* (philosophy) in contrast to the theosophy which was inspired by mysticism.

The first of these philosophers was **Al-Kindi**,[2] a Motazilite who lived in Baghdad in the period of the Abbasid caliphs. The famous *Theology*, which was attributed to Aristotle, but which in fact was a neo-Platonian treatise, was translated on his initiative.

Al-Kindi adhered to the neo-Platonian theory that "the world was a creation of God," who under the name of the primary intelligence and through a series of intelligent hierarchal actions created the world *ex nihilo* (out of nothing). It was said this was the only theory in conformity with the Quran.

Al-Farabi.[3] A universal mind on account of his

[1] K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, vol. 2, Tirana 1958, p. 119. Alb. ed.

[2] Abu Yusuf Yagub ibn Ishaq al-Kindi (Kufah, 796 — Baghdad, 873).

[3] Abu Nasr Mohammed ibn Mohammed ibn Tarkan

profound knowledge in a series of fields of science. He was called Magister Secundus after Aristotle who was Magister Primus.

His many works consist of commentaries on the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle, as well as attempts to reconcile the doctrines of these two outstanding Greek philosophers of Antiquity.

In a series of other works based on Plato and Aristotle, interpreted in a neo-Platonic way, without ever relinquishing the Muslim belief which he considered the supreme expression of human reason, Al-Farabi elaborated a complete idealist-religious philosophy which was to exert its influence on such outstanding philosophers as Avicenna and others. Prominent in his philosophical doctrine is the thesis that in the ontological plane, the existence must be distinguished from the essence of created beings, in which the existence is simply predicative or an accidence of the essence, the "essential being" must be distinguished from the "possible being" in which the "possible being," in the final analysis, becomes essential for as long as it is linked with the "essential being."

The other important thesis is that of the "intelligence" which, through a series of acts, passing from one "intelligence" to the other, up to the tenth intelligence, created the whole cosmos, including the earthly world, together with man.

Al-Farabi's doctrine about the ideal organization of society, or "the perfect city," which could be achieved when society is based on the laws of

---

ibn Uzalag al-Farabi (Wasij, Turkestan, about 872 — Damascus, 950).

the Prophet and governed by his successors, the imams, is an expression of the influence of Plato's philosophy mixed with the Islamic philosophy.

The philosophy of Al-Farabi constituted the first attempt to establish harmony between the Islamic religion and human reason.

The most outstanding of all these philosophers, however, is the famous **Ibn Sina (Avicenna)**, an outstanding physician, thinker and politician. In philosophy he became a zealous student of the works of Aristotle and in his monumental philosophical work *Shifa* [Book of Healing], he tried to make a synthesis of the philosophy of Aristotle, interpreted in the neo-Platonic spirit, with that of the Islamic Eastern world. He elaborated an entire idealist philosophy of the "creation." For him the creation was the activity of the being as the primary intelligence which in itself is the "divine thought," which, through a series of acts, created the heavens and the world and, finally, also our earth.

The philosophy of Avicenna is also considered an illuminative philosophy because it contains the mystical idea of Al-Farabi about the intelligence and its creative activity. As the scientist he was, however, Avicenna frequently broke away from mysticism and in his *Physics* arrived at the idea of the motion and development of matter on the basis of natural laws of cause and necessity. With these materialist ideas he gave an impulse to science and caused perturbations in medieval scholasticism.

Al-Gazali.[1] Philosopher. He was the greatest

[1] Abu Hamid ibn Mohammed al-Gazali, known also as Al-Gazel, (Khorasan 1058-1111).

sufi. Professor of theology and law at the Nizamiye madresa (university) of Baghdad.

Al-Gazali fiercely attacked the philosophers and considered all their efforts to arrive at the truth in vain. He proclaimed his mysticism, the idea that the truth is achieved only by means of faith and intuition, in his work *Tahafat al-fajlasafia* [self-destruction of philosophers].

But philosophy found a great champion in **Ibn Rushd (Averroes)**, one of the most outstanding men of knowledge of the Orient, kadi (judge) in Cordova, physician and adviser to the Almohad monarchs. He had a major influence on medieval Europe with his doctrine which was called *The Double Truth*. Ibn Rushd said that there are different levels of understanding of a text like the Quran and its truth. One truth which is for the ignorant people, and is given in the language of the faith, and the other truth which is arrived at only by a few knowledgeable people and is given in the language of philosophy. Thus he practised esotericism, making philosophy a knowledge which could be achieved by only a select minority who were able to understand and interpret the "message." This reasoning allowed him to reconcile faith with philosophy and to defend the philosophy of Aristotle which he considered the supreme truth and the model for any philosophy.

* * *

The philosophy and method of Descartes nurtured the philosophical and scientific thinking of Europe and can be considered one of the deepest breaches in medieval scholasticism and one of the

most decisive breaks of the Occident from the Orient. By giving reason, the rational, supremacy over faith and the irrational, he became the founder of the new European culture and transformed it from a culture centred on God (theocratic) into a culture centred on man and his powers of reasoning (anthropocentric).

This debate in 17th-century Europe had taken place in the Muslim world as early as the 11th century. Al-Gazali decided the issue, but in favour of religion and not of reason. From that time onward philosophical research in the con-text of the Muslim theology had to be done according to the Quran, the law of Islam, which was considered "the science above all sciences" and everything had to be linked with it, and not with reason or according to reason. No amendment or improvement could be made to the law of the Quran. It was perfection itself, the word of Allah. Hence, religion undertakes the perfection of mankind. Gazali's theses are: "Islam is the absolute, the divine and the rational." "Allah in his omnipotence has created the world. To be or not to be depends on his will."

Islam in the Middle Ages

Mohammedanism, or Islam, is a "universal" monotheist religion. Islam, which developed in the 6th century of our era is a religious doctrine which, at the time of its birth, was linked with the social situation of inhabitants of the Arabian Peninsula — a vast desert of about 3 million square kilometres with the fortified oases of Mecca and Medina. Later it served as a means to transcend the limits of the desert to conquer other countries and peo-

ples and to create the great Arab-Muslim empire in subsequent centuries.

The development of Islam was connected with political and historical events of various peoples, with organizational forms of religious and administrative leadership at different periods and in different countries.

During this development of Islam there were schisms which split into opposing groups such as the Shias, the Sunnis and the Ismailites. The major schisms of the Shias, the Sunnis, the Ismailites and others retained "the essence of the Islamic dogma" expressed in the chapters and versets of the generous Quran, its monotheism expressed in the axion, "There is no God but Allah, and Mohammed is his Prophet." For the Muslims the Quran is "the sacred book" sent to Mohammed by God through the archangel Jebrail (Gabriel).

The essence of the monotheist dogma of Islam was the same as that of the patriarch Abraham and the prophet Moses of Judaism.

Islam was presented as the continuer of those beliefs of centuries before our era, but in fact the Quran is more complete and purer than the Bible (Torah) of the Jews, the Christian Gospel, etc. Islam recognized the paternity of the single God in these books and also recognized the earlier prophets as apostles of God. While recognizing Christianity, however, Islam did not accept the Christian "Holy Trinity" and in particular did not accept Christ as the "son of the Holy Father" (of God). That is, it did not accept the formula of "the father and son," while the "Holy Spirit" was acceptable to Islam.

If I am not mistaken, Islam accepted the messianism of the Hebrews in silence, since in the first chapter of the Quran there are three letters (one verset) which have never been explained by any of the great philosophers and interpreters of Islam in all its sects. The only explanation which has been given is that "these three letters are destined to be understood and will be understood only by a prophet, by a *resulullah*" (one sent by God).

The book of Moses, the "*Decalogue*"[1] (The Laws of Sinai), given in biblical accounts, are recognized by Islam as "the first book." The second holy book is the Quran, "revealed by God" to Mohammed in the caves of Mecca.

This is the source of the relative "tolerance" of Islam towards other religious. However, this "tolerance" is only relative, because in principle the chapters of the Quran speak about the war which must be waged against infidels (jihad), which implies those who do not accept or oppose the Islamic religion.

Islam was not simply a recreation of the Judaic religion of Abraham, or an Arab adaptation of biblical monotheism. No. Always based on the Quran, it reflected the Muslim thinking which is compatible with any religious anthropology and presented itself right from the outset as a universal religious doctrine.

Naturally, the chapters of the Quran are a series of laws and precepts which were developed and became established in a society of nomad bedouins

[1] According to the Old Testament, the Ten Commandments Moses received from Yahweh on Mt Sinai.

who lived travelling in caravans from one oasis to another in the vast spaces of the Arabian desert, merchants established in Mecca or Medina, and who in order to conduct trade, crossed the Arabian desert, Ar-Rahab, Sinai, the desert of Syria with caravans and emerged in fertile and developed lands.

Mohammed, who came from a family of the Kuraysh tribe, had travelled this course before he went to Jerusalem, whence, according to the Quranic legend, "he was elevated to heaven to meet Allah."

Muslim and non-Muslim thinkers and historians say that the first to adopt the religion and preachings of the Prophet Mohammed were the poor who suffered from the oppression of powerful tribes. It is supposed that "the punishment in that life," that is, in the afterlife, the punishment of the wealthy, was directed against those who ruled in the "commercial republic" and worshipped the various idols of the Mecca which Mohammed destroyed. Despairing of his fellow citizens in Mecca and seeing the increase of his opponents, Mohammed, together with a group of followers, considered leaving that city and emigrating to another centre in order to spread his prophecies. At first he thought he would go to a tribe of highlanders called Taif, where the Kuraysh had land and houses, but he found no support there. Then he decided to go to Yathrib, a town beside an oasis several hundred kilometres from Mecca, the inhabitants of which, unlike those of Mecca, were peasants rather than merchants. Mohammed and his followers arrived at Qoba near Yathrib in the last days of September

622.[1] After Mohammed settled there Yathrib changed its name and was called Madinat-al-Nabi [the City of the Prophet]. This city is called Medina to this day.

So it turns out that the economic situation created the message of the prophet and that Islam developed in a known context of social processes which had to do both with the crisis of Arab commerce of that time and with the conflict of poor nomad bedouins with the urban aristocracy.

It can hardly be supposed that the monotheism of the *hanifs*,[2] which the interpreters of the Quran explain with the term "believers," could have existed before the beginnings of Islam. The monotheism was a gradual evolution of Arab paganism. It is equally difficult to suppose a monotheism in the context of Mecca, with various faiths and idolatry. The moral preaching of the Quran created the tendency towards monotheism.

Islam as an expansionist ideology began during the lifetime of Mohammed, who made several unimportant expeditions outside the desert of the Arabian Peninsula. The real expansion and invasions were to come after the death of Mohammed from the caliphs, or his "representatives," the

[1] September 24, 622, "12 first rabi." This date marks the beginning of the year of hegira (emigration), the Muslim calendar, which was decided should begin on 1st of Muharrem, which coincides with 16th July 622.

[2] Syriac *hanif* — "heretic pagan" described by the Arabs as "religious dissidents" who lived in isolation. Monotheists who had nothing in common either with Judaism or with Christianity and who later joined Islam.

heads or leaders of Muslim communities.

Thus in the period of caliphs Abu-Bakr, Umar, Uthman, Muawiyah and Walid I, their rule extended to Iraq, Byzantine Palestine, Syria, Jerusalem, Mesopotamia, Egypt and Cyrenaica, Cyprus, Eastern Persia, Rhodes, Smyrna and Spain, and incursions were made in the direction of Gaul, the Transoxan East, India, etc. All this vast area, which included many peoples and countries, was invaded within a century after the death of the Prophet.

In these conditions Islam assumed development. Together with the faith and the dogma, the Islamic civilization linked with them developed and what was called **the Arab Islamic society emerged**. The empire that was created was Arabized and Islamized at the same time.

The theory that claims that the Islamic Arab empire was created after the death of Mohammed through human phalanxes which came one after the other from the Arabian Peninsula is not completely correct. In fact, before this expansion whole tribes of bedouins had infiltrated into the fertile lands of Syria and Mesopotamia. This nomadism and the settling of bedouin tribes in these countries had existed since the time of the Roman occupation.

As various scholars and historians say, the alphabet which was spread as Arabic script was worked out in Hirat of Mesopotamia, the capital of the Lakhmids (Arabs).

The source of this alphabet is still undetermined, because it was called "semitic" for linguistic and not racial reasons and because it was linked with the script of the Arabs mentioned in the *Nabataean* writings, an Aramaic population which lived

in Mesopotamia, and with the Syriac script of the Gasanids, a tribe which inhabited the lands in the southeast of Palestine and fought against the Byzantines and the Lakhmid tribe. These peoples had disappeared before the emergence of Islam, but in the time of Mohammed and after he began his preaching of the Muslim faith and after the Arab invasions, isolated Arab populations re-established themselves in the south of present-day Jordan and lower Iraq.

How can the occupation by the Arabs of the territories of all those peoples and kingdoms be explained, how can it be explained that the forces of Byzantium were defeated and even Costantinople threatened, that the Sassanid dynasty was liquidated, and so on?

The more organized Arab-Muslim attack began with the caliph Umar,[1] a great personality and talented fighter. His authority was legendary. He created an organization, military and administrative at the same time, which he strove to keep under his strict rule and control. The troops of his military units were lighter and more mobile than those of his opponents whose accoutrement was heavy and who defended themselves in fortresses, where the Arab infiltrations, before and after attacks, damaged them heavily. As to their numbers, this cannot be ascertained accurately, either for the Arabs or for their opponents. It is said that the Arabs were in greater numbers. Likewise, the local troops conscripted by the Byzantine generals showed little enthusiasm for defending a regime which oppressed

[1] Mecca, 581 — Medina, 644. Ruled from 634 to 644.

them.

The wars between the Byzantines and the Achaemenids,[1] the dynasty that ruled Persia for 4 or 5 centuries, had worn out the military forces of on both states. Later, the empire of the Sassanids[2] had been weakened in the same way. Therefore, they were unable to withstand the attacks by Arab generals.

What was the Arab strategy? A clever and methodical type of warfare. First of all, the Arabs thoroughly acquainted themselves with the terrain, the places from which they could gain entry, they prudently restrained themselves from frantic attacks during their marches, guaranteed the success of their offensives by the prior establishment of a number of support points, winter quarters, etc.

The Islamic religious belief which followed the Arab occupation became a factor which played a role destructive to the religious beliefs it encountered and unifying to the new material and spiritual society which it promised.

In various parts of the Byzantine Empire, the Christian doctrine had not adopted the conformist orthodoxy of the Empire. The monophysitism of the Armenian Church, the Syrian Jacobite Church and the Coptic Church of Egypt and Ethiopia, which predominated, opposed the official theological formulas and spread discontent.

Likewise, in the Sassanid Empire, too, the official Zoroastrianism was attacked by Manichaeism,

[1] Persian dynasty, founded in 550 before our era.

[2] The Sassanids ruled in Persia from the years 226 to 651.

the doctrine which preached the coexistence of two opposing principles — good and evil, and by Mazdaism, a dualist doctrine which obliged its followers to chose between the two principles — good and evil which were fighting for the division of the world, doctrines which affected the intellectual strata and gave the religion a more social tinge, and so on.

The vast extent of the countries occupied by the Muslims and Arabs was a heterogeneous agglomeration of peoples with their own individual customs and a certain autonomy. Islam unified and brought them together, but nevertheless created new social and administrative problems. In the first place, it created the rulers and the ruled, the Muslims and the non-Muslims, those who did not believe in the Muslim religion.

The hierarchy established by the military victories held the top commanding positions in the fighting forces. This hierarchy could not be other than Muslim-Arab.

The caliph was the leader and defender of the unification. The Muslims were the rulers rallied round the caliph and occupied privileged positions. The local people, the natives, occupied places in the administration.

Thus, a universal form of government and leadership of society was established. In time, many people adopted the Islamic religion and sought to participate in responsibility and in benefits. In this way delicate problems arose over the issue of governing and the social relations between people. Later this had consequences for the Islamic-Arab civilization which, as we said, extended over the

vast area that was called at that time "*dar-el-Islam*" [the Islamic world].

Such a hierarchy in the administration and sharing of benefits affected the possession of privileges over the land, rather than over the people.

The adherents of Judaism, Christianity, Zoroastrianism and other Persian beliefs were able to save their lives and retain their own faiths only by precisely respecting the teachings of the Quran. The Arabs who did not adopt the Islamic religion were considered and treated as slaves (mamluks).

Within the Empire, three clearly defined categories of people were formed: the triumphant Muslim-Arab invaders, the non-Arab peoples who were converted to the Islamic religion, and the Arab and non-Arab peoples who remained faithful to their original religious beliefs. At the same time, however, the process of assimilation began.

The use of the **Arabic language** spread throughout the whole Empire to such an extent that in the 8th century the Umayyad Caliph Abd-al-Malik translated into Arabic all the administrative registers which, up to that time, had been kept in different languages, such as Greek, Latin or Pahlavi (Persian). New coins were minted, too. The figures which existed on the Byzantine or Sassanid coins were removed. They were replaced with phrases from the Quranic legends.

During the occupation the autochthonous peoples of the Empire, too, emerged and distinguished themselves in military leadership. For example, the peoples of North Africa, converted to Islam, of course, and especially the Berbers, played a major role in the occupation of Spain. One of them was

general Tariq[1] after whom Gibraltar was named.

Likewise, after the Abbasid revolutionary movement, the Iranians of Khorasan were accepted into the local Muslim-Arab troops and served in the anti-Umayyad propaganda. However, these were the first steps to the overthrow of the dynasty of Umayyad[2] caliphs. Their admission to the Caliph's army led to the formation of the mercenary army of the Abbasid dynasty,[3] another dynasty of caliphs which ruled until the 13th century. This army was comprised of mercenaries of slave origin who were to play an important role in medieval Muslim society.

Throughout the whole Empire the Islamic doctrine was retained, Arab patriotism dominated, but the development of the Islamic culture was enriched from the cultures and customs of different peoples that made up this conglomerate. This, of course, could not have taken place simply and quietly, but aroused many quarrels and debates which continued right throughout the 8th century and into the 9th century.

An example is that of the Persian poet and thinker Ibn al-Mukhafa, a Zoroastrian converted to the Islamic religion. He proposed to the Abbasid caliph[4] that he should take the decisions himself

[1] Tariq ibn Ziyad. Islamized Berber. Invaded Spain in 711. Gibraltar took his name: Gebel Tariq — Mount Tarik.

[2] Dynasty of Muslim-Arab caliphs which ruled from 650 to 750.

[3] 750-1258.

[4] Al-Mansur al-Mahdi (775-785).

and create a code for the entire empire. But this was not accepted. So as opponent of the Quranic law and because he was a follower of Manichaeism and because he translated the book "Halila and Dimna" of the Pahlavi dynasty he was executed in Basra.

This shows that the Persian culture, the Achaemenid or Sassanid neo-Persian culture and the Greek culture contributed their part to the Islamic culture.

The wisdom of the Greeks, Greek science and logic, were adopted through translations made on a large scale. In fact, it was the Arabs who re-introduced the great culture of ancient Greece to Europe.

The various caliphs, and especially those of the Abbasid dynasty, encouraged the adoption of the Greek culture as an aid and reinforcement for the Islamic dogma and in order to oppose the other dogmas which had their source in other beliefs, especially Persian beliefs.

In this way, the Islamic-Arab culture was enriched, but remained compact, because it was based on Islam, affirmed the Islamic-Arab unity and the universality of the Quranic law and because of the widespread use of the Arabic language.

Because of the Islamic religious teaching, the Arabic language became the universal means of communication within the Empire. Islam, as a dogma, a doctrine, became universal both for the Arab peoples and for the other non-Arab peoples.

Nevertheless, little by little, the Arabs were eliminated to some extent, especially from the privileged posts of the Empire. They retained their his-

torical prestige and place of honour. The peoples were robbed of the rights which religion gave them, while the "call" that Islam must triumph remained. However, this too, gradually assumed the form of a hope to be realized over thousands of years, and much less eschatologic. But this call was always remembered and served the ambitions of various dynasties for the creation of empires. Herein lay both the strength and the weakness, the rivalry, which frequently damaged the social-religious unity at which the universal Islamic dogma aimed.

The specific local characteristics, the tendencies and customs that survived the pre-Islamic beliefs were retained, to some extent, in the new Islamic-Arab society. As a result of this, at the moments of philosophical debates and schisms to which the extension and administration of the Empire gave rise, the rivalries between various caliphates exerted an influence on the interpretation of various chapters of the Quran.

The cradle of Islam was Arabistan, the great Arabian Peninsula. That was its birth place and that is why the Arab influence was confused with the Islamic religion.

Arabistan exerted a major influence in the broad sphere of Islam in the Middle Ages.

The Muslims of this epoch virtually identified Islam with Arabism, irrespective of the fact that Mohammed himself, when he preached the Holy Law, the Quran, was clear that within the Arabian Peninsula itself there were tribes, or clans of bedouins settled at oases or roaming about as nomads, or merchants of Mecca and Medina, with different beliefs and customs, who were subsequently uni-

fied under the influence of Islam, and emerged as Islamic-Arab phalanxes for the occupation of places more favoured by nature and for the conversion of the populations of those countries to the Islamic religion.

Subsequently, through the various schisms and dynasties, this identification of terms weakened and nowadays has undergone very profound changes. Mecca and the Qaaba as sacred places and the religious belief in the Quran are all that remain from universal Islam. Today Saudi Arabia is simply another Muslim state in the Arabian Peninsula.

As to the nature of Islam, opinions are divided. Some say that it has the fighting character of the fury of the nomad bedouins thirsting for plunder through *razzias* (raids), while others give it the urban mercantile character, which the residents of Mecca and Medina had.

Of course, these views are open to debate, because in the 6th-7th centuries and later, in the Middle Ages, Medina and Mecca were not as we see them today. They were villages, stopping points for caravans, trading centres, and the description of Medina in the Quran as "Madinat-al-Nabi" was given to show that it was a centre of the faith (din).

There Mohammed began his real activity to ensure that the new religion he preached triumphed. To this end, at Yathrib (Medina) he established the active centre of the community and founded the first mosque (masjid), thus laying the bases not only for the spread of Islam but also for its transformation into an active force. The first objective he set himself was to unite the various groups, in-

cluding the Jews, who lived in this centre.

These groups were divided as follows: the true believers who came from Mecca were called "muwajurun"; the residents of Yathrib who were considered supporters were called *antchar* [aide] the stubborn Arabs on whom it was difficult for the newcomers to impose obedience, and who were ready to change their stand according to circumstances, were called "munafikun," hypocrits, or hesitant elements.

In order to win the support of the Jews, Mohammed made them certain concessions, for example, turning towards Jerusalem during prayers, and the ten days of fasting, the "ashura," in imitation of the "tishri" of the Jews.

Later, following invasions, other developed urban centres were created.

The cities that were created, beginning from Persia, Syria, Egypt, North Africa and extending to Spain, not only developed as centres of merchants and craftsmen, but also served as military camps and support points for invasions. These cities were gradually populated, became centres of caliphs or their governors who ran separate provinces. In these cities, the caliphs and their deputies, as well as other members of the administrative hierarchy, built marvellous residences, cultural and philosophical life flourished, and there was a flowering of the poetry and music characteristic of the Arab people with their nostalgia for the vast spaces of boundless deserts, with pronounced notes of the mystical poetry and the local music and art, which was adapted to the Islamic religion and Arabism.

Thus, the Sassanid and the Byzantine empires

became an entity in which a single culture developed and extended from Basra Kufa and Shiraz to Fustat of Egypt and Kairouan of Tunisia.

Arab chronicles speak of a "fortress city" encircled by lofty battlements built about the middle of the 8th century[1] on the banks of the Tigris River by the 2nd Abbasid Caliph, al-Mansur. Within this "fortress city," which later took the name Baghdad, which it retains to this day, al-Mansur had his majestic and luxurious palace, while the economic-trading centre was shifted outside the gates of the citadel, thus, the real city and its various social activities developed outside the "fortress city." Baghdad became the capital city of the Abbasid dynasty.

Almost at the same time,[2] a similar thing occurred on the other side of the Tigris, where another palace was built by al-Mahdi, al-Mansur's successor.

In this way, big urban centres were created as important points for the development of the Empire's trade from the south to the north and from the east to the west. They became flourishing cities. However, the impoverishment and weakening of the caliphs who were unable to retain their temporal power, and especially the losses caused by wars and natural calamities, such as the floods of the Tigris, Euphrates and the Nile, prevented the continuation of their prosperity and eventually put an end to their splendour.

Even to this day the glory and fame of Baghdad emerges in history and in legends as the capital city

[1] The year 762.
[2] The year 768.

of the Abbasid dynasty in its "golden age." This splendour overshadowed the residences of the Iraqi caliphs, Raka or Sumara.

Another outstanding city of the Middle Ages was Basra, while Kufa suffered from the competition of Baghdad. In Egypt it was the city of Fustat, the old Cairo, that assumed such development in the Islamic Middle Ages that it overshadowed Alexandria and ancient Babylon. There were similar developments in other cities, such as Nishapur, Shiraz, Isfahan in Persia, not to mention many cities in Spain newly established by the Arab occupiers or revived and beautified to achieve great splendour, like Cordova.

In these big mercantile centres social life and culture developed, too. Various Islamic philosophical schools exerted their influence, a thing which was linked precisely with the importance of the caliphates, as for example, in Baghdad or in holy places such as Meshhed and Qum in Persia, Kerbela and Nadiafi in Iraq, etc.

In time the Islamic-Arab Empire was invaded by different peoples such as the Seljuk Turks, the Gaznevids, etc. This empire had many contradictions which resulted from the vast extent and configuration of its territories, with mountains and valleys which frequently kept the peoples far from the direct influence of the caliphian administration; from the peculiarities of the customs and cultures of the different peoples who comprised it and, in the first place, from the class antagonism, from the economic exploitation of feudal lords and administrators, who had become great landowners and imposed heavy taxes in the form of tithes and tributes.

In the West, the Islamic-Arab Empire was invaded by the Berber tribes. The Almoravids[1] who ruled in North Africa (Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia) were obliged to cope with the attacks which came from the desert of Central Africa and as far away as Nigeria. Likewise, in Spain, the minor monarchs of Berber-Arab-Islamic origin were at war with the Castilian Christians. Here mention must be made of the Almohad Berbers of Cordova.

These developments also had consequences in the Islamic culture of the Maghreb-Iberian countries.

Hence, the Islamic-Arab Empire became a conglomerate of peoples. Besides the Arabs, there were native peoples like Armenians, Turks, Persians, Copts, Berbers, Andalusians and others, who were not of one race, who retained their own languages and were not assimilated at all. Thus, Azerbaijan became the base from which Babak, the leader of an opposition movement,[2] operated.

General al-Mamun Tahir proclaimed his independence in Khorasan, the Samanids of Transoxania broke off relations with the caliphate, the Black Zauj tribes settled in Syrian Seistan. In the 10th century a group of Shias created a new caliphate, the caliphate of the Fatimids of Ifrikiya (present-day Tunisia). This caliphate occupied Egypt, while the Zayidite Shias established their

[1] Berber feudal dynasty which ruled in North-Western Africa and Southern Spain in the 11th-12th centuries.

[2] This movement assumed great development in the years 826-837.

caliphate in Yemen, and so on.

These events showed that the Empire was being eroded by rivalries and broken up into different principalities. This state of affairs developed in the 10th-11th centuries and was worsened by the invasions of the 15th-16th centuries.

Of course, the links of the Muslim faith existed, but it is difficult to determine how much influence they exerted upon the elimination of this diversity, and to what extent the local beliefs, the rivalries of clans and regions, fostered it.

It must also be borne in mind that it is difficult to place on the system of Islamic institutions a label formed on the basis of the concepts of political sciences of the Occident, or of other countries outside the Islamic-Arab Empire.

The practical experience of centuries of Muslim history has brought particular arguments, sometimes contradictory, despite their apparently logical conclusions, but which, in fact, are contrary to the Islamic preaching. For example, Islam admits no distinction between various individual and collective elements. It preaches: "The sole and final aim of man is to serve God, to obey his will and to apply the Quranic law."

It is difficult to define the Islamic theoretical conception of the "state," because nothing divides its political concepts from its religious concepts. While being a preacher of the Quranic law, Mohammed, at the same time, was also "head of state." Nowhere in the Quran, however, can one find a definition of who should lead the *ummah* [community of the faithful of Islam] and who the state and imperial institutions. Likewise, the Quran

does not say who should replace the Prophet after his death. This was a problem which always remained open and gave birth to rivalries, feuds and schisms.

As soon as Mohammed arrived in Yathrib (Medina) he made a treaty, an agreement, with the 12 Arab tribes and 10 Jewish tribes in the city. This treaty can be considered to be the first "written treaty in the world." In fact it was a juridical act divided into two parts: the first part confirmed the brotherhood of Muslims and created a definite entity — the *ummah* i.e., the 12 tribes of Yathrib and the refugees from Mecca. The second part comprised a "political alliance" with the 10 Jewish tribes of Madinat-al-Nabi. These Jewish tribes retained their religion and had the same rights as the Muslims.

This treaty is important because it created the Muslim state from a heterogeneous population, that is, the tribes existed but they were in solidarity to create a joint political organism.

In this treaty Mohammed, as the apostle of Allah, represented the central power with the right to declare war or establish peace, and also had the monopoly of the right to pronounce sentence in the final instance, that is, the right of final judgement in trials.

War between tribes was prohibited, private individuals could not conduct trials or pronounce verdicts, but were obliged to turn to the government, the central power of the Prophet, because: "The Prophet has competences to order benefits and prevent evil." Mohammed was not an "autocrat" because God was the only "source of author-

ity both for the leader (Mohammed) and for the people."

The state system which Mohammed set up in Medina for a Muslim state was preserved in broad outline by his four deputies, the caliphs, after the death of the Prophet, and was considered by them an ideal, simple and realistic system. After this period there were breaches in the constitutional theory of the state and in the practices of those who governed. Thus, the system established by Mohammed was fully respected for only 30 years.

The first breach appeared with the advent to power of the Umayyad dynasty. Its founder, the caliph Muawiyah, ibn Abu Sufyan,[1] who established the centre of the caliphate in Damascus, opened the doors to Syrian and Byzantine influence. Muawiyah was attracted by the luxurious life of Byzantium, which the friends and associates of the Prophet such as Abu Bakr, Umar, Ali, Hasan and Hussein, disdained and rejected.

During the period of his rule Muawiyah turned into an autocratic ruler. He gave more importance to temporal power and development than to spiritual preoccupations, that is, to the application of the Quranic law. The caliphate lost a little of its religious character and the personal authority of Muawiyah was enhanced. In order to run the country politically he formed a council of Sheikhs, the *shura*, in Damascus, as a consultative and, at the same time, executive body. In this way the dynastic system which continued through a number of Mus-

[1] Mecca, 603 — Damascus, 680. He was caliph from 658 to 680.

lim-Arab caliphates was established in the 7th century.

Nevertheless, the principles established by the Prophet Mohammed continued to inspire the philosophical thinking of the Muslims through the centuries. Even today in the Muslim world, generally, politics cannot be conceived apart from the religion.

Neither the Quran nor Mohammed laid down any special form of government or administration. The best structure of government which the Muslims have to choose is that which permits and makes obligatory the application of the law of Allah — the Quran.

Even though the caliph is considered the successor to the Prophet, he cannot make amendments or additions to the law of Allah — the Quran, which was dictated to the Prophet by Jebrail (Gabriel).

Can we speak of "democracy" in Islam? In the original Muslim institutions the Arab and bedouin traditions and customs were retained. The democratic character was reinforced, also, by the liberation of people from the tyranny of different religions, which was brought about through the spread of the Islamic religion, and also by the fact that the governments were more tolerant.

Some considered the Islamic system a republican system. Perhaps this is because the Quran recommends that consultations and debates should take place between the leader and the citizens.

Likewise, it is known that the Quran says, "God does not like the oppressors." The first caliph, Abu-Bakr, that is, the first to succeed Mohammed, addressing his subordinates, said: "Obey me ac-

cording to the tradition, as long as I obey Allah and the Prophet. If I do not obey them, you must not obey me."

"Brotherhood" in Islam was a principle and a juridical issue. Hence, in principle there should be material and spiritual unity in the community between those who govern and those who are governed.

As was pointed out above, following the death of Mohammed, the question of temporal and spiritual power led to bloody feuds and caused schisms in the ranks of Islam. There was no directive in the Quran which said how the *ummah* should be organized, which, in the socio-philosophical context of Islam, is astonishing.

It took three centuries after the death of the Prophet, three centuries of schisms, wars between individuals, clans and dynasties, to create an administrative and institutional form of the temporal power which, of course, was closely linked with the spiritual dogma, with religion.

The caliphate, as a system deriving from the logic of Islam, has not been considered by the Muslims a fundamental dogma of religious faith. Mohammed appointed Abu-Bakr solely to lead the collective prayers of the community, the *ummah*. In the mentality of the Prophet's associates, however, by analogy with the imam, who leads the collective prayers and is. at the same time, also the political leader of the community, Abu-Bakr was considered caliph with the same competences. Hence, it turns out that the state and the religious community exercised a single joint function.

In theory, the caliph was either chosen by the

people, like Abu-Bakr, or appointed by his predecessor, like the caliph Umar. The system of the caliphate, its material and religious prerogatives, evolved and changed as a result of the interpretations of dogmatic and philosophical schools and finally the caliphate was transformed into a monarchy. But the power of the interpreters of the Quranic law, of the imams, wise men and caliphs was transformed into a political power with tendencies to weaken, and they did weaken, the prerogatives which the caliphate had assumed over three or four centuries. Thus, when Mustafa Kemal destroyed the caliphate, which was a revolutionary act, there was no disturbance in the ranks of Islam, and this because the caliphate had departed from the Islamic-Arab tradition of the Prophet.

After the death of the Prophet the Islamic dogma had its ups and downs. As long as Mohammed and his associates were alive the tradition was preserved and had its important role. However, the extension of the Arab territory and the contact with the different peoples and beliefs of the empire had their influence on the debates, on the interpretations of the Quranic law by the various imams, wise men and caliphs, and also profoundly affected the organization of the state power.

After the death of the Prophet, the idea of "prophecies" was considered over and done with. Only certain Shia sects believed that the "will of the Allah" on how they should be guided continued to manifest itself. For the others, the Prophet brought the word that he was expected to bring and no other prophecy was expected. Now the question was to interpret and safeguard the message he brought.

There was confusion and chaos over the application of the law, the levying of taxes, the punishment of thieves, etc. Some took certain steps and tried to adapt actions to the doctrine, others followed the tradition of the time of the Prophet.

Beginning from the 8th century several juridical schools were created in the Arab world, at Medina and Mesopotamia. The most important are the Malekite school (named after its founder Malek ibn Anas[1]) and the Hanifite school (named after its founder Abu Hanifa[2]) which laid down the doctrinal foundations. With the passage of time they became the official sunni schools which elaborated the Quranic law and codified Muslim justice.

These schools laid the foundations of the first manuals of justice. After them and in discussion with them, other doctors, imams, scholars and interpreters, like the imam al-Shafi and the imam ibn Hanbal, also emerged with their views.

They had their adherents and created their own ways of explaining and interpreting the Quranic laws which were not restricted to the field of justice alone but extended to the ethical-moral field, too.

Going into more detail about their doctrine, the Hanbalites were traditionalists in theology and rigorous in morality. The Shafites accepted reasoning and, by analogy, accepted various relations between God and his creations and adopted a more flexible theology, with a tendency to mysticism. While the Hanifites proved to be more independent and were united more through a rationalist the-

[1] Muslim-Arab jurist (Medina 710 — Medina 795).

[2] Died in Iraq in 767.

ology.

Now orientalists try to determine whether these differences in views are "reflections of individual opinions," or the result of the influence of other civilizations, especially the Greek civilization with its logic.

Many theological discussions had major political-philosophical consequences and led to the emergence of a number of schools and schisms.

The acknowledged main theological issue, behind which political issues were hidden, was the question of the imam and his functions, that is, the whole question of the status of the imam. The essence of the matter was whether the rights of Ali, the son-in-law of the Prophet, were to be restored against the prerogatives which the caliphs before and after him assumed.

Herein lies the basis of the two schisms in the Muslim world and their doctrines: the one Shia, the group of partisans (Shia) of Ali, and the other Kharijite, the former partisans of Ali who revolted against him later.

However, the problem became complicated not only over the functions of the imam. War broke out between Ali and his opponents, Talha and al-Zubair supported by Aishe, the widow of Mohammed. The battle which took place between them in the year 656 is known as "the Battle of the Camel" because Aishe took part in this battle mounted on a camel. This was the first civil war amongst Muslims. Talha and al-Zubair were killed in the fighting, while Aishe was taken prisoner and sent to Mecca where she died. After the battle, the theological discussion continued over who caused the

bloodshed. Ali's opponents laid the blame on him. Some claimed that "the sinners" must go to "hell," while the remainder preached neutrality.

This debate put in doubt the issue of faith in the imam or, you might say, the status of believers. The discussion became embittered, it was demanded that a definite stand should be taken towards this civil war and the very existence of the caliph was put in question. The question was presented in this way: Can he who commits a mistake or an injustice remain caliph?

The Umayyad caliphs demanded unconditional obedience from their believers and encouraged the Murjite tendency according to which believers must not be judged in this world. Hence, anyone who believed in Islam could not be expelled from the community (ummah).

In opposition to them, the Kharijites, whose doctrine was developed after the battle of Syfen[1] between the caliphs Ali and Muawiyah, demanded strict observance of the Quranic law. According to them, anyone who violated this law was expelled from the community and, if he was not killed, was considered an infidel, *kafir*. Hence, the caliph was placed under the judgement of all, because they were the guarantors of the truth.

Muawijah triumphed in the battle of Syfen and was recognized as caliph of Syria.

One of Ali's sons, Hussein, refused to recognize the caliph Jazid I and rose in insurrection against him. The battle between them took place at Kerbela (to the south of Kufa) where after five months

[1] July 1, 657.

of fighting Hussein and his followers were massacred.[1] In this way the Shias had their own martyrs and from that time on, this date has been a day of mourning for them.

However, this issue, that is, the question about the "faith" and the "faithful," was only one of the questions which was raised in those early years of Islam. Another question which was raised was: Can alien ideas have been introduced into and influenced the faith and dogma of Islam?

In many chapters of the Quran it is said that "Man will be judged in the other world for the good or the evil which he has done in this world."

But by whom will he be judged? By the almighty, Allah, say other chapters of the Quran. Because it is "Allah who both confuses man and leads him on the right road." In other words, man as God's creature is deprived of the will to act and personal responsibility. Hence, God is omnipotent, while man enjoys little freedom.

The theory of *jabrism* [compulsion] strengthened *murjism* to establish complete obedience towards the ruling imam.

The Shias described the Umayyad caliphs as usurpers and the government circles of Medina as men without faith, without religion, without souls, who violated the Quranic law. Thus, as early as the final period of the Umayyad dynasty the discussion began about the concept of God and about the nature of the Quran as "the word of God."

The thesis that "the Quran was not revealed but

[1] October 10, 680, or 10 Muharrem 61 according to the Muslim calendar.

was compiled" arose about the 7th or 8th century. The question of the date is obscure, but this thesis is attributed to Jad ibn Dirham who lived in the 8th century. The Umayyad caliph, Halil Al-Kasr, had him beheaded.

This thesis had consequences later, because it led to doubts about the question of "God."

A certain Jahm from Persia went even further: by defending the thesis that "God did not speak to Moses," he implied indirectly that he had not spoken to Mohammed, either, and likewise, by saying that "God could not have had Abraham as his friend," he inferred that what had occurred was the opposite of what the Quran, following the Biblical tradition, wrote on this question.

It can be supposed that the thesis of this "mysterious" Jahm, who was beheaded, arose as a reaction against anthropomorphism.

The translation into Arabic of books of the philosophers of ancient Greece, a thing which took place at the end of the Umayyad dynasty, might have had an influence in this.

These people named Jad or Jahm were opposed to the Umayyad dynasty and wanted to overthrow it. Therefore, it can be accepted that their thesis "the Quran was not revealed but was compiled" represented a political struggle.

In any case it marks the beginning of a "rational approach" to the question of the dogma.

With the advent to power of the dynasty of Abbasid caliphs, a new theological school, which its opponents called Motazilite, began to emerge and take concrete form. The precursors of this school were two persons who belonged to the Persians

converted to Islam (mawali), hence, freed slaves loyal to the Iranian traditions: Wazil ibn Ata and Amr ibn Ubaid, who showed up both in the political and in the religious planes.

The Motazilite tendency did not have clearly defined contours and its followers were isolated groups or individuals who practised "neutrality" towards the contradictions which had arisen in the doctrine.

According to heresiologists, the political aspect predominated amongst them, although the religious and intellectual aspects also existed. It was claimed that those who were called Motazilites strongly supported the Abbasid caliphs, but the chronicles do not stress this aspect to any extent.

Wazil maintained a neutral stand between the partisans of Ali and the camp of his opponents. He also came out against the Kharijites who "irrevocably" condemned Ali whom they had previously supported.

According to anecdotes, from this emerged what the disciples of Wazil subsequently called "the intermediate position of the sinner." They were opposed to the Kharijites who defended the thesis that the "sinner" was the "Cain" of the religion, a disloyal infidel.

It was Amr ibn Ubaid who formulated the thesis that man is "the free arbiter of his own actions" and this infringed the attributes of God and the nature of the Quran. This thesis had an intellectualist tendency because it adopted a concept about God who had to be just, hence, who was not free in his own justice, a God who was all-in-all, about whom no attribute and no description were given, except

that he "existed." With such a definition of divine justice and divine unity, in fact the religion was deprived of any power and any arbitrary initiative.

Hence, for the Motazilites God was no longer the Almighty whom man should fear, but a reasonable being who should be respected, and you should not pray to him to request something, because "since God is just there is no need to pray to him."

In these intellectual discussions between the Kharijites and the Motazilites about the form and substance of the issue, whether in accord or in discord, not only the political problems of the time but also the philosophical currents of Antiquity exerted an influence.

In the 9th century the caliph Al-Mamun[1] supported the Motazilite thinkers who gave the problems under discussion philosophical consistency.

Motazilism became the doctrine which defended the thesis that "there is one God and one justice" (*Al Tahwid Ma-l-hadh*). Hence, it sought a theodicy, which insisted on the extra-temporal character of God, God is something outside time. He is neither substance nor accident. He is outside any human category. He has not been created and does not create. This is a completely negative definition of God which transformed him into a simple abstraction.

This concept has its origin in the philosophical reasoning of Antiquity which the Motazilites began to discover and study. Reasoning began to take the

[1] Abd Allah al-Mamun, Abbasid caliph (Baghdad 786 — near Tarsus 833).

place of blind belief in the dogma. This shook the traditional ideas that attributed everything, science, life, the word, the power, etc., to God.

This position aroused great discussions because it infringed the traditional view that everything had its source in God, that he was the creator, and it presented the new idea which did not accept the holy transcendence of God, the origin of everything from Allah. These discussions were held by interpreting the various versets of the Quran. Here is one such verset: "He who does good does it for himself; he who does evil does it against himself."

The Motazilites did not accept and rejected the concrete qualifications, the statements that "God sees everything, hears everything and punishes everything." Just as on the question of the new concept of the oneness of God, the Motazilites defended the thesis that man is free in himself and his actions. According to them, "evil cannot be attributed to God. The mistakes of man would be his own responsibility." Man was completely responsible for his own actions.

Thus, it turned out that there was no reason for the Prophet to intervene in all these actions, and hence, there was no longer room for the mercy of God.

To this starting-point of moral and religious life other considerations of a philosophical character were added.

The principle of "justice" required that **Allah himself should "conform" to "justice" and judge men "justly"** in the function of "good and evil," but this "good or evil" must be defined by men themselves, thanks to their capacity to think.

The Motazilites restricted the will of God by saying that "God must conform to the reasoning of men." In this way Motazilism was elevated to a religious philosophy in which **"reason"** occupied a position superior to the "holy power of God." It gave reason miracle-working powers and considered it the sole criterion in the work of man and in the question of the faith.

From this it arrived at a devaluation of the Quranic message, which was considered not "revealed" but "compiled," hence not eternal.

Because it retained the fundamental aspects of the dogma, although displaying possibilist tendencies, Motazilism could be considered rigorous and sectarian as a philosophical current of Islam. In the 20th century some Islamic currents attempted to adopt Motazilism, but in fact it can be neither adapted to nor equated with any Occidental philosophical current.

The movement of Motazilites became so powerful that, for a time, under a number of caliphs it became the official doctrine and the Motazilites themselves became intolerant in their dogmas, declaring that "he who is not a Motazilite is not a believer."

Despite the reaction which the ardent proselytism of Motazilite caliphs like Al-Mamun caused and confronted, it is clear that the phenomenon itself had a major impact on the medieval development of Islam. New schools, debates and problems arose and other systems of interpretation were proposed.

The imam Ibn Hanbal opposed the Motazilites. He called Motazilism an "anti-rationalist theol-

ogy," hence, opposed to the traditionalist belief, and described their doctrine as "literalist and fideist."

Al-Ashar, a dogmatic theologian of the orthodox wing and ex-Motazilite, represents the opposition of Hanbalite traditionalism and through his views comes out in open defence of the Muslim faith. Asharism created its own school.

Although all these ideological contradictions retained their abstract character they led to schisms. The first schism was linked with the struggle between the partisans of Ali who wanted to make him caliph, and his opponents. The Shias presented different aspects and branched out into variants with different options and doctrinal and political stands.

These branches retained one common custom, their reliance on rationalist arguments, and sought to place these alongside the legitimist traditions which recognized Ali's rights as the heir to the Prophet, who himself had invested Ali with the powers of the Imam during his lifetime.

There were discussions about the legality of the heredity right of the Imam and this gave rise to divergences which also became the cause of schisms in Islam.

The Shias or Zaidites defended the thesis that the only lawful imam caliphs were the descendants of Ali, that is, of Fatime, the daughter of the Prophet and wife of Ali, naturally, if they possessed exceptional qualities of faith, science, and courage. Hence the Shias defended legitimism.

The Shias themselves were divided in two other branches, which are called Imamites and Ismai-

lites. These two branches believed in the existence of hereditary imams who originated from Ali and Fatime, who would be appointed "generation after generation" from father to son until the final one, the twelfth for some and the seventh for others, would disappear.

Hence, some awaited the "return" of the 12th imam (the Maahdi) who had disappeared in the 9th century. On his return he would establish a new, more just order, and would condemn his opponents. These were the Imamites. Meanwhile, the others awaited the 7th imam, Ismail, who disappeared, or was "hidden," in the 8th century, and would reappear and establish justice. These were the Ismailites.

To this day the partisans of the 12th imam expect the return of the Maahdi, the one who is to establish the kingdom of pure justice and true Islam, while those of the 7th imam founded the Fatimidite caliphate in Ifrikiya.

In fact the circumstances led Imamite Shiism, which should have gone to divine voluntarism, to the rationalist tendencies of Motazilism, combatting the anthropomorphic interpretations and considering the truth which was represented in the Imam as a truth which responded completely to reason. With its rationalism Imamism was also intellectualist.

Imamite Shiism and Motazilism were opposed to the advent to power of Sunni[1] caliphs.

For this the Imamites were hunted down by the

[1] From the word "Sunna" — rigorous observance of the Quran and the tradition of the Prophet.

Sunni caliphs and considered themselves persecuted by them.

The tragedy of Imam Hussein at Kerbela speaks of the tragedy of passions of the medieval Orient.

The Imamites liked to meditate on the past suffering of the holy family of the Prophet, while their thinkers liked the esoteric doctrine which accepted the whole system and recommended a spiritual life based on initiation into secrets and the advice of the imam.

Fatimidite Imamism flourished for about 3 centuries in Ifrikiya and in Egypt. It was based on an elaborate philosophical doctrine and defined the "superhuman" nature of imams or caliphs in regard to their appearance and disappearance. This was an esoteric doctrine which adapted the Quranic truths to the emanationist system of ancient philosophers. The Imam was considered the universal spirit which governs the world. This tendency became more pronounced with the neo-Islamism of the 11th century in Almud of Persia, where the Imam was considered above the Prophet and above the Quranic law, because it behoved the Imam to proclaim a new revolution and inaugurate a new era.

Thus, although Mohammed appeared to be respected, he had been rejected by the extremist branch of Ismailism.

* * *

Islam has also had its false prophets, but had their movements, for example that of Motazilites in the 8th and 9th century (followers of a Muslim

theological school which sought to bring together supporters and opponents of Ali), not been suppressed whenever they were created, they would not have permitted Islam to have had that spiritual development which it had later.

In this direction the *Sufi* movement was a movement of poets and mystics (they took their name from the white woollen robe — *suf* = wool — which they wore).

The mystical and ascetic current of Sufism presents itself as a special line of alleged perfection and saintliness of the believer, who could divorce himself from the world and ascend to Heaven by means of ecstasy. The Sufis abjured worldly blessings in order to get closer to paradise, to become the *muharabun*, those appointed by God to be closest to him.

The members of this movement of dervishes formed secret societies to which they were admitted after a special preparation and indoctrination through prayers, mysterious movements and dances which were called *zijer*.

The Sufi sect of dervishes was comprised of:

— Mevlani dervishes;

— Rufai dervishes;

— Bektashi dervishes.

It is claimed that Sufism was influenced by Indian (Buddhist and Vedic) and Christian mysticism.

There is also the **Wahabi** sect whose leader is called Wahab[1] (bedouin). The Wahabites are considered the most puritanical and fanatical sect.

[1] Muhamed Ibn al-Wahab (1703-1792).

Most of them are found in Saudi Arabia.

* * *

In these notes it is not my intention to write the history of Islam or of that great Arab civilization which spread to many countries and peoples of the continents of Africa, Asia and Europe and had its influence on the development of civilization and science in these countries. This influence was reciprocal. Modern civilization and the progress of present-day science have their embryo in the civilizations and scientific developments and achievements of former epochs. The crusades, the armed religious expeditions of Christian Europe against the Seljuk Turks allegedly for the liberation of the "Holy Sepulchre" and Jerusalem from the unbelievers, especially the 4th crusade, which was initiated by Venice and ended with the occupation of Constantinople, had their negative influence on the Arab culture and philosophy. But, at the same time, the Arab culture and philosophy influenced the thinking and philosophical sentiments of European philosophers and men of knowledge of that period. Hence, you might say that European civilization arose after the decline of Arab civilization.

The Arab civilization had its flowering and decline. This decline was not solely the result of the devastating invasions of Mongol hordes or the crusades of the fanatical Popes of Rome and the great feudal lords of Europe, who opposed the development of philosophy and science. With the passage of time, Islam itself no longer cultivated but inhibited the further development of true scientific knowledge. Why? Because the Quran and its chap-

ters were considered and propagated as the culmination of all achievements and human development. The cult of fatality, the sense of inferiority towards the major phenomena of laws of nature, which were presented as punishment because of the wrath of Allah over the sins of mankind, were implanted in its believers. Hence, man did not and could not have any power to restrain or prevent these major phenomena of nature. On the contrary, he had only to submit to them, which in reality meant that mankind must submit without any opposition to the Quran, which represented the word, the will and the desire of Allah.

This absolutizing of the role of the Islamic religion and the power of Allah, accompanied with draconian laws against any opponent, became major obstacles to the further progress of Arab society, or more precisely, became the reason that the Arab sciences were unable to continue to develop the objective aspects of the progress of society, to the extent they should and when they should, in their own territories. Thus, even though the Arab philosophers were the first to accept the Greek philosophers and became the bearers of their ideas to European civilization, the time came when medieval Europe opposed them with Plato and Aristotle, who became tombstones for the further development of Arab culture and science.

* * *

Today the Arab peoples have risen in struggle and revolt against ignorance and backwardness, for their social liberation and for general development in accord with the time in which they live. How-

ever, the realization of these just aspirations of these peoples is not so easy, because their enemies are numerous and very powerful, and because the force which links and unites them, the Quran, their religion and the Arabic language, in which this sacred book is written, is insufficient.

Apart from this, the schisms which emerged centuries ago in connection with the interpretation of the Quran, as well as the undermining work of the imperialist bourgeoisie and its reactionary philosophers, fostered their division and individualism. The imperialist bourgeoisie strives with all its means to make the Arab peoples irresolute about rising and fighting for an order and a state truly in their national and social interests.

However, we are witnesses to the fact that the flow of events in the Middle East is not going in the way that the imperialists, the social-imperialists and world reaction desire. The Arab peoples of this great oil-bearing zone have awoken, have risen and are boldly demanding to take their fate into their own hands. In many Arab countries a just struggle is being waged against all types of imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism and their economic-political and military potentates. This is a positive development which all should support, because it represents revolutionary progress, the future, and responds to the interests and desires of peoples who are aware of their oppression, who live in poverty and ignorance, even though the countries in which they live were the cradle of a brilliant civilization and contain great wealth which, if it were not plundered by foreigners, could bring them well-being, longer life, and the capacity to defend them-

selves against their savage enemies.

When this resolute and just struggle of the Arab peoples against world imperialism and its local tools and lackeys, this mounting revolution, frees itself from the negative aspects of the religion which is still clinging to dominant positions, which plays an inhibiting role and frequently incites wars between Shia, Sunni and other factions, then it will certainly end with the victory of the Arab peoples more than a hundred million strong, and will mark a new stage and a new page in the history of mankind.

WEDNESDAY
AUGUST 17, 1983

CEAUSESCU, THE ARABS AND ISRAEL

The role of intermediary which Ceausescu plays, not only between China and the United States of America, but also between other countries, has long been known. He has been no less involved in mediation at very difficult moments between Israel and a number of Arab governments.

Now that a real situation of occupation has been created in Lebanon by the Israeli army and the "multi-national force" (of the United States, France, Italy and Britain), when the anger and indignation amongst progressive mankind over the grave and inhuman crimes which the Israelis organized last year against the Palestinian civilian inhabitants of Sabra and Shatila have still not died down, Ceausescu is welcoming and holding cordial talks with Shamir, the foreign minister of Israel.

What are they talking about? As the news agencies say they are discussing "mediation" to re-establish diplomatic relations between Israel and the Soviet Union and other countries of Eastern Europe.

Undoubtedly, Ceausescu has undertaken this role and will try to carry it out, because, like all his other attempts at mediation, it might bring him some economic advantage. However, I think that the greatest aid which he is trying to give Israel at these moments and in this situation is to somewhat reduce the indignation of international public opin-

ion towards the criminal anti-Arab and anti-Palestinian policy of Tel Aviv.

This is not the first time that Ceausescu has come out on the side of Israel and he frequently has cordial meetings and talks with the heads of Tel Aviv. Next to Washington, the capital city to which the heads of the Israeli government go most frequently, is Bucharest. The heads of a number of Arab countries go there, too. It is regrettable, however, that Arafat and some others in the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization have illusions about these meetings.

THURSDAY
NOVEMBER 3, 1983

BRAVO THE AFGHAN PATRIOTS!

As news agencies report, in recent days the Afghan patriots attacked the general staff of the Soviet army of occupation and the embassy of the Soviet Union in Kabul. The reports also speak of bold actions in the other major cities of the country and attacks on Soviet strategic military positions. Fire, uninterrupted fire, on the foreign occupiers!

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN THE CYPRUS PROBLEM

The legislative assembly of the Turkish community in Cyprus has proclaimed the formation of the "Turkish Republic of Cyprus," that is, the independence of the northern part of that island.

This event will certainly have repercussions and consequences in the international arena, will worsen the already bad Turkish-Greek relations, will increase the danger of superpower intervention and will exacerbate the existing very disturbing situation in the Mediterranean.

What has occurred is the work of the superpowers. At the proper time we will take our stand. We have supported the just struggle of the people of Cyprus, both Greek and Turkish, for freedom and national independence; we have been and are of the opinion that a just and lasting solution to the problem of Cyprus can be achieved only through talks between the two communities and without any external interference.

SATURDAY
DECEMBER 10, 1983

A SERIOUS AND HARMFUL SITUATION WITHIN THE RANKS OF THE PALESTINIAN MOVEMENT

One of the main aims of American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism, Zionism and Arab reaction has always been to sabotage any movement for national and social liberation in the Middle East, which is one of the regions of the world richest in oil. In this context their immediate objective is to destroy the liberation movement of the Palestinian people by inciting feuds and fratricide amongst Palestinians. While there have been and still are contradictions between them over the question of oil, of spheres of influence or the possession of strategic regions, over the liquidation of the Palestinian people they have no contradictions, but on the contrary have a tacit all-round agreement. Through their intrigues, through the activity of their secret agencies, through compromising individuals with money and blandishments, the enemies of the Palestinian people have managed to achieve some results.

That there have been opposing tendencies, groups with differing programs and aims within the Palestine Liberation Organization, is a truth which cannot be covered up. Likewise, the other fact cannot be denied, namely, that between these opposing currents and groups there have been political squabbles, sometimes very grave ones, which have

had a negative influence on the struggle of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland, to their own national territories. Now, however, it seems to me that matters have gone much further and the quarrels have become much more profound so that they are endangering the movement itself and the continuation of the struggle of the Palestinian people, in general.

For some days the news agencies have been speaking about a serious split in the ranks of the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, between Arafat and one of his military aides, Abu Mousa. These quarrels have reached the point of bitter armed clashes with serious consequences for both sides. Abu Mousa, supported by the Syrian military units deployed in the Beqaa Valley, has risen in revolt and is fighting against Arafat and his supporters, compelling them to withdraw into the besieged Lebanese city of Tripoli.

What is Abu Mousa demanding? Under the accusation that Arafat has betrayed the revolution and usurped the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Abu Mousa is demanding his resignation from the leadership of that organization and his final withdrawal with all his supporters, about 4,000 men, from Lebanese soil.

For his part, Arafat is accusing Syria and Libya, with which he has disagreements, of being the main inciters of Abu Mousa and trying through him to take control of the whole leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization and hinder the Palestinian liberation struggle. Meanwhile the fratricidal fighting continues with the greatest severity, a thing which is truly regrettable, because it serves

only to sabotage the struggle and the revolution of the Palestinian people and helps to destroy their unity. The Israelis and all the enemies of Palestine and the Palestinian people are fanning up and pouring benzine on the flames of these fratricidal clashes, warming their bloodstained hands and gloating over the Palestinian blood which is being shed every day.

Without doubt the Palestinian people and the genuine Palestinian fighters are opposed to this split and this fratricidal fight and I would like to hope that reason will triumph over the hatred implanted by others, over the individual jealousy and non-national interests. The Palestinian people and their valiant fighters need unity amongst themselves in order to triumph over their savage and merciless enemies, the Israelis and their patrons, the American imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists and the Arab reactionary feudal-bourgeois forces. The split is in favour of these enemies and their anti-Palestinian and anti-Arab plans and plots.

MONDAY
DECEMBER 19, 1983

THE END OF A VERY HARMFUL FRATRICIDAL WAR

After a great deal of fighting and all-round pressure and faced with the danger of even greater damage to the organized Palestinian forces and the major damage which could be inflicted on the local inhabitants, Arafat agreed to withdraw, together with his supporters, from the Lebanese city of Tripoli where he has been besieged for some days.

In the news agency reports we see repeated facts which show that this business has been decided and the question being discussed now is how and with what means about 4,000 Palestinian fighters together with their armaments and families will be evacuated. Profiting from the new situation which has been created, the Israelis have imposed very onerous conditions: the Palestinians are to leave, but first must surrender their heavy weapons. Second, Arafat must be "handed over" to be "tried" and "executed" for "the crimes he has committed against the Israelis"! Otherwise, say the rulers of Israel, their warships will attack and sink any ships which transport the Palestinians. This is how far their unrestrained arrogance and savage hate for the Palestinian people have gone.

Meanwhile, those who hatched up this fratricidal war amongst the Palestinian fighters, including the American imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists, are "holding out the hand," "offering their aid" and "showing them the ways" how to

withdraw from Lebanon, etc. For example, it has been suggested that Arafat and the Palestinian fighters should leave on ships of a country neutral in this conflict; that they should board the ships under the protection of the "multi-national force" stationed in Beirut; that the transport ships should be protected on the high sea by French and Italian warships, etc. Meanwhile the Israeli government is putting its threats into practice, has stationed its warships close to the port of Tripoli and from time to time makes artillery attacks on the places where the Palestinian fighters have begun to assemble.

We shall see how this business proceeds. In any case the Palestinian fighters have received another heavy blow which will undoubtedly have consequences on the further development of their just struggle to return to their homeland.

WEDNESDAY
DECEMBER 21, 1983

THE PALESTINIANS HAVE LEFT TRIPOLI

News agencies report that the departure of the Palestinian fighters from the Lebanese port of Tripoli on Greek transport ships, escorted by Italian and French warships and under the close observation of Israeli warships, began, at last, yesterday. Arafat is on one of the Greek ships.

The ships will call at a port of Cyprus, from there the Palestinians will go in various directions, for example to Tunisia, South Yemen and, by air, to Iraq.

Last evening I saw on TV some scenes of the forced departure of the Palestinian fighters. Amongst them I saw men who held a rifle high with one hand and a small son or daughter with the other. Where are these now homeless people going to go? What awaits them where they go? What does the future hold for them, their families and their children?

What a bitter fate the long-suffering Palestinian people have had! Nevertheless I am convinced that irrespective of these heavy blows, irrespective of the struggle waged against them from all sides, they will triumph. The peoples cannot be conquered! The Palestinian people cannot be conquered! We have always been on the side of the Palestinian people and always will be.

FRIDAY
DECEMBER 23, 1983

ARAFAT MEETS MUBARAK

I am following the Odyssey of the Palestinian fighters who have left Lebanon for still unknown destinations. I read a news agency report that one of the ships which is transporting the Palestinian fighters had entered the Suez Canal. Yesterday, Arafat, who was on board it, landed at the port of Ismailia and went to Cairo where he met the Egyptian president, Mubarak. This meeting is causing a great sensation. Why? Because it is a completely unforeseen, unexpected meeting.

As everyone knows, Egypt has accepted the Camp David accords and has signed the peace agreement with Israel. It has established diplomatic relations with Israel. Hitherto the Palestine Liberation Organization and Arafat personally have been opposed to these actions of Egypt and, indeed, they left Cairo for this reason.

We shall soon learn what is really hidden behind this change and this unexpected meeting of Arafat and Mubarak and what its consequences will be for the struggle of the Palestinian people.

THE MIDDLE EAST IN THE YEAR 1983

Notes

This year, too, the open political-economic rivalry, and the indirect military rivalry between the two imperialist superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, in the Middle East, as well as the problems linked with this were in the centre of international events. There were new dangerous developments in the Arab-Israeli conflict, the war between Iran and Iraq continued fiercely, the resistance of the people of Afghanistan against the Soviet occupiers assumed more extensive and greater proportions, etc. At certain moments the further evolution of the events indicated that the hotbeds of local wars in this region might lead to much greater clashes, with grave consequences for the neighbouring countries and peoples, too.

As I have written previously, the real basis of all the inter-imperialist rivalry in the Middle East is the oil and the military strategic positions of the Arab countries. For years the United States of America and the Soviet Union have been clashing fiercely, openly and surreptitiously, over the oil of the Middle East and for strategic military positions in this region. Without oil, their economies as a whole, and their mighty military machines in particular, cannot go on for long. Without dominating the land, sea and air routes of communication which pass through this very extensive region it is

difficult for them to realize their plans for occupation and expansion in the vast territories of the continents of Asia and Africa and the boundless Pacific and Atlantic Oceans.

These are the main reasons why both the United States of America and the Soviet Union have declared and treat the Middle East region, which extends from Algeria to Iran, as "spheres of their national interests" for the defence of which, as they say publicly, they are ready to risk everything, including war. Proceeding from this viewpoint, during 1983 they have gone over from public threats to concrete actions and measures.

The United States of America dispatched a whole naval fleet and special landing detachments to the vicinity of the Persian Gulf in order to use the force of arms if Iran were to close the Strait of Hormuz and prevent the oil tankers from passing through to the ocean. In the Mediterranean it reinforced the 6th Fleet to the maximum and landed more than 2,000 marines in Lebanon. Each of these military actions was carried out under the pretext of "defending the national interests" of the United States!

The Soviet Union acted similarly. It dispatched a part of its naval fleet to the Pacific Ocean, strengthened its Mediterranean fleet to the maximum, etc. It, too, did all these things in order "to defend" the national interests of the Soviet Union in these regions!

Hence, the two imperialist superpowers, this year more than ever before, put into practice the gunboat policy in the Middle East, totally disregarding the independence, freedom and desires of

the peoples of this region. This gunboat policy and the open military actions of both sides were expressions of the further exacerbation of what is called "the Middle East crisis."

At the same time, "special envoys" of the presidents and governments of the two superpowers undertook frequent journeys with top secret special missions to Tel Aviv, Riyadh, Cairo, Damascus, Amman and many other capital cities of the countries of the Arab world to offer "the aid and mediation" of their countries, but in reality to exert pressure and organize further plots against the Arab peoples and, first of all, against the Palestinian people.

During the year I have recorded in my Diary some of the moments and events which have impressed me most from the illegal and inhuman activity of the imperialist superpowers and Israel, as well as moments from the heroic struggle of the Palestinian, Arab, Afghan and Iranian peoples against the plots of the two superpowers. I have also recorded some of my thoughts and feelings, the grief which I feel over the misfortunes which have descended upon these peoples and the injustices perpetrated against them, as well as the great joy which I feel over their exemplary struggle for their freedom and national independence, against the savage Israeli, imperialist and social-imperialist occupiers and enemies. Here I am making a summary of these general events.

The Arab-Israeli conflict and its complications

The year 1983 can be considered the year of the consolidation of the de facto occupation of Leba-

non by the Israeli armies and the "multi-national force," which is made up of special detachments of the American, Italian, French and British armies. This occupation was carried out, first of all, to strike a new blow against and to destroy the organized Palestinian forces centred in Lebanon. This means the practical application of the second part of the package plan of Israeli, imperialist and Arab reaction to sabotage and completely paralyse the just struggle of the Palestinian people to return to their own homeland.

After fierce fighting, the Israeli army, armed to the teeth with the most modern weapons and comprised of about a hundred thousand men, occupied Beirut and the main part of the southern zone of Lebanon. The Palestinian fighters resisted heroically, but, abandoned by their false friends, in the end were obliged to withdraw from Beirut to the zones north of the city and in the direction of the Beqaa Valley under the "surveillance" of the "multi-national force."

Nevertheless, the occupation of Lebanon and the implementation of the plan for the destruction of the organized Palestinian forces could not be fully achieved without breaking up and damaging the unity of the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples. Thus in 1983 the world was faced with two fratricidal wars incited by Israel, the United States and certain reactionary circles of the Arab world. Fratricidal war was incited between various factions of the Lebanese people, between Christians and Muslims, and even between various Christian and Muslim sects as between the Druze, the Shia, the Sunni Muslims, the Maronite Christians, and others. This

war had very grave political and economic consequences for Lebanon and, amongst other things, led to the destruction of the cosmopolitan and formerly wealthy city of Beirut. The other fratricidal war was that which was incited within the Palestine Liberation Organization, between Palestinian fighters, between Arafat and his supporters, on the one hand, and Abu Mousa, at one time Arafat's right-hand man, on the other hand. This war ended with the complete withdrawal from Lebanon of Arafat and about four thousand partly disarmed Palestinian fighters. From all this fratricidal fighting it was Israel that benefited and the Palestinian people and their liberation movement that lost.

During this year, in the context of the campaign of terror against the defenceless Palestinian population and the attempts to drive from Lebanon about three to four hundred thousand Palestinians who had settled there since Israel drove them from their homeland, the agents of Israel in Lebanon organized and carried out in cold blood a massacre unprecedented for its ferocity in Sabra and Shatila, two undefended Palestinian camps on the periphery of Beirut. In the darkness of the night and under the supervision of the Israeli regular army which allegedly had the duty to protect these camps from surprise attacks, some Lebanese fascist gangs in the service of Israel slaughtered more than 1,500 people — men, women, old folk and children, entire families, without discrimination, in the most barbarous way.

Those who perpetrated this inhuman crime as well as their inciters and supporters covered their tracks, were taken under protection and remained

unpunished. Nevertheless the whole of progressive opinion throughout the world condemned them and branded them war criminals.

During this year a very grave situation was created, also, in the internal political affairs of Lebanon. The country remained almost continuously without a government and administration capable of running affairs, caring for the people and opposing the actions of the Israeli occupiers. The reactionary Lebanese circles took advantage of the situation, organized and armed themselves and carried out military actions against progressive Lebanese forces, especially against the Palestinians, contrary to the national interests of Lebanon.

Nevertheless the Lebanese people were not defeated. They took up arms and forcibly resisted the Israeli army of occupation and the other occupiers, especially the American and the French. Israeli, American and French military targets were attacked, and serious damage was inflicted on them.

Hence, the situation became no more peaceful, even though the Israeli army occupied Beirut and the inspirers and supporters of Israel dispatched thousands of "peace-keeping specialists" (the multi-national force) to Beirut. Therefore the Israeli air force and navy and the air force and naval fleet of the United States of America, which included the aircraft carriers "Nimitz," "Eisenhower" and "Independence," and tens of heavy cruisers, continued to bombard and strike the positions of the Palestinian and Lebanese fighters in the mountains around Beirut and especially in the Beqaa Valley with all their firepower.

The American air force and naval artillery have

also bombarded the joint Arab-Syrian forces which have been deployed in the Beqaa Valley with the approval of the Lebanese government.

As for the Soviet social-imperialists, as far as I can see from their deeds and their bombastic statements, it seems that they are doing nothing at all about these things that are occurring, about the attacks which are being made on the Palestians and the Lebanese or even about the attacks which are being made on the Syrians. Why do I say this? I say this because even though the Soviet Union has a "treaty of friendship" with Syria, it has played and is playing the role of the deaf and the blind. This is not the first time that the Soviet social-imperialists have betrayed and left "their Arab friends" in the lurch. The Soviet social-imperialists are interested, more than anything else, in selling them the maximum number of weapons so that they use them up as quickly as possible and then buy more weapons, rather than in carrying out the pledges they make in "the treaties of friendship" which they sign with one country or another, and in engaging in open conflict with the American imperialists.

Now there is more and more talk about a "package political plan" said to be prepared and hatched up under the personal patronage of the American president, Reagan, for the settlement of the Middle-East crisis. This plan does speak about the creation of a dismembered "Palestinian state" under the domination of the anti-Palestinian king of Jordan, but its main objective is to guarantee secure borders for Israel. This is the third instalment in the achievement of the aims of Israel, American imperialism and Arab reaction, for the dispersal of

the Palestinian people and the sabotage of their just struggle.

Our people have special sympathy for the Palestinian people, because they have waged and are waging a resolute and heroic fight, and we have supported and will go on supporting them in the ocean of loneliness and betrayal in which they find themselves today. Even though betrayed and abandoned as the Palestinian people are today, they will triumph. They will triumph, for they are fighting for a just cause, for their return to their homeland usurped by the Israeli aggressors with the open support of the American imperialists, the Soviet social-imperialists and the reactionary forces of various Arab countries.

The Afghan people will kick out the Soviet occupiers

These days see the completion of four years since the occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviet army. The Soviet social-imperialists committed this fascist aggression with the hope that everything would quickly be forgotten and that the Afghan people would be deceived and subjugated just as quickly. But they were gravely mistaken. Not for one moment have the Afghan people reconciled themselves to the occupation of their homeland by the hordes of the Soviet social-imperialists. On the contrary, they have fought and are fighting arms in hand so effectively that the Soviet government has been obliged to dispatch continual reinforcements of fresh troops and the most modern weapons, including chemical weapons, to carry out mass bombardments by means of the air force and artillery,

to depopulate, burn and massacre whole villages, to employ the policy of scorched earth and to pack the prisons with defiant Afghan fighters. What means have the Soviet social-imperialists not used during these four years to subjugate the Afghan people? But they have been neither subjugated nor intimidated and they will not be subjugated or intimidated.

During 1983 the armed resistance of the Afghan fighters to the Soviet occupiers assumed more extensive and greater proportions. The powerful garrisons of the Soviet occupation army have been the targets of repeated attacks by the Afghan patriots and not just in mountainous regions as in the provinces of Paktya, Kandahar and Herat, etc., but also right in the capital of the country, Kabul. On a number of occasions the "fortress" Soviet embassy and the buildings in which the general command of the Soviet occupation troops is entrenched have been attacked. Generals, other senior officers and thousands of soldiers have been killed, scores of advisers have been taken prisoner, military airports have been attacked and airplanes, helicopters, tanks, artillery and other means of warfare destroyed, while large quantities of weapons have been captured. The very ground is ablaze under the feet of the Soviet occupiers who are obliged to live in panic amongst a people who know them not as "friends" but as savage, perfidious enemies who must be fought to the death. Not for one moment can the Soviet occupiers feel themselves secure on Afghan soil, irrespective of the number of soldiers and the amount of fire power they have deployed there.

The valiant fighting people of Afghanistan, who are poor and armed mainly with weapons captured from the occupiers, are setting a very fine example of how foreign occupiers, whoever they are, however powerful and heavily armed they may be, can and must be fought, of how the ability to fight, the qualities of bravery and self-sacrifice are acquired in the course of the fighting to defend their freedom and their homeland.

Frequently when I read reports or see on the TV shots of the fighting and daring actions which the Afghan fighters carry out against powerful formations or motorized columns of the Soviet army of occupation, jumping from rock to rock amongst the snow and ice, the rain and countless other difficulties, and armed only with rifles, my mind goes back to our glorious National Liberation War, to the heroism and sacrifices of our valiant, patriotic and revolutionary people. Of course, our war was at a much higher level and much better organized and, above all, it was led by our Communist Party on the basis of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. Our people, rallied in the Democratic Front organization, closely united, without distinction as to region or religion, were more conscious about the ideals for which they had to and did fight and about the character of the state which they would build on the ruins of past regimes, after the victory. Nevertheless, I repeat that the struggle of the people of Afghanistan is a just struggle, and the Afghan patriotic fighters deserve to be honoured and respected by all the patriotic forces of the world, to be supported so that they can step up their liberation war even further until they drive the Soviet oc-

cupiers completely from their homeland. And, whether the Soviet social-imperialists and their local lackeys like it or not, this will certainly be realized in the not too distant future. The people of Afghanistan will regain their freedom and independence.

On the Iraq-Iran war

The Iraqi rulers began the war against Iran from fear of the influence in their country of the Iranian people's revolution against the Shah and his patrons, the American imperialists, and also with the incitement of the Soviet social-imperialists, the American imperialists and Arab reaction in order to overthrow the new Iranian regime. It seems to me that Saddam Hussein and his clique thought that this war would be over very quickly and that the Iranians would soon surrender on account of the state of their army after the revolution, allowing the occupation of the rich oil fields near the border, in Khuzestan and elsewhere. But it did not turn out like that. The Iranian army withstood the initial attacks of the Iraqi army, launched counter-attacks which liberated the border zones occupied by the Iraqis, and continued to drive deeper into Iraq.

The war has dragged on for three years with heavy fighting and bloodshed, sometimes more quietly, sometimes simply with attacks with artillery, rockets and aerial bombing, the latter especially from the Iraqi side. Already the war has caused very great losses of human life and material damage which is estimated at several tens of billions of dollars on each side.

The aims for which Iraq began the war have not been achieved and Saddam Hussein has several times sought mediation to end it, but without rendering account for his deeds and without assuming moral and material responsibility for the damage which has been inflicted on the Iranian people. Quite rightly the Iranians have not accepted this manoeuvre. However, those who incited this war and who foster it with arms supplies are also opposed to the ending of the Iraqi-Iranian war.

Who are those who want to prolong this war endlessly? They are the Soviet social-imperialists, the main suppliers of Iraq with all types of the most modern weapons; they are the American imperialists who, by means of Iraq, want to carry out the counter-revolution in Iran, to overthrow the present regime and re-install the barbarous Pahlavi regime, to regain control of the great oil wealth of Iran and the fabulous privileges which they enjoyed only a few years ago; they are the arms monopolies of certain other imperialist countries, such as France, Britain, etc. which sell Iraq supersonic aircraft, missiles and chemical weapons; they are the Israelis who want the Arabs to chop each other to pieces. Finally the Arab reactionaries, who are scared to death of the revolutionary spirit and progressive movements of the Palestinian people, the Iranian people and any other people in this region, also want to keep it going.

This year the conflict not only continued, but assumed more extensive proportions and became more bitter. Iraq has hit and is hitting inhabited centres and cities outside the war zone and especially a number of oil fields and the refineries at

Abadan, Kharg Island, Bandar-Khomeini and elsewhere, employing modern means of warfare, including supersonic aircraft, missiles and modern warships which it has received from the Soviet social-imperialists and the other imperialists. On these occasions the Iranian government has declared officially that if the imperialist powers continue to assist the regime of Saddam Hussein and enable it to attack the Iranian people and their property with such means, it will be obliged to take measures to close the Strait of Hormuz and stop the passage of oil tankers from the Persian Gulf to the high seas. Closing the Strait of Hormuz would mean that the western capitalist countries, including the United States of America, would be deprived of 40-45% of the oil needed to keep their industry going. Therefore they have all ganged up against and increased their pressure on Iran. Indeed, the United States of America has threatened armed intervention. To this end some time ago the Americans deployed a big naval fleet in the Gulf of Oman as well as other special troops and means for rapid intervention in the Persian Gulf zone. Regardless of these pressures, the Iranian government is maintaining a firm stand in defence of the interests of the Iranian people and resolutely opposing the anti-Iranian policy of the two superpowers.

The prospects for putting an end to this war are gloomy and its prolongation increases the possibility of military intervention by the superpowers at various strategic points of the Persian Gulf, increases the dangers of even greater flare-ups and complications in this region of the world and further exacerbates the Middle East crisis.

* * *

The year 1983 proved once again that the Middle East crisis cannot be resolved through the "package political plans" or the "mediation and aid" of the two superpowers. On the contrary, they are trying to prolong this crisis as much as possible because only in this way can they realize their plans to sabotage and undermine the movements for national and social liberation of the Arab peoples, continue to ensure colossal profits from the trafficking in arms and maintain their control of the extraction and processing of Arab oil, which entails the enslavement, oppression and exploitation of the Arab peoples.

However, the crisis in the Middle East can never be solved until the martyred Palestinian people regain their homeland stolen from them by the Israeli aggressors, and this will be achieved only when the political, economic and military influence of the superpowers and the other imperialist powers has been dealt powerful blows and been totally rejected by all the Arab peoples. In this sense, this year showed that the primary question which faces the Palestinian people, the Lebanese people, the Afghan people, the Iranian people and all the other Arab and non-Arab peoples of the Middle East is to avoid falling again into the traps and the misleading and disruptive plots of the superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and Israel. They must establish and strengthen genuine unity among themselves in order to resist and overcome the united forces of Israel, the American imperialists, the Soviet social-imperial-

ists and the local feudal-bourgeois reactionary circles. Only resolute, uncompromising struggle, based on genuine Arab unity, will lead them to victory, to true independence and freedom so that they can utilize their colossal wealth, their oil, for their national development and social progress.

* * *

The events of the last two years in the Middle East and their further development cannot fail to have consequences in the region surrounding this zone, too, the Mediterranean, Europe, Africa and elsewhere.

In the Mediterranean they have been exploited by the two imperialist superpowers to increase and strengthen their naval fleets to such a level as to create serious concern and grave threats to all the Mediterranean peoples. Europe has been filled with new land and air bases and the number of long- and medium-range nuclear missiles has been increased.

The arms race has assumed even greater proportions and, even though the capitalist-revisionist world is in a grave economic crisis, the arms production industry continues to grow and bring the capitalist magnates colossal profits. This whole arms race is being carried out mainly by reducing the funds which ought to be spent to raise the standard of living of the working people, especially in the sectors of services, health and education, the production of cheaper consumer goods, etc. The question presents itself: How long will the working masses put up with this crazy arms race of the monopolies for profits, which is at their expense?

Certainly this cannot go on for long and without doubt the peoples will rise. Then the capitalist-revisionist bourgeoisie will be obliged to take new, more severe measures of oppression and will seek new ways to get out of the crisis. One of these ways will be the threat of the outbreak of a new world conflict. Therefore, the clamour about "disarmament" which is being made by the United States of America and the Soviet Union, as well as a number of other countries such as France, Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany, which have militarized their industries and are engaged in the arms traffic, is intended to deceive progressive public opinion and keep it under control.

We see that French imperialism, too, has entered the race to capture new markets. France has begun to pursue its old colonial policy and is trying, directly or indirectly, to return to all those countries which were the French spheres of influence or, as they are called, "the French-speaking countries" in the Near East, Lebanon and some countries of Central Africa. Today, apart from selling them weapons and trying to re-introduce French culture, France has sent detachments of paratroops to those countries. They include the detachments which have been sent to Chad, where a bitter struggle for influence is being waged between France and Qaddafi of Libya, and those dispatched to some other African countries. Hence, France is seeking to regain the place in the sun which it had before the Second World War.

Apart from Chad, there are other hotbeds of war in which the situation is critical in Africa. That is, the situation in Angola, South Africa, Namibia,

Mozambique, Somalia and other countries.

In Tunisia, major clashes broke out between the masses of the people and the local police and army over the increase in the price of bread and flour. The clashes ended with many deaths on the people's side and President Bourguiba was obliged to annul the government decisions on increasing the price of bread and flour.

In Morocco there was a major bloody clash between the army and the people, mainly the student youth, for the same reasons. In fact, in both cases the main reason for the clashes was the resistance to oppressive measures and police violence.

In the Balkans the imperialist superpowers are fanning up the flames and want to turn it into a powder keg again as it was in the past. On this peninsula a particularly negative role is being played by the Titoites who, in order to escape from the grave internal political and economic crisis, in collaboration with other reactionary and fascist forces, are fanning up the flames in the direction of our country.

It is self-evident that all these developments, these events and situations, make it essential to enhance the awareness of the peoples that the imperialist superpowers are threatening the world with a terrible new conflict, although they are afraid of it because it would be catastrophic for them, too.

The superpowers and the other imperialist powers have become more arrogant and aggressive everywhere in the world, in Asia, in Africa, in Central America and elsewhere. Therefore, today more than ever, it is up to the progressive and revolutionary forces, and the genuine Marxist-Leninists to

arouse progressive opinion worldwide, in the first place, the proletariat, the working class, the oppressed and enslaved peoples, to cry halt to the crazy, predatory, warmongering policy of the United States of America, the revisionist Soviet Union, all the other imperialist and revisionist powers, and national and international reaction.

Our people, led by their Party, are standing vigilant, working for the ceaseless strengthening and flourishing of the economy and the defence of their socialist Homeland, well aware of the dangerous situations and plots of the superpowers, the imperialist and revisionist powers and all the other reactionary forces. Our country pursues a foreign policy of friendship with all other countries and peoples and especially the neighbouring countries and peoples. It does not interfere in their internal affairs and allows no one to poke their fingers or meddle in the internal affairs of Albania. The People's Socialist Republic of Albania fights to defend its rights, its freedom and independence and the victories achieved in the construction of socialism, therefore it is strong and fears no one. At the same time it has supported the liberation struggle of all other peoples and will continue to do so in the future.

THE NOVEMBER 8TH PUBLISHING HOUSE

Catalogue available at november8ph.ca

NEPH would be glad to have your comments on this book, its design, any corrections and suggestions you may have for future publications. Please send them to **info@november8ph.ca**

Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist)
Read *TML Monthly and Daily*!
Support CPC(M-L)!
cpcml.ca